

Oregon stated that there was a ghetto in Portland, when only 20,000 Negroes live throughout the State, and more than 18,000 of them are in the city of Portland.

The Secretary or his agents are authorized to hold hearings and investigate, and to have access to premises, records, documents, and individuals and any other evidence to determine if there are any violations of the provisions of this act. Here, again, is another constitutional safeguard to the right of privacy, a citizen's right to be secure in his home, trampled underfoot by this amendment. As I said before, it is unbelievable that the Senate would consider for a moment enacting the provisions of this amendment into law, taking away all of the rights which were fought for so long and so hard.

This bill is so obnoxious because it weights the controversy so heavily in favor of the person who claims to have been discriminated against. There is no attempt to maintain evenhanded justice. A person can file a complaint against the owner of a dwelling or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development can file the complaint, or the Attorney General can bring an action in the U.S. District Court against an alleged violator, all independently of each other, or all working together, depending upon their own discretionary choice. Anyone who violates the Secretary's orders can be fined \$50 a day for disobeying such an order. In the past, Congress has created special commissions such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, and has endowed it with quasi-judicial functions. It has made certain by the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act—APA—and other rights of redress against arbitrary acts of the Commission to insure that a respondent or violator would be protected in his constitutional rights.

However, in this case, an ordinary political appointee of the President and his agents who hold office at the pleasure of the President, are invested with these overwhelming executive and judicial powers, without any safeguards for the rights of an accused person. To my knowledge, this is the first time a partisan political official in this Government would be granted such powers.

The pending amendment on open housing represents the ultimate in social extravagance in the United States. Every cherished liberty purchased at a high cost in Anglo-American history over the centuries is cast aside. All personal rights and liberties of the individual are ripped away for the alleged purpose of preventing discrimination. All the personal liberties wrung from the sovereigns from the Magna Carta to the Bill of Rights are trampled under foot. If this amendment becomes law, those guaranteed rights will be nothing but lies and dead concepts. The curators of our archives have placed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution in a steel and concrete vault. How stupid and foolish. Do they not know that the protection of the Constitution is here on this very floor and in the minds and actions of all Americans? The vault contains but empty promises on faded parchment. The fulfillment of the promises has not been kept.

Under this amendment the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would become a virtual commissar of housing—violating every right of life, liberty, and property. Sweeping judicial powers, I repeat, are given the Secretary and his agents to investigate the facts of alleged discrimination, render judgments against an accused and assess penalties. No right to file a complaint in court is granted an accused until 6 months after the Secretary or his agents

have rendered their judgments that a violation has occurred. However, if the Secretary should decide against one of the so-called aggrieved persons he can go into Federal court in 30 days. In other words, if a so-called aggrieved person does not get a favorable decision from the Secretary within 30 days he can get the Attorney General to go into Federal court with his complaint. However, the poor fellow accused of discrimination cannot get a fair trial in a duly constituted court for 6 months.

Nothing so monstrous has been perpetrated on civilized people since the French and Russian Revolutions. The howling mobs are always the same—whether it is Paris in 1793, Petrograd in 1917 or Detroit in 1967. It is always in the name of democracy and equality. Equality is the last refuge of the trifling, the shiftless and the incompetent. This amendment runs into many of the same constitutional objections as the pending bill does, only it violates more provisions of the Bill of Rights.

The amendment is more or less the same bill that was considered in 1966 and 1967. On May 27, 1966, the Attorney General of Louisiana filed an opinion in the form of a memorandum with the Judiciary Committee on the constitutional questions raised. At some future time I shall quote from his very thoughtful and learned opinion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 16, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 16th Annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 1, the 16th consecutive annual Presidential prayer breakfast was held. The breakfast was attended by the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Also present were presidents of national and international labor unions, outstanding leaders in the field of industry and business, chancellors and presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, and men of distinction from the courts, from communications, and

from every other phase of our economic life.

We have found this event to be very meaningful, not only to those of us who gather at the breakfast, but also to millions of citizens across this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the text of the program and the proceedings.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Invocation: The Hon. John A. Volpe, Governor, State of Massachusetts.

Introduction of Head Table and Statement: Sen. Frank Carlson, Kans.

Greetings from House Breakfast Group: Rep. Ben Riefel, S. Dak.

Old Testament Reading: Rep. John W. McCormack, Mass.; Deuteronomy 6:4-17, Read by Sen. Joseph Tydings, Md.

Greetings from Senate Breakfast Group: Sen. John Stennis, Miss.

New Testament Reading: John 15:1-17, The Vice President of the United States.

Prayer for National Leaders: Hon. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary Housing and Urban Development.

Message: General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

Address by Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States.

Closing Prayer: Hon. Price Daniel, Office of Emergency Planning.

Closing Song: The Singing Sergeants.

INVOCATION, GOV. JOHN A. VOLPE

We raise our voices in prayer to the God of men and nations acknowledging our dependence on Him and our earnest intention to do His will. On this earth we only see dimly His divine light. After we hear too softly the sound of His voice. May His grace make us each day more sensitive to our duty, more conscious of how helpless we are without Him. As we ask His blessing on ourselves, we ask Him also to guide this nation and all others into the paths of peace and justice. Too often in our bewildered world, His sons are enemies separated by conflict and violence seeking to resolve by power what must be earned in peace. Those who call Him Father must by this fact be brothers, but how easily oppression, persecution and discrimination divide them one from the other and make a mockery of brotherhood and justice. The world God made for man, man has remade according to his own weakness. Help us, oh Lord, to know your ways and give us strength to follow them. Make us humble

before You, loving toward our fellow man and forgiving of the faults of others. In these times of stress we ask His special blessing on the man who guides the destiny not only of our nation but indeed the entire world. Our President is burdened with problems which affect the people of every nation on earth. We ask that your divine guidance give him the foresight, intuition, knowledge and wisdom necessary to resolve that which has been placed before him. We ask that his virtue and love for his fellow man be spread throughout the world in order that all may live in peace and understanding. Let everything that we do find favor in your sight so that when life's cares are at last set aside, we may live eternally in your presence. Amen.

INTRODUCTION: SENATOR FRANK CARLSON

What does it accomplish? Each week, when Congress is in session, men from the United States Senate and from the House of Representatives meet to discuss and pray together. And it is in that spirit that we meet today.

Since the inauguration of this breakfast this idea of men in positions of responsibility meeting together privately and without publicity has spread to every State, scores of cities and to over 50 nations of the world—in parliaments and congresses on every continent.

Once a year men in leadership from various aspects of our national life meet together with the President of the United States and his official family to rededicate ourselves and our nation to almighty God. Now, the beginning of our nation, the United States of America, is recorded in the experiences of groups of people who left their homes and country, confident that they were being guided by the Lord to find a new country where they could worship Him in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. While still onboard the ship their leaders assembled in the cabin and prepared a compact which was to be their guide in their new-found home. This document was the historic Mayflower Compact. Later they prepared a document, the Declaration of Independence.

These documents declared that they were dependent upon God for their preservation and their continued existence as a people and as a government. Out of the 13 colonies grew the United States of America. Again and again the leaders of this new government reaffirmed their assurance of the protection and their guidance. Their faith as expressed in national documents, statements of the Presidents in their inaugural addresses, in the preambles of the States' constitutions and chiseled in the stones and marbles of monuments and public buildings.

Our Presidents have, to the man, called upon almighty God to help them meet the awesome responsibilities vested in them as President of the United States. April 30, 1789, in the first Inauguration, George Washington said these words: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that almighty Being who rules over the universe."

Those of us who are gathered here today believe that the United States of America is truly a nation under God. We're meeting today as citizens feeling our complete unworthiness, because we know of our public and private sins, but also recognize that we are charged with a serious and unique responsibility to perpetuate this trusting faith in God to the oncoming generations.

After giving some thought to what I might say, if I only had the opportunity to say one more thing to the leaders of my beloved country, this being the end of 40 years of public service, it's just this:

Men, do not take the God of our fathers lightly or allow Him to be squeezed out of our lives through the neglect or our own selfish appetites. Only through our commitment to love Him with all our hearts, our souls and minds, and our neighbors as ourselves, will be safeguarded all that is worthwhile for our

children and for our country and for the peoples of the world.

Now, it becomes my pleasure to present those at the head table who will not participate in the program. We have a great group of distinguished guests here this morning, and as I read their names, I hope they will rise, remain standing and that we hold our applause until all have been introduced.

I'm going to start at my extreme left with Dr. Abram Vereide; the Honorable Dewey Bartlett, Governor of the State of Oklahoma; the Honorable Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia; the Honorable Charles Terry, Jr., Governor of Delaware; Dr. don Napoleno Alcerro, who is Vice President-Designate of Honduras; the Honorable Allen Boyd, Secretary of Transportation; the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Ramsey Clark; the ambassador from Nicaragua, our very fine friend Dr. Sevilla-Sacasa; Dr. Hernan Garron Salazar, president of the National Assembly of Costa Rica who, by the way, brought with him a letter to the President from the President of Costa Rica which I shall deliver.

Now, I'm going to start at my extreme right. The Honorable Joe Tydings, the Senator from Maryland; the Governor of the great State of West Virginia, Governor Hulett Smith; the Governor of North Dakota, the Honorable William Guy; the Governor of the State of Mississippi, the Honorable John Bell Williams; the Honorable Mr. Pennell, Solicitor General of Canada; the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry Fowler; Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Marshall; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack.

Rep. REIFEL. Mr. President, honored guests, friends: I bring you the warmest of greetings from the prayer breakfast group of the U.S. House of Representatives. We meet at 8 a.m. for breakfast in the Capitol on nearly every Thursday that the Congress is in session. As you are aware, many of you more than I, our Government was established and nurtured by men of meaningful commitment to the faith of our fathers and a belief that the supreme power beyond themselves watches over its destiny. We meet on these Thursdays as the inheritors of their great work that we might collectively give expression to our reliance also on God's help and ask Him for His guidance for ourselves, our President and all others in authority that whatever we shall do will be in keeping with His will.

We go from these meditations hopefully so reaffirmed in our belief that each in his humble way may walk a bit closer to the path that God would have us follow and with the psalmist say reassuringly. "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me."

For several years past, many of us have been privileged to share in this international commitment of free men that we might join in giving praise to our Lord, and together with meek hearts call upon Him for divine guidance. We know that we do not depend upon the frailty of man to face the challenges of that come to us from all around. And again, this day we will be reassured in the knowledge that our President ever strives to lead our nation and assist all mankind in the light of the deep and abiding spiritual heritage that is ours.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. President, Senator Carlson, and other friends, I bring special greetings of good will and good wishes from our Senate Breakfast Group. Without formality, some 15 to 20 of us meet informally at breakfast, each Wednesday morning for fellowship and to exchange views and com-

ments in an attempt to apply spiritual values to present problems. Our responsibilities in Washington also demand spiritual food.

Within less than an hour from now I shall open hearings on a \$79 billion military program for fiscal year 1969, the second largest in our Nation's history. There we shall be briefed on airlifts and sealifts, missiles and anti-missile missiles, conventional weapons, and ultimate weapons—all weapons.

Throughout such testimony, and during other days ahead, a grave question always plagues my mind: Is the real challenge in material things or in spiritual things?

I often feel encouraged to recall a recent air flight across the Atlantic when I visited the chief pilot of a giant passenger liner of the air as it winged its way over the trackless ocean. I asked him to explain how he took his bearings, how he kept his plane on its course and how he finally reached his true destination. Observing lights from several surface ships far below, I asked him if the ships gave him signals. His reply was piercing:

"Senator, I would never stay on my course if I took my bearings from strange and unknown ships at sea. I have trustworthy instruments here on my panel board. I know how to operate and read them. Furthermore, if those instruments should be inadequate, or if storms should overtake us, this plane has the power to climb above the clouds; I would then take my bearings from the stars."

As I left him and returned to my cabin, I knew this splendid pilot had given me a lasting message, great and true!

And I believe it was also a true message for our people, for our country and for the free world.

We have our instruments and panel boards of liberty and personal freedom. We have been trained to understand and to operate these instruments.

We have economic freedom, an instrument of happiness.

We have material resources, and the ability to convert these resources into material strength.

We have political freedom and a system of government which permits the people to govern themselves and preserve both their personal and their economic freedom.

Furthermore, we have the priceless heritage of religious freedom.

And, thankfully, we have been trained from our youth to rise above the clouds and look to the stars and to a Higher Light and Higher Power and thus find our bearings and our course.

Though the future may appear dark, as now, the challenge is not in the material world but in things of the spirit. So let us use the instruments on our panel board in charting our way and then purpose in our hearts to do our part in following that course.

Let us take courage. In other generations, the way has also been hard. At another uncertain time in history when our Constitution was being written, Delegate Benjamin Franklin addressed the Convention with these words:

"I have lived a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of man. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

The Convention thereupon adopted Mr. Franklin's motion that the sessions be opened each morning with prayer. Within less than two weeks, basic agreements were reached which led to the final adoption of our present Constitution, a document which has been the charter and protector of our own freedom, as well as the inspiration and guide of free men everywhere. By it, we have taken our bearings and stayed on our course.

We, too, must rise above the clouds and

look to the stars, and even beyond for the Higher Light. With the help of that Divine Light, we will find our way. May God sustain us as we look forward and face the future unafraid.

Senator CARLSON. At this time we are going to be led in prayer for our nation and for our national leaders by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver.

PRAYER FOR NATIONAL LEADERS

Our Father we thank Thee for the communion we enjoy together as we break bread here. We ask your guidance that we may create in this nation and on this earth a world in which men's deeds are governed not by their fears and hates but by their faith and hopes. Grant us peace and brotherhood thy most precious gifts and enable us to be messengers of peace. Bless our country and strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship between all the inhabitants of our land. We ask in particular that in your divine wisdom you will grant your love and guidance to our president that he may find renewed vigor and insight in facing the awesome decisions that rest upon him. And we call upon thee, oh Father, to encourage those of us who are in positions of national leadership so that we may find the patience and understanding to transform despair into hope and replace frustration with vision. Hear our prayer, oh Lord, Amen.

ADDRESS OF GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Introduction

Senator CARLSON. We have as our guest speaker this morning a great Christian layman, one of our nation's great military leaders, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Harold Johnson.

General JOHNSON, Mr. President, Senator Carlson, friends in God:

"I'll go where you want me to go, dear Lord; Real service is what I desire.

I'll say what you want me to say, dear Lord;

But don't ask me to sing in the choir.

I'll say what you want me to say, dear Lord—

I like to see things come to pass.

But don't ask me to teach girls or boys, dear Lord,

I'd rather stay in the class.

I'll say what you want me to do, dear Lord;

I'll yearn for the kingdom to thrive.

I'll give you my nickels and dimes, dear Lord,

But please don't ask me to tithe.

I'll go where you want me to go, dear Lord,

I'll say what you want me to say.

But I'm busy now with myself, dear Lord, I'll help you some other day."

Does that strike a familiar note to anyone?

Three years ago, when the honor, the privilege and the responsibility of appearing before this distinguished audience was accorded to me, I was pretty apprehensive. I asked then and I ask now: what in the world is this Johnson doing up here this morning?

And I said then and I say now that I don't believe that it's because I happen to share the same name as my Commander-in-Chief, but because, like our President, I believe in the power and the glory and the strengths of Almighty God. And as the task of preparing for this appearance this morning began to close in once again, I asked: What more can I say? And then I began to reflect back over a great number of events in my own life, and I started out with a number that I was going to tie together. And I had them boiled down to two last night, and this morning as we sat here at breakfast, I reduced it to just one that I want to relate very briefly:

I reflected back to late September, 1945, when I returned to the shores of this magnificent country after more than five years'

absence, of which nearly 41 months had been spent out of communication, with little information and no sensing at all of public attitudes here at home. And the most vivid impression that I received when I came home and that I still carry with me—and, I might add, the greatest shock that I felt when I returned—was a national attitude of "what's in it for me?"—money under the counter if you expected to rent an apartment, must know a friend to get nylons for your wife or even a white bath towel, must know someone on the Ration Board to get tires for your car—"What's in it for me?"

And as I thought about this, I decided I had become so presumptuous as to try to give a brief message today despite the fact that I know in my heart that my qualifications really place me as a listener rather than as a speaker up here. I acknowledge that I am no paragon of virtue and that I violate the very things that I am going to speak about much more and perhaps much, much more than anyone who listens this morning.

And I want to use the third chapter of the letter of James, the thirteenth through the eighteenth verses, and I am going to read from Phillip's translation, and I quote: "Are there some wise and understanding men among you? Then your lives will be an example of the humility that is born of true wisdom. But if your heart is full of rivalry and bitter jealousy, then do not boast of your wisdom. Don't deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart. You may acquire a certain superficial wisdom, but it does not come from God. It comes from this world, from your own lower nature, even from the devil. For wherever you find jealousy and rivalry, you also find disharmony and all other kinds of evil. The wisdom that comes from God is utterly pure, then peace-loving, gentle, approachable, full of tolerant thoughts and kindly actions, with no breath of favoritism or hint of hypocrisy. And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness in other people and in themselves."

Our nation today is troubled and uneasy. We have those who believe that we should pull out of Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia. We have those who believe that we are not doing enough in Southeast Asia. We have those who believe that we are not doing enough for the underprivileged of our country. We have those who believe that we are fostering and harboring a segment of parasites within our population. We have those who believe that the laws of our land can be flouted and that they can choose the laws they will obey and the laws they will ignore. We have those who believe that disrespect for the law should be confronted with a club or a gun.

Parents across our land are concerned with the use of drugs and dope among our young people.

So where do we turn? What do we do? How many of us—referring back to James—and I quote: "deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart"? How many of us have given real thought to the commandment that was read in our first scripture: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thine soul and with all thine might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart?"

We are part of a social structure that is growing more crowded with each passing day. It is becoming more difficult for an individual to establish an identity. The older among us are too busy and too preoccupied to communicate with the younger. Our consciences are becoming hardened by continued exposure to both the contemptible and the pitiable. Unable or unwilling to take corrective measures, we offer at first only our contempt or our pity. Contempt and pity give way to acceptance; acceptance leads finally to the worst attitude of all—

uneasy indifference, anomalous as that may seem. We ignore, with the vain hope that the distasteful or the hard-to-solve problem will somehow go away.

And I wonder if it isn't time for each of us to reflect upon the eighth and the ninth verses of the fourth chapter of Genesis. Remember that after Cain slew his brother, the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" And Cain replied: "I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?" And the answer is: "Yes, I am my brother's keeper." Each of us is his brother's keeper, and in the eyes of God, all of us are brothers.

We dare not be indifferent to our brothers' needs, whether those needs be material, spiritual or just plain communication.

Now, there is a solution to the problems of this world: Turn to God. There is a solution to the conflict between nations: Turn to God. There is a solution to the problems of our cities and our streets: Turn to God, not in a superficial way, but in a humane and compassionate way. As man to man and friend to friend, there is a solution to the problem of our young: With them, turn to God.

What's in it for me? Just the satisfaction of becoming a compassionate human being.

Finally, if we ever wonder how far we should carry our love for one another, remember that Jesus was not content with the old commandment to love our neighbors as ourselves. True to His manner, He added glorious new dimensions to that injunction by saying, in the words of our final text this morning: "This is My commandment—that ye love one another as I have loved you."

We can never hope to match His matchless love, but we grow in grace and glory every time we try.

ADDRESS OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Distinguished head table guests, reverend clergy, gentlemen: At this season of the calendar, the nights are long, the winds are chill, the light of day is often dull and gray. Our minds know that the chill will pass, that spring will come, that the days will be brighter once again.

What our minds know, our spirit often forgets. We weary of the winter and despair of the coming of the spring. We are tempted to turn from the task of duty and lay down the works that are ours to do.

At this season of the affairs of man, it is all much the same. The nights are very long. The winds are very chill. Our spirits grow weary and restive as the springtime of man seems farther and farther away.

And it is for such seasons as this one that man was given by his Creator the saving strength of faith—the strength that we summon to sustain us when we pray.

Once again, this is a season now when America needs to draw upon the strength of our many faiths. In this great office of all the people, it is not my right or my privilege to tell other citizens how or when or what they should worship. I can—and I do—tell you that in these long nights your President prays.

And in the hours of this night that just past, I found these lines of prayer that were repeated a quarter of a century ago by another President. It was in 1942, when we were challenged in both oceans, at a season when the winds of the world blew harsh and the dawn of a brighter day seemed very far away, Franklin Delano Roosevelt offered to this nation these words and I repeat them in these times:

"God of the free, we pledge our hearts and our lives today to the cause of all free mankind. . . . Grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace, that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our own lands, but throughout

the world. And in that faith let us march toward the clean world that our hands can make. Amen."

We cannot know what the morrow will bring. We can know that to meet its challenges and to withstand its assaults, America never stands taller than when her people go to their knees.

Senator CARLSON. The closing prayer will be given by a former Governor, a former United States Senator from the great state of Texas, and he is presently the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, the Honorable Price Daniel.

CLOSING PRAYER

Now Father, we thank Thee for these inspiring messages from the President of the United States and the other speakers on this program. We thank Thee for the privilege of this meeting, of the leaders of our nation and visitors from other lands in which we have pledged anew our faith in Thee and the spiritual ties which bind us together. We pray again Thy blessings upon the President of the United States and all who are in authority. Go with us now as we depart from this meeting, guide and direct us in our thoughts and actions in order that we may hasten the day when Thy teachings of justice, love and brotherhood may prevail in our nation and throughout the world. In the Master's Name, we pray. Amen.

Buy Dow

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, the Dow Chemical Co., headquartered in my district in Midland, has been the target of mob harassment and vilification solely because Dow is the only producer of napalm used by our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Largely generated on college campuses, these smear tactics by a lunatic fringe have attempted to identify this fine company with an allegedly immoral policy of the United States. On February 1, 1968, there appeared an editorial in *Forbes* which bears directly on this matter. I am pleased indeed to present it for reproduction in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Buy Dow

The kicking around that Dow Chemical Co. is getting both literally and figuratively on college campuses because it makes napalm to meet defense orders is completely unfair.

The sort of publicity that accompanies these episodes is presumably damaging to the company's public image, and any company realizes the vital importance of its image.

I just wonder, however, if Dow really is or will be hurt by all this. Is it too much to expect that the vast majority of Americans will recognize the inequity involved?

No matter what one thinks of our course in Vietnam, that's got absolutely nothing whatever to do with those supplying what the United States Government asks for in carrying out its policies. One might as well boycott the airlines that fly to Vietnam, the tire and auto companies that supply the vehicles for use there; the mills that make the uniforms and the companies that supply the fibers, and so on ad infinitum.

Protesting policy and casting ballots are part and parcel of the American way of life. Downing Dow isn't.

I both hope and believe this sort of irre-

sponsible abuse will boomerang, that more people might buy Dow things now to demonstrate disapproval of this misdirected abuse.

Tribute to the Women Marines

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on February 13, 1943, the U.S. Marine Corps brought into existence the women marines. When one considers that the U.S. Marine Corps antedates the signing of the Declaration of Independence, one realizes that that service took due deliberation before removing a rib for the creation of a women's section. They have never regretted their action.

The women marines have, by their very fine service, added to the luster that surrounds the U.S. Marine Corps record in war and in peace.

During my own service as a private in the U.S. Army, I had the opportunity of observing the fine work of the women marines and when, upon my discharge, I formed my own commercial company, I chose a former woman marine sergeant as my assistant.

That most capable person, former S. Sgt. Rusty Work Schwall, is now my administrative assistant and has served in that post for almost 20 years. I mention this only to prove my contention that the training that one receives in the U.S. Marine Women Corps prepares one for a position of great responsibility.

In 1943, upon the creation of the women marines, over 100 women volunteered for service in the first 24 hours of the call. They were rapidly followed by 18,000 more who flocked to the service to "free a marine to fight."

The question of a title for this new group soon arose. The Army had its WAC's, the Navy its WAVE's, and the Coast Guard its SPARS's. When questioned as to his choice, Marine Commandant Gen. Thomas Holcomb stated:

They're marines. Call them marines.

Certainly all will agree that these ladies by their dedicated service have well earned that envied right.

A mother of two women marines has written an excellent poem dedicated to all past and present members of that part of the U.S. Marine Corps. That poem by Mrs. Margaret C. Norris follows:

TO A WOMAN MARINE

A tall young girl in forest-green stands proud
And straight as she salutes her country's flag.

This woman soldier has a right to brag
Because she stands apart in any crowd.

A tall young girl in forest-green stands proud
And straight; her uniform reflects a long
And faithful service to a nation, strong
Because Marines, with honor, so have vowed.

Such people deem it duty to uphold
The principles of freedom, tolerance and
justice, with self-government the
means.

The Corps consists of people free and bold;
Today the women stand beside the men,
So proud to be: United States Marines!

Once more the United States finds itself in a serious war and our Marine Corps is as usual in the forefront of the fighting. As in the past, its capabilities have been tested by the foe who have found that the marines of today are living up to their traditions. The women marines have shared in these responsibilities and they too have earned the right to assume the proud title of "marine."

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. L. F. Chapman, a great fighting general has issued a proclamation in tribute to the women marines, past and present, it follows:

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D.C.

Twenty-five years ago, our Corps looked to woman-power to meet a new war's unprecedented demands for man power; and America's women—19,000 strong—answered the call to "free a Marine to fight."

Since that time . . . in war and in peace . . . those women and others like them have faithfully sustained the strongest military tradition in the world, that of the United States Marine Corps.

With pride in your past achievements . . . with faith in your promise for the future . . . I extend to you—Women Marines past and present, congratulations on your Silver Anniversary and best wishes for the years to come.

L. F. CHAPMAN, JR.,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

It is indeed timely that this tribute to the women marines appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so close to Valentine's Day for they are indeed the beloved "valentines" of us all.

We owe a debt of gratitude to those noble, patriotic women who have or are serving in the U.S. Marine Corps.

When the history of our national defense is written, their service will occupy an honored place.

Equal Employment Opportunities

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Extensions of Remarks* an inspiring article that describes how the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co. found that it was a good business to be concerned with equal employment opportunities. The author of the article is Mr. Thacher Longstreth, executive vice president of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and a Republican member of the Philadelphia City Council. Mr. Longstreth has distinguished himself over the years by showing a very deep concern for the rights and opportunities of all minorities.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

AN EXTRAORDINARY ACHIEVEMENT

Although I have not made it a practice in this column to discuss the activities of individual corporations, this week will be an exception because of the rather extraordinary

achievement of the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company during 1967 in the hiring of a large number of non-whites.

In June of 1966, First Pennsylvania management decided that the less than 80 Negroes employed by the bank did not represent any real approach to the problem of unemployment facing Philadelphia's Negro community. So word went out through the Personnel Department that a particular effort be made to hire non-whites wherever possible, without at the same time causing any strain in the very happy relationship which the bank enjoyed with its several thousand white employees. It was a tall order but it has worked like a charm.

In addition to the emphasis given to the employment of black people through the regular channels of employment, Project 35 was set up in 1967 to provide special opportunities for low income persons who would not ordinarily have qualified via education, work experience or test at First Pennsylvania. Thirty-five people were selected, following a total waiver of the usual personnel requirements. In addition to a regular work day, these people were given 15 weeks of night training on a voluntary basis which concentrated on improving their reading and mathematical skills and provided special instruction for the jobs they were occupying during the day. Incidentally, these special employees were charged against an executive budget rather than against any departmental budgets, so that none of the department managers had to worry about the possibility of learning time or poor performance being charged against departmental records. This played an important part in achieving close working relations between supervisory personnel and the 35 newcomers. At the end of four months, 27 of the 35 were permanently hired, with six having dropped out along the way and two others lacking skill and performance records to warrant permanent employment. A second Project 35 started a month ago and is continuing on the same basis.

The Bank also initiated Project STEP, which set up a secretarial program for 15 girls along similar lines, and Project BEEP, which employed 25 high school boys from the 11th and 12th grades of predominantly Negro high schools who work Monday through Friday from 1 or 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. The Friday work period is devoted to a seminar by an appropriate bank official in the Board Room. These boys were selected by the counseling staffs of the schools and are paid \$1.75 an hour for their work. All 26 of these youngsters have been with the bank since the program was inaugurated last fall. There have been no dropouts among them, either from First Pennsylvania or from school. Sixteen of the boys have no father in the family and their grade level in reading and mathematics is approximately at the 6th or 7th year.

Although these programs all stem from the intense interest of the First Pennsylvania's top management, spearheaded by Bill Walker, John Bunting and Nat Bowditch, in creating vastly increased opportunity for Negroes within the job structure of the bank, the driving force behind the programs has been Jim Blocker. Big, handsome, black and dynamic, Blocker is the first Negro to achieve officer status in a Philadelphia bank, and his program development at First Pennsylvania has made a big hit with both blacks and whites. Most important of all, of course, is the fact that a conservative, supposedly slow-moving institution like a bank has been able to increase its Negro employment from less than 80 to nearly 400 in slightly over a year. First Pennsylvania is quick to admit they expect this to be good business as well as good citizenship. Negro depositors and small loan users are increasing rapidly. The bank is working, through a Negro enterprise—the Business Development Corporation under attorney John Clay—with an ever increasing number of Negro businessmen who need financial assistance in start-

ing up new enterprises or expanding present ones.

Is all this good business? No one can tell for sure yet, but perhaps it is more than coincidence that First Pennsylvania's vast involvement in Negro employment came in a year when the bank enjoyed the highest percentage growth in profits of any of the nation's top 25 banking institutions. It is my fond hope that other Philadelphia institutions in all kinds of business will take a leaf from First Pennsylvania's successful book.

Achievement of a Society of Abundance and Individual Freedom

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Special Programs in the Department of Transportation made a most perceptive and provocative speech on February 1 at St. Mary's College, in Moraga, Calif. Mr. Agger discussed the roles of private enterprise and government in our evolving effort to achieve a society of abundance and individual freedom. I commend this speech to Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, AT THE 11TH EXECUTIVES' SYMPOSIUM, SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE, MORAGA, CALIF., FEBRUARY 1, 1968

I'm going to begin today with a complaint, and my complaint is that our sponsors have rigged this program against me. Not only am I the only bad guy on the program—that is to say, the only full-time Government worker; even our topic is rigged.

I am reminded of what Thomas Reed Powell said: "I can win any argument if you will allow me to state the question." The question before us is, "Private Enterprise and Big Government: Friend or Foe? What does it mean? Well, in the American tradition, 'private enterprise' is a good thing and 'big government' is, of course, a bad thing.

How about this for a topic? "Creative Government and Heartless Big Business: Friend or Foe?" You see, a lot depends on how you state the question.

For the last 5 years or so, we've been hearing a great deal in this country about the dangers of big government. I, for one, am deeply concerned about the danger of making government too big and the danger of giving government too much authority. For 15 of those years I have been watching the Federal monster ooze across our national landscape. In a minute or two, I want to articulate for you my conviction that government must never be called upon to do things that can be done effectively outside of government.

At the same time, I think that in any discussion such as this one, we should keep in mind that if government is big, so is the nation. We have more than 200 million citizens—citizens with needs, citizens who make demands. Our big government didn't simply spring forth fully developed, the realization of someone's bureaucratic dream. Our government grew with our nation, and it grew in response to the demands of the people.

I would point out, too, that on many occasions the spokesmen for private enterprise have been among the most demanding of the citizens. It was private enterprise, just as much as the consuming public, that needed regulatory agencies like the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission. It was private enterprise that needed the Small Business Administration. Most observers today would tell you it's private enterprise that needs urban renewal.

The airline industry was built with Federal nourishment and financial support. Many advances in technology (the supersonic transport and the high-speed train, for example) are made possible, and can be made profitable, only because of government—only because that same big government which we rightly fear is underwriting so many ventures.

And private enterprise thrives on Federal research money. One economist has pointed out that research and development in the United States has been undergoing a distinct process of nationalization—that three fourths of the money spent in this nation for research and development is spent by the Federal government. You don't often hear private enterprise complaining about that.

Friend or foe, then I submit that the question is invalid because it assumes that private enterprise and government are either friends or enemies, but in any event, separate from and somewhat alien to each other. In our complex society, this simply is not the case. The edges are blurred—and sometimes not only the edges. Our concepts of private enterprise have changed and evolved right along with our concepts of government, and the result is a complicated mixture of roles and responsibilities.

One private entrepreneur will tell you that Congress ought to repeal most of the regulatory laws of the Federal Government, and the next private entrepreneur will tell you that without anti-trust laws, or without subsidies, or without import restrictions, or without even so-called "fair trade" laws, he couldn't stay in business.

I would ask also, exactly what is private enterprise? Is it the fellow who takes the family savings to open a hardware store on the corner? Or is it AT&T, whose annual revenues are in excess of the combined annual revenues of more than half the states? Is it really private enterprise when 90 percent of a company's gross income can be traced to contracts let by the government? And is it private enterprise—is it private enterprise in the traditional sense—when a corporation's assets are owned by millions of stockholders—stockholders who are known by their friends as citizens and voters and consumers, and whose primary concerns never are directed to the corporation whose stock they happen to hold?

AT&T now has more than three million share owners. France has some 50 million citizens—all share owners, you might say, in the French national corporations. Which is more private, AT&T or one of France's *Societes Nationales*? And where is the breakoff point—at five million share owners, or 15, or 50?

And what of big government? I would suggest to you that American government today is what it was always intended to be: a system of checks and balances—and more than that, a system of built-in tensions. One of the first things the schoolboy learns about his government is the concept of separation of powers. But American government in the 20th Century has gone a step further. There has developed within the Executive Branch what might be called a concept of the separation of interests, or the separation of pursuits. I would no doubt make headlines tomorrow in somebody's newspaper if I stood here and whispered to you that a certain Federal agency in Washington is looking out for the welfare of a

certain corporation. That would be wrong, and it would be news. But I would shock no one if I told you that the Department of Agriculture has been looking out for American farmers, or that the Department of Labor has been promoting the interests of American workers, or that the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Treasury are helping manufacturers increase their exports. We seldom say such things, and I think the reason is that they seem so obvious. Nevertheless, in a discussion of whether business and government are friends or enemies, the point is worth making.

In 1892 a man by the name of Charles E. Perkins was president of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad. Mr. Perkins was dissatisfied with the activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and he happened to be a personal friend of Richard Olney, who was Attorney General under President Cleveland. So Mr. Perkins wrote the Attorney General and urged that he work in Washington for the abolition of the ICC. The Attorney General's reply is interesting. Let me read you part of the letter:

"My impression," said the Attorney General, "would be that looking at the matter from a railroad point of view exclusively, it would not be a wise thing to undertake. . . . The attempt would not be likely to succeed. If it naturally succeeded and was made on the grounds of the inefficiency and uselessness of the commission, the result would very probably be giving it the power it now lacks. The commission, as its function has now been limited by the courts, is, or can be made, of greater use to the railroads. It meets the popular clamor for a government supervisor of railroads at the same time that the supervision is almost entirely nominal. Further, the older such a commission gets to be, the more inclined it will be found to take the railroad view of things. . . . The part of wisdom is not to destroy the commission, but to utilize it."

I want to make a proposal today, and I'm going to direct my proposal to the Steering Committee for next year's Executives' Symposium here at Saint Mary's College. My proposal is that next year's topic for discussion be this: "Friend or Foe: The Public Interest vs. the Government-Industry Coalition." That is, government and industry on one side; the public interest on the other. I would like to hear a group of businessmen engage the question of whether their political power and their public relations and lobbying resources have been so strong as to weight the scales of government on the side of industry. I would like to hear your views as to whether the missions of private enterprise include a responsibility to let government serve the public interest undeflected by the vested interests.

So far I've said that I can't really define private enterprise and that I can't categorize very neatly all the elements of government. But I will state my own definition of the aims of the two. The primary goal of government is the well-being of its citizens—all its citizens. The primary goal of private enterprise is making money.

I start—as I'm sure you do—with the premise that a free enterprise system, or more accurately, a private enterprise system, is the best economic system to fulfill the needs of all the people of a community. One can construct all sorts of philosophical or sociological or even theological arguments to support that thesis. Today, I will plead only the historical argument—which is to say that a free enterprise system works. Heaven knows, it has worked for the United States.

Private enterprise built this country and helped unify the various sections of this country. Private enterprise helped make individual citizens physically and economically healthy. It helped us through a domestic war and through foreign wars. The world in the 20th Century is a sort of living laboratory

of economic systems. Many theories have been tested. I think there is no question in the minds of any of us that the private enterprise way, the American way, has stood the test. And it will continue to do so.

Still, I think all of us would agree also that we could not have a healthy economic system if private enterprise were completely unchecked by government. Without the counter-balance of government, John D. Rockefeller might have had all the money; and all the rest of us would have been poor. I think it is clear, therefore, that one of the legitimate functions of government is to help private enterprise work—in a sense, to help protect free enterprise from self-destruction.

I said before that the primary goal of private enterprise is making money and that I believe this goal coincides, for the most part, with the government's goal of enhancing the well-being of the people. But now let's draw the contrast. While the people weren't paying attention—and thus while the government wasn't paying attention—private enterprise helped pollute our air and our rivers. It contributed to the decay of our cities. It spoiled large areas of scenic and recreational value. It helped solidify the divisions among the races. It shored up social systems which denied economic and educational opportunity to certain groups of citizens. It sold us unsafe automobiles and diseased meat.

I am by no means indicting the private enterprise system; but I would ask you, should private enterprise set limits on its goals so that in its eagerness to expand assets and income, it does not tread upon the interests of the nation as a whole? Or should government set those limits?

And what of social stability? What is the responsibility of private enterprise to the worker whose talents are made unnecessary by new technology? In my office in the Department of Transportation, we talk about what has been called "the container revolution"—the use of large containers, or boxes, to ship quickly and efficiently the cargoes that traditionally have been moved laboriously, item by item, from rail to ship or from ship to truck. The container can be packaged at the factory and moved from one mode of transportation to another and never opened, never unpacked, until it reaches the final destination somewhere across the ocean. The container threatens to put thousands of longshoremen out of work. This is what we mean when we talk about technological unemployment. Now I ask you, whose job is it to look after these men?

Are they the responsibility of private enterprise—the same private enterprise which boasts so often that it provides jobs and good lives for so many Americans?

Or are they the responsibility of government? And if so, why is it, then, that when the government suggests a new program to solve the problems of unemployment, businessmen sometimes lead the attacks against the program?

I say that private industry can't have it both ways. Perhaps industry has no responsibility to the people displaced by its shiny new machines. But government can't take that narrow view—not in our society; not, if you will, in a democratic society.

My own bias is that the marketplace ought to be allowed to operate at the lowest cost and price levels possible. I would like the marketplace to function without regard to a great many social problems. But the social problems must be met, and you're aware, I'm sure, of the overhead involved in running an operation out of Washington.

Where containerization is concerned, the shipping interests and the longshoremen's union here on the West Coast have reached an accommodation which is at least creative and which could set a pattern for other industries. In 1960, the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshore-

men's and Warehousemen's Union signed a contract which anticipates that fewer and fewer longshoremen may be needed. The contract provides both lump-sum payments to the union and incentives for the early retirement of individuals. In this instance, the dynamics were such that private enterprise fashioned an agreement which appears to be working satisfactorily for most of those involved.

I don't know what is the long-term point of the story about the ILWU and containerization. But I would point out to you that it does contain a question of fundamental social and economic importance. To what extent should technological unemployment be viewed as the financial responsibility of the industry as in the case of the longshoremen? Is this problem more properly a responsibility of the society as a whole—of big government if you will, be it state or federal government?

Not long ago I read a heartening article by Victor H. Palmieri, the president of the Janss Investment Corporation. Mr. Palmieri suggests that one of the critical questions facing the nation is whether the business community is really willing to scrap its almost habitual opposition to government action, and whether business will join the effort to find new ways to meet public needs.

Let me quote Mr. Palmieri:

"The old principles, or rather the process in which they operate, can be stated this way: Politics expresses the public need. Government accepts the mandate to fill the need. The business community, following its traditional policy of containment, first denies the need, then seeks to limit the response of government. Two decades later both the particular need and the governmental response are accepted as legitimate and appropriate; a new administration comes to power with a new mandate for social action; and the whole melancholy process is repeated."

"The result," says Mr. Palmieri, "is not failure so much as it is a discontinuity in the rhythm of our progress as a nation and as a free people."

Now there are some people who would suggest that this "discontinuity in the rhythm of our progress" has served the nation well. They would argue that without foot-dragging by business and others, the nation would have gone too far too fast. Perhaps so.

I submit, however, that time is running short for the solution of some problems. Our cities were on fire in 1967. In that situation, can we afford a process in which needs are first denied and responses are then limited?

Last October, Paul Goodman spoke in Washington at a symposium sponsored by the National Security Industrial Association. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the views of Paul Goodman. It is a vast understatement to say that they are controversial, especially when Mr. Goodman is speaking to the leaders of large corporations. I'd like to quote something Mr. Goodman said.

He was talking about urban affairs, and about whether American business is equipped to assist in the vast urban clean-up and renovation which most Americans now agree is mandatory. This is Mr. Goodman speaking to the executives:

"Unfortunately, it is your companies who have oversold the planes and the cars, polluted the air and water, and balked at even trivial remedies, so that I do not see how you can be morally trusted with the job."

And a little later, he said:

"Your thinking is never to simplify and retrench, but always to devise new equipment to alleviate the mess that you have helped to make with your previous equipment."

Let's assume for the sake of argument that Mr. Goodman's indictment has some validity. (Who would deny that it has at least some validity?) If so, then for at least a portion

of the time, business and government *ought* to be enemies.

We hear quite a bit these days about how business has developed a conscience—how it's going to help clean up the slums and clean up the rivers and construct new bulwarks against urban sprawl. All you've got to do is turn on the television set to see a petroleum company telling that its refineries are so pollution-free that the fish and the waterfowl live in health and luxury and social welfare in the marshland just outside the refinery doorway. All you've got to do is flip to the inside of a magazine to see a producer of tractors or fertilizers or pharmaceuticals telling how its products are going to help save the overpopulated and undernourished world.

Regardless of how much real substance there is behind the advertising campaigns, we entered a new era when we reached the point that business felt it had to try to convince the public that it has a conscience. We've come a long way. There is hardly anyone successful in business today who would think of uttering such a statement as "the public be damned."

But I think we've got to go somewhat deeper than the advertisements if we want to explore seriously the question of whether the corporation can be an institution, as someone said, "for good as well as gain."

I hope private enterprise can find ways to accomplish good things and still stay in business. I hope corporate managers are ingenious enough to do some of the things that must be done, and that they can do so without making the stockholders too angry. I hope that technology will provide us new tools for improving the lives of all our citizens at costs they and the nation can afford.

The reason for my hope is simple. I don't think governmental institutions as we know them are any better at getting things done than non-governmental institutions. Indeed, I'm convinced that institutions outside the government are generally better equipped for action than any governmental institutions which have yet been devised.

But I will say that private enterprise has usually lacked the motivation to work for good as well as for gain; and private managers have felt for good reason that they lacked the mandate to work for good as well as gain. If all that is changing, I rejoice in the prospect.

Just two weeks ago, President Johnson in his State of the Union Address called for a partnership between government and industry to work for certain national goals such as full employment. The President was serious when he suggested this partnership. And I think I can say that the President, and all of us in government, will be delighted if private enterprise chooses to be the leading partner—if business decides to lead the way.

I think that today, more than ever before, businessmen know they have a stake in solving problems such as unemployment. This is made abundantly clear by a glance at the list of corporate participants in a group such as the Urban Coalition, which reported last summer on the plight of the nation's cities. The courageous nature of that group's proposals is evidence that businessmen can be as daring as any other group in the search for solutions to the nation's problems.

On the other hand, we would be naive in the extreme if we assumed that government can safely abdicate to industry the basic responsibility for those activities in which the profit motive is absent. What we must do is assure that private industry recognizes and encourages the need for government activity at the same time that private industry is maintaining relentless pressure on government in order to keep the bureaucracy's greedy tendencies under control.

That brings me to my final point. Anything as large and powerful as government

represents a vast potential threat to that unit in our society which is of greater value than government or business; that is, the individual. I want to close this little sermon with an appeal, and my appeal is that private enterprise become the aggressive and untiring defender of the individual in American society.

If private enterprise can do this job—if private individuals working through private institutions can assume this role, then private enterprise will become in truth what its public relations people have always said it was and what it has always wanted to be.

Let me explain what I mean. This great nation is challenged today in ways no nation has been challenged before. It is challenged to prove, against increasing odds, what Americans have always felt to be true. It is challenged to demonstrate that a growing, wealthy, highly industrialized nation can provide plenty of privacy, plenty of breathing space, plenty of choice for the individual.

Let's examine the threat. We have come to a time in history when the problems of expanding population, on the one hand, and the possible answers offered by technology, on the other hand, tempt us to do things which would not have occurred to previous generations.

Someone has said that the most awesome thing he ever saw was machines making machines. But that isn't nearly as awesome or as frightening as the possibility we now face—the possibility not that machines will make people, but that they will shape people and direct people's lives.

We're coming to a time, too, when machines can talk to machines—when your computer on the West Coast can interrogate someone else's computer on the East Coast and when, between the two of them, they can catalogue just about all there is to know about such-and-such an individual. What are the consequences going to be for the American individual when the computers have stored up, along with his Social Security number, every little bit and piece of his life—every time he got in trouble, every failure, every success?

At Columbia University, Zbigniew Brzezinski has described the period we are about to enter as "the Technetronic Age"—a time in which society is shaped by the impact of technology and electronics, especially computers and communications devices. Brzezinski asks these questions:

"Can the individual and science co-exist, or will the dynamic momentum of the latter fundamentally alter the former; can man, living in the scientific age, grow in intellectual depth and philosophical meaning, and thus in his personal liberty too; can the institutions of political democracy be adapted to the new conditions sufficiently quickly to meet the crises, yet without debasing their democratic character?"

Brzezinski and others look to a time when human life will be, as he says, "less spontaneous and less mysterious"—when we'll be able not only to determine the sex of our children, but when we'll be able—with drugs—to control their personalities and also, perhaps, the extent of their intelligence.

Private enterprise has always pictured itself as the realm of opportunity for the individual in America. And it has pictured itself also as a bastion of private choice—the institutional framework which allows the individual to make his own decisions and select his own way.

I suggest that private enterprise can do a service for this country if it will establish itself as the defender of the traditions it has preached. Private enterprise can make itself the stalwart refuge for the individual—the place where promising new ideas are welcome; the place where any man, regardless of class or caste, can prove himself on the strength of his intelligence and his ingenuity and his willingness to work. And does the

corporate personnel man really have to interview the candidate's wife before he may join the corporate congregation?

I'd like also to see private enterprise lead the fight against the demeaning institutionalization which threatens our pride as human beings. I'd like to see private enterprise lead the fight against invasions of our private lives.

I recommend to you the work that has been done in Washington by such men as Senator Ervin of North Carolina and Representative Gallagher of New Jersey. They have recognized that technological snooping devices and information-storing computer systems are threats to our freedom. Senator Ervin has called upon American industry—upon private enterprise—to devise safeguards against the use of such devices to invade our privacy.

Look also at the race problem. In our laws and in our public institutions we have eliminated much of the racial discrimination which has shamed us as a nation. Now private enterprise can lead the way in providing private opportunity, and it can use its special talents of innovation and inventiveness to do so.

Look what Ford Motor Company is doing—going into the ghettos to recruit workers and offering them bus fare and lunch money until that first pay check arrives. And look at Neiman-Marcus, the department store. It announced recently to its suppliers that in the future, the store—and I quote—"would rather do business with a company which is actively and sincerely pursuing a policy of equal opportunity than to continue to do business with one which is not." Stanley Marcus, the president of the store, noted that the Federal government demands that its suppliers be equal opportunity employers. And he said: "We believe a private company should do no less."

I don't know whether the Neiman-Marcus plan or the Ford plan or any other specific private undertaking of this sort appeals to you as a businessman. But I do suggest that you as businessmen have the know-how and the tools to help make this nation continue to be a nation in which private, individual achievement is encouraged.

The strength of the United States has been found throughout our history in the riches of our diversity. I have had the uneasy feeling that our diversity is threatened by technology—not only by the machines, but by the technocrats who man them—the system systems people. I like to call them; the people whose formulas make no provision for a flash of brilliance or an admission of error. These are the input-output people—the tyrants who change our nouns and our adjectives to verbs, so that we finalize projects instead of completing them. They would, in fact, computerize everything. And they would program all our lives—everything from the sexual act to the transplant.

They would palletize our people, and they would commit our very souls to a flow chart. They would quantify us—that's the way they would say it—so that we will violate none of the parameters they have assigned for our journey through memoranda-ville.

Our individuality is at stake; and our diversity—our heritage as a pluralistic society. I look to private enterprise as a fully appropriate guardian of that heritage.

What Is Illinois Like?

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, since the onset a few weeks ago of the yearlong

celebration of Illinois' 150th anniversary as a State, much has been said and written about its history, its virtues, its people, and its future. Few of these utterings, articulate though they are, are as warm and moving as that composed by a young man from my district.

What Robert Trizna, a high school sophomore from Joliet has to say about our beloved Illinois—and how he says it—merited space in the editorial column of the Joliet Herald-News. I believe that those who read it will know why, and will know as well a feeling of fellowship, be they an Illinoisan or not.

WHAT IS ILLINOIS LIKE?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was the winner in the Catholic Women's League essay contest sponsored as part of the Illinois Sesquicentennial celebration. It was written by Robert Trizna, a sophomore at Joliet Catholic High School.)

On December 3rd, 1818, Congress met in Washington, D.C., and admitted the territory of Illinois into the Union as the 21st state. Named for a tribe of the Algonquin Confederacy, this section of wilderness, bounded on the west by the Mississippi River, first became acquainted with the white man in 1673, when Father Jacques Marquette and explorer Louis Joliet paddled down the Fox River to the Mississippi. Since then Illinois has become "the hub" of the nation. But Illinois means something more than just history.

Miles and miles of boring flatlands and cornfields in the first impression most travelers get of Illinois. To them it appears to be one vast farm. They are partially right, because Illinois is one of the country's leaders in agriculture. Corn, wheat, and soybeans pour out of the Prairie State almost unceasingly to other parts of our country and the world. Its major city, Chicago, is a giant meatpacking center and the "Wall Street" of the grain world. Here is commemorated the first self-sustained nuclear reaction on the campus of the University of Chicago. As the convention capital, Chicago is now preparing for the "68" Democratic Convention. O'Hare field, the world's busiest airport, adds to Illinois' credentials as a major economic and social center, as well as an agricultural capital. Such is the Illinois of the visitor's view.

But to the people who live in the state, this is only one facet of Illinois. It is also the cities, the suburbs, the subdivisions, and the small towns. It's the quiet "Main Street" of Willitsville, with its dry goods store, hardware store, and diner. It's bustling State Street of Chicago, with Marshall Field, Rothschilds, and Marina City. It's the "ole swimmin' hole" outside of Addieville, where the farm kids gather on a warm day; it's Lake Michigan, whose beaches overflow with scantily clad urbanites, and upon whose piers are unloaded cargo from many lands. The wooded areas, parks, and forest preserves are very much a part of Illinois too. They provide city dwellers with that rare chance to commune with nature. There they can hunt; they can also fish in the numerous rivers and streams which cut through the land. The Mighty Mississippi graces the western boundaries of Illinois. Now, as in the days of Louis Joliet and Fr. Marquette, the Mississippi is an important thoroughfare for cargoes and barges. Just as these ships provided the early settlers with articles needed for survival, they now provide us with oil, cotton, coal, and other necessities. Such is the Illinois of the citizen's view.

But to me, Illinois means even more. It is Joliet, the town in which I live. It's my parish and my school. It's the rural areas near Channahon where the wheat fields in spring and the corn fields in summer are the overland seas of gold and green. It's the DuPage river, where carp and catfish swim in the days of the first settlers. The warmth of

the people would be difficult to equal anywhere else, for Illinoisans are a pleasant mixture of city slicker and country folk. This is the Illinois that I love, the place where I will always remain, in spirit if not in body; for Illinois is My Home.

All of this is Illinois; it's the traveler's view, the citizen's view, and my view combined. But it is even more than this. The heritage of Illinois is something you or I could appreciate. Every drop of sweat shed by the first settlers is part of it. Their ambitions, their joys, and their labors have contributed significantly, even inestimably, to this heritage. We are celebrating the sesquicentennial of Illinois' statehood. We should be even prouder of the work of our forefathers who first tilled the soil of Illinois and brought forth the abundant fruits which are now so much a part of the Prairie State. This is our heritage; for Illinois is . . . Our Home.

The Great Swamp of New Jersey

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion lately—albeit accompanied by too little action—about air pollution and water pollution. But there is still relatively little understanding of threats to our total environment.

Theodore M. Edison, of West Orange, N.J., is a mechanical and electrical engineer who years ago became concerned about the imbalance between our enthusiasm for technology and lack of attention to the impact of that technology upon our environment. Experienced in implementing and assessing the technology of which he speaks, Mr. Edison is well qualified as a knowledgeable and concerned citizen about the problems of our environment.

On February 1967, Theodore M. Edison submitted testimony before a public hearing of the Fish and Wildlife Service on New Jersey's Great Swamp which was being considered as a site for a jet airport.

Mr. Edison discussed the lack of awareness of the effects on our own environment and the accompanying lack of rational planning to meet, rather than compound, the problems of tomorrow.

His statement was reprinted in the May 1967 issue of the National Parks magazine. I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

[From the National Parks Magazine, May 1967]

THE GREAT SWAMP OF NEW JERSEY: JETPORTS AND "PROGRESS"

(Several years ago the Great Swamp of New Jersey was being viewed as a site for a jet airport. The swamp, rich in scenic, plant, and animal interests, was saved from development then by conservationists and local residents, and part of it was incorporated into the national wildlife refuge system. But recently there has been more talk of the Great Swamp as a jetport site.)

(In February the Fish and Wildlife Service held a public hearing on its plans for Wilderness in the Great Swamp Refuge. Presented here is a statement submitted for the hearing record on that occasion by Theodore M. Edison of West Orange, New Jersey, in which the author asks some disturbing questions about a philosophy which the conservationist

Darwin Lambert has called "the perpetual growth mania.")

Three years ago, Public Service Electric and Gas Company distributed throughout the nation handsome sets of picture postcards in an effort to bring more business and industry to New Jersey. The pictures showed an awe-inspiring expanse of port facilities and other examples of modern developments, as well as several beautiful views of farm country and wild areas. To induce employers to come here, it was pointed out that "New Jersey is a beautiful state and one that offers the industrialist and his employees and visitors many opportunities to enjoy the great outdoors." It was further stated that "Few other states can boast of such a desirable diversification and balance in land utilization."

Political and business leaders are continually taking part in similar sales campaigns that stress the importance of economic growth. However, statements like those just quoted make me wonder why so much effort should be spent on trying to expand the very developments that may soon destroy the diversity and balance that are said to make the state attractive. It is argued that more industry will be needed to provide jobs for the rapidly increasing population, but it seems to me that we cannot follow the "more, more" policy much longer without "progressing" toward serious blight.

Projections indicate that if every bit of vacant land within fifty miles of New York City were to be developed to the maximum permitted under present zoning, there would not be enough room to take care of the increased population expected there in less than thirty years. Even if we sacrifice most of our remaining farms and wildlands to supply the added millions of people with water and other essentials up to the year 2000, what will we do when the population doubles again in a few more years? Unless there is a general awakening to the urgent need of reducing the rate of population growth immediately, I fear that there will be rapid deterioration in our environment, and that the present generation may live to see us reach the point of disaster. We already face serious problems with smog, water supply, waste disposal, traffic strangulation, and many forms of social frictions and cost inflation that result from crowding, and I predict that these problems will mount with amazing speed as we run out of the relatively open spaces into which we have been expanding.

If we need another jetport now, we will probably need several more a few years hence, but present difficulties in finding a site show that it will be virtually impossible to meet the later demand. If we are going to be forced to find alternatives to more jetports anyway, why not concentrate on such alternatives now, instead of ruining our best remaining rural and natural areas to get only inadequate results? As certain problems of traffic congestion, noise, and smog production can probably best be solved by reviving and improving mass rail transportation, there would seem to be good reason to eliminate subsidies to at least the more dubious airports and highways that are helping to defeat the railroads. If rail services are allowed to deteriorate to the point of abandonment, revivals may become almost prohibitively difficult and expensive.

It has been implied that just a few selfish people with estates near the Great Swamp are blocking the selection of that swamp as a jetport site, but I feel that that is far from the case. The public outcry against loss of the swamp has been very widespread. And when it comes to selfishness I doubt that those concerned with aviation are in a good position to throw many stones. For example, one airline, in its current T.V. advertising of new direct flights to Lima, Peru, wonders how long Peru can survive the American tourist. It comes right out and says that it is making it much easier for tourists to get

there and much harder for Peru to stay unspoiled, and then quite logically concludes with the advice that travelers should go early. It is nice to know that if jets succeed in eliminating the last shreds of tranquility here, it may still be (temporarily) possible for people with enough time and money to escape in those jets from our own rat race to help spoil a remote place. And we can make even faster progress in that direction if we can just get the great majority of Americans (who seldom or never fly) to put up with shattering sonic booms.

John Cummings of the Philadelphia Inquirer

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, there is a most distinguished American priest who has made popular the saying, "Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness."

There is one man who has lighted 10,000 candles. His name is John Cummings, and he writes for the Philadelphia Inquirer.

I am almost tempted to say that the mind of man goes not back to the time when John Cummings was not writing. That would be an exaggeration, but it would be a pardonable one. For decades he has written with a delightful and whimsical humor, with a sharp, perceptive mind. Now he has passed his eightieth birthday, and will be starting another decade of political punditry which will delight everyone who has any interest in the passing scene of Pennsylvania or national politics.

I am sure that everyone in this House joins me in wishing John well, and in wishing him many more decades of toil over his typewriter. I am sure, also, that all of you would want to read the delightful column Harold J. Wiegand wrote in the Inquirer on January 23. It is a splendid tribute to a distinguished son of Olyphant, in my own congressional district.

The column referred to follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY: HE IS 80

(By Harold J. Wiegand)

People don't get to be eighty every day in the week, not even John M. Cummings' Uncle Dominick. But on this particular day of the week, John Cummings has reached that rather remarkable point in his lifetime, and we have taken the liberty of nudging him out of his corner of the editorial page to say a few words on the subject. That is more than anyone could possibly get from Cummings—a few words.

Some friends of the columnist will gather at dinner to salute him at three-score and twenty, to pump his hand, to tell him a few lies about how young he looks, to drink a toast or two, and so on. There will be newspaper people and politicians and judges and assorted characters who knew him "way back." There will be some of his favorite women (including our own favorite among them, first name Margaret). There will be singing friends from the Kelly Street Chorus and talkative friends from the Clover Club and drinking friends from all over. You can bet this: no one will have a better time than the guest of honor.

He has been having a good time, and help-

ing others to have a good time, for years beyond memory. All that time he has been piling up a unique record as one of the most widely read political writers in the State. His pungent comments on the political scene and its participants, his gently biting observations, his use of a sledgehammer when appropriate, have made his column prescribed reading for several generations.

Because John Cummings has been around for such a long period, some persons have the impression that he covered the Johnstown Flood, had to shovel his way out of the Blizzard of '88 and held Nick Hayes on his lap as an infant. None of this is true, although other legends have foundations in fact. It is true, for example, that he fought in the First World War, returned home as a first lieutenant and was promptly given a field commission as captain by George Brennan, then the venerated political editor of this newspaper. Hence the nickname "Cap" attached to the Cummings name ever since.

Cummings is a transplanted coal-cracker. His home town of Olyphant is not precisely a coal patch; but it is not a metropolis, either. Give heed to Cummings' nostalgic prose, however, and you'll think it is the Athens of America, with a philosopher behind every bar and cracker-barrel.

The columnist has covered every National Convention since 1920, when he secured a news beat on the impending Republican nomination of Warren G. Harding—getting it from Ed Vane on the train carrying the Pennsylvania delegation to Chicago.

He has been on a first-name basis with every Governor of Pennsylvania since Martin Brumbaugh, every Mayor of Philadelphia since Rudolph Blankenburg, and, we might add, with every manager of the Bellevue Stratford since Claude Bennett.

He has been a long-time president of the Clover Club, an ancient assembly of bonvivants whose hearty slogan is "When we die we die all over; when we live we live in clover." He is president of the Kelly Street Chorus, which had its prehistoric origin in the bar room of Pete Dooner's Hotel, where reporters and politicians of another generation used to gather after hours to hoist a few beers and songs. As the closest Cummings has come to having a singing voice is his membership in the Welsh Society, it is evident that he was not chosen president because of his vocal talents.

He is also the oldest member of the Pen and Pencil Club, itself the oldest newspaper club in America, and he is dean of the Pennsylvania Legislative Correspondents Association, a Harrisburg organization that antedates Harvey Taylor—but barely.

His baronial residence near Blue Bell, tastefully captioned "Horsefeathers," has become a historic place of interest in upper Montgomery county, a tourist attraction, and a refuge for cats, guinea hens, courthouse politicians and other strays.

Readers of the Cummings column have at time seen something leprechaunish in his humor, going back, perhaps, to County Mayo by way of the Delaware & Lackawanna. We wouldn't know about that, but this is for sure: he has lightened and brightened the beginning day for uncounted thousands who will wish for him, on his 80th birthday, many more!

The 150th Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of the Sacred Heart in North America

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, 1968, the Society of

the Sacred Heart is celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding in North America.

The Society of the Sacred Heart was founded in 1800 in France by St. Madeleine Sophie Barat. In 1818, at the age of 49, Mother Rose Philippine Duchesne arrived in New Orleans and made her way by steamboat to St. Louis, Mo., intending to bring quality education, culture, and love of God to the "little savages" who lived there. She and the other nuns were met by Bishop du Bourg who directed them to set up their school in St. Charles, Mo. Upon their arrival in St. Charles, Mother Duchesne commented that—

Divine Providence has brought us to the remotest village in the United States.

Despite this and the many other hardships which were encountered in those years, she set up her convent and school. Called the Academy of the Sacred Heart, it became the first free school west of the Mississippi. The institution grew with the community of St. Charles, and in 1821, St. Charles became the first capital of the new State of Missouri. The Academy of the Sacred Heart was a basic ingredient of the cultural growth of not only this area, but of the State of Missouri as a whole.

Mother Duchesne lived to be 83 years of age. During her life in the service of God in America, she established two other convents in the St. Louis area, and the great success of the society in North America can be traced directly to her influence. The society has educated thousands of women in this country who have made their marks in every field of endeavor, and it shall continue to do so as long as the living spirit of, and the tradition of excellence engendered by blessed Philippine Duchesne is honored as it is in this sesquicentennial year of the founding of the order on this continent.

Private Morality and Public Law

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable William Graham Cole, president of the Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill., has an interesting and well-researched article in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal concerning the relationship of private morality and public law.

The article emphasizes that our young people must accept responsibilities that accompany constitutional rights which they choose to exercise. Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place excerpts from this article in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE MORALITY AND PUBLIC LAW

(By William Graham Cole, president, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.)

Edmund Burke was speaking as the classical conservative who believes that the human will contains appetites which require restraint, either external or internal, when he said:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites. . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

The liberal, on the other hand, perhaps nowhere better personified than in Rousseau, regards man as naturally filled with sweetness and light, peaceful and generous toward all, corrupted only by the artificial structures of society. In our own political history, both of these viewpoints have had their advocates, from the conflict between Hamilton and Jefferson down to the present day. Neither side has entirely won the battle. Our heritage represents a remarkable synthesis of both ingredients. Some eras have witnessed the temporary ascendancy of emphasis upon the freedom of the individual from external restraints, with much talk of rights—religious, political or civil. Other times have stressed the necessity for a strong governmental hand, and this has resulted in the frequent use of words like duty, obligation, responsibility.

There have been some curious historical twists here and there. Jefferson was all for minimal national government, until the government was his. Jackson spoke for the freedom of the common man, but threatened to hang the nullifiers of South Carolina. Lincoln supported the right of peoples to revolution, and suspended the writ of habeas corpus. The Democratic Party spent the last half of the nineteenth century fighting for states' rights against the centralist power of Republican administrations, and then completely reversed the field in the twentieth century. The same turnaround occurred with respect to protective tariffs. And in 1964, we witnessed the curious spectacle of the party of Abraham Lincoln joining forces with Southern Democrats to check the movement for the civil rights of Negroes. American politicians and parties have never been for long guilty of that foolish thing called consistency!

Just now we are locked in one of our perennial struggles between private morality and public law, and all the cards seem to be falling to the advocates of individual rights. No one has much to say these days about duty and obligation and responsibility, or if someone does, not many hearers are in evidence. Youth in general and students in particular are loudly proclaiming their protests over any attempts to regulate their lives by law. They claim to be mature enough and responsible enough to decide for themselves what is right and wrong, good and bad. There is no valid evidence to suggest that any very radical change has occurred in the private morality of students in their practices with respect to alcohol and sex. There is more drunkenness (and there may be less) on the campus today than in my time a generation ago. There are a few emotionally mixed-up kids who are sexually promiscuous and there is a fair amount of premarital sex between youngsters in love and planning to be married. But then there always has been. Today's students do not seriously clash with public law at these points. Many of them drink before they are twenty-one, and thus violate the law of most states, but often their liquor is served to them by their parents or their parents' friends. The debutante parties given by the leading citizens of society fracture the law spectacularly in this particular regard! And while the official position calls for sexual abstinence until marriage and monogamous fidelity thereafter until death, students know full well that their elders honor this law very much more in the breach than in the observance.

Today's clashes between students and college and university administrations are again nothing new. The President of Amherst Col-

lege in the 1890's was forced to resign by a student riot led by a young radical named Harlan Fiske Stone! In the 1770's the President of King's College in New York was so terrified by a student torchlight parade to his house that he fled down the back stairs to a British warship in the harbor, on which he sailed home to England, never to return. The student leader of that parade was Alexander Hamilton.

What is new in this particular conflict is the fact that students are clamoring today for all of the rights and privileges of full citizenship. Aided and abetted by certain faculty members, they are demanding that in all academic discipline, the full paraphernalia of adversary proceedings be used, including the right to counsel, to cross-examine accusers, to trial by a jury of peers. They want their dormitory rooms protected against search without a warrant. They want to be able to refuse to answer questions on grounds of self-incrimination. They want due process with a capital D and a capital P.

There has been a historic concordat between town and gown, due to which members of a university or college have always enjoyed a certain immunity from the civil authorities. Students apprehended by local police *flagrante delicto* have traditionally not been arrested and brought to trial but rather turned over to the dean for his discretionary discipline. In 90 per cent of cases involving student delinquency, the problem has not been one of establishing guilt or innocence. The student has been guilty as hell and has admitted it! The problem was to let the punishment fit the crime, and on the whole deans have historically been pretty good at that. Much better by and large than student courts, who have in the past tended to be overly severe. What students are now saying is that they no longer want to be treated so, no longer want the college or university to be *in loco parentis*. They are not, they say, minors but majors and they demand all of the privileges appertaining thereto.

But this means that they must also accept the responsibilities that accompany the rights. If deans can no longer serve as parent surrogates, if academic administrators must act in all respects like the civil authorities, then there will inevitably be increasing resort to these authorities. To be blunt, the college will "call the cops". Student misdemeanors will no longer be dealt with *in camera* with wide discretionary powers exercised by the dean but in court with counsel. Convictions will become a part of the student's permanent and public record, not kept in a confidential dean's file, regarded as youthful pranks to be forgotten and forgiven. Where narcotics are involved, and they are unfortunately on a sharp increase on all campuses, administrators requiring search warrants will go to the police and offenders will be treated as violators of federal statutes. Unfortunately, many students today regard their own private notions of morality concerning marijuana and other psychodelic substances as superior to and surpassing the public laws. It is doubly unfortunate that they are given aid and comfort in this position by supposedly competent medical authorities who regard the use of some of these substances as relatively harmless. Using that kind of expert ammunition, students argue that these drugs are merely like alcohol—both give one a pleasant buzz. No one seems able to make them see that pot is rather like alcoholism, where every time one drinks he does so to the extent that he loses contact with reality and ceases any longer to be a responsible human being.

In any event, student demands for protection under the law are going to have consequences unforeseen by them and their advisers. They are appealing from one law, which they currently regard as arbitrary, to another, which they find more just. Their private moral judgments see only the rights due them as individuals under adversary proceedings. They cannot see that behind every

right lies a responsibility; behind every privilege there is an obligation. The first cannot exist in the absence of the second. Without some form of public order, no individual has any civil rights. He has only what he can protect by his own brain and brawn. Just now today's youth are obsessed with demanding their rights. But if history is any judge, they will learn that those rights carry a price tag. No society can long endure on the philosophy of what the French call "*la culte de moi*". Without a willingness to accept responsibility there can be no enduring rights. So what in actuality students are doing is not to appeal to private morality against public law. They are only exchanging the law of the police and the courts for the law of the dean and the trustees. The alternative is anarchy.

A similar principle holds with respect to the civil rights movement. In the early stages of the sit-ins, the demonstrations, the marches, the boycotts, what was happening was that the participants were testing certain public laws, local ordinances clearly discriminatory in nature, against another and higher public law, the Constitution of the United States. The private consciences of the protesters told them the local laws were wrong and they deliberately disobeyed them, seeking arrest and trial so that these laws could be tested in the higher court against the higher law. That sort of relationship between private morality and public law is altogether legitimate and has a long and noble tradition behind it. To argue on the other hand, however, that my private morality is superior to the highest law of the land and that I can disobey that law with entire impunity is quite another matter. The individual, of course, always has the option of martyrdom. Against arbitrary tyranny, disobedience and resistance are often heroic, and the annals of human nobility shine with the courage of such stars. But those great ones were never under any illusions that the regime against which they moved would simply say to them, "There, there, that is perfectly all right. Here is a mild slap on the wrist. Now go, and sin no more." They knew perfectly well that they risked apprehension, imprisonment and often death.

What our contemporary "heroes" are demanding is that in the name of their private morality they be permitted to violate laws that are perfectly constitutional and then be excused for such violations on the grounds that they were done for conscience's sake. They seriously believe that they should be allowed to stop traffic during rush hour at busy city intersections, to move in and occupy buildings and offices, making it impossible for the rightful owners and occupants to transact normal business, to prevent trains carrying troops or munitions from arriving at their destinations. No matter whose conscience is involved, I know of no law or court decision which makes that kind of behavior permissible in an orderly society. If it is excusable on grounds of conscience for a group of civil rights demonstrators to disrupt a city's traffic, then why is it not equally excusable for a white citizen's council also on grounds of conscience to disrupt a civil rights rally?

Many, indeed most, of our present protesters will not only accept but demand the full protection of the law for their rights to dissent, to demonstrate, to speak, publish and assemble. If the police do not act to shield them from hecklers and bullies, they are outraged. But they cannot see that those same police are merely doing their same duty when they break up an illegal sit-in or march. There is a hint of philosophical anarchism behind some of the more bizarre protest groups in our midst—the hippies and mods, the beatniks and Vietniks who drop out, op out or cop out, thumbing their noses at society and its values. They suggest in their actions if not in their words that all authority, all order, all structures of law are beneath contempt. What they curiously fail

to recognize is the strong likelihood that if their vision of society prevailed, they would themselves be the first victims of the lawlessness they advocate. Unrestrained by police and civil law, an outraged public would move in on these "kookvilles" and clean them out! The inner city police so often accused of brutality and prejudice come in very handy in protecting legal demonstrations against illegal bullies.

I am not suggesting that direct action should be banned, though techniques once effective because they were called forth to dramatize desperate situations have lost much of their effect by being used to express a sometimes merely petulant disapproval. There are situations, as in labor strikes, where negotiations break down and no other avenue is open except to strike and picket, or as in the South, where local authorities flagrantly denied Constitutional rights to American citizens. These call for extreme measures. But they do not call for violating the rights of other American citizens. Not in a democratic society, where the people are governed by their own consent. Societies sometimes reach the point where the people have no recourse except revolution. We of all nations should know that. And we have been known across the years to support a revolution or two elsewhere in the world. But until that time comes, any nation-state has not only the right but the duty to protect itself and its citizens from minorities who attempt to set their private morality above the public law. When and if the time comes when the public decides the minority is right and the law is wrong, then the law will be changed or there will be a revolution. But until then, we must assume that the law represents the wish of the public and it must be enforced.

We as a nation have been remarkably tender toward dissenters. With the possible exception of Great Britain we can boast a better record than any other nation in the world. We have some scars here and there: the denial of habeas corpus during the Civil War, the Communist hysteria and its tragic excesses after both World Wars, but on the whole we do not come off too badly. People today in the heat of passion over Vietnam forget that there has been a noisy, strong-minded minority vocally opposed to every war we have ever fought, saving only World War II. It was true of Korea, "Mr. Truman's war", of World War I, of the Spanish-American War. Many opponents of our own Civil War were absolutely persuaded that military victory was impossible in that one. Young Congressman Lincoln was among those against the Mexican War. And both 1812 and the Revolution were bitterly opposed by many Americans. Yet we have allowed the dissenters their voice, have tolerated those who lash out savagely at the whole fabric of our society. And never in our history have the protections accorded under the law to individuals and groups been stronger. We cannot permit espionage, sabotage or treason. But subject only to the clear and present danger limitations we allow even a lunatic fringe to sound off at will. When a speaker can stand before an audience and exhort them to "Burn it down, baby, burn it down!", and that not only once but numerous times, and stay out of jail, I have no fear for the civil liberties of dissenters! Even the accused American criminal today has greater protection than the upstanding citizens of half the world.

And yet, despite that record, despite a heritage which should evoke pride, there are large numbers today who seem to hate their country and virtually everything it stands for. Our press, our educators, our churchmen, our political leaders outdo one another in damning and denouncing our President, our Supreme Court, our Departments of State and Defense, our admirals and generals, our chiefs of police, our superintendents of schools, our national policies, foreign and domestic. As I read editorials and columns these

days, listen to speeches and panel discussions of the so-called "opinion makers" of our society, whether conservative, liberal or middle-of-the-road, I wonder why anyone should any longer be proud to be an American. All we hear any more from anyone is what is wrong with us, and those few individuals who dare now and then to speak up in defense of our really very impressive past and present are accused of being administration finks! It has become very fashionable nowadays to be very sophisticated, very cynical and very critical. Dissent and difference from whatever party or person happens at the moment to be in power is one thing—an important and essential part of any democracy. But we lack the British concept of a "loyal opposition", opposed to the present administration but faithful to the nation.

I was much impressed last March on a trip behind the Iron Curtain to find the schools and universities of the socialist countries doing an extraordinarily impressive job of educating their young people toward a thoroughly positive desire to make their own individual contribution to the larger goals of the society as a whole. The students are not by and large brainwashed or propagandized Communists. They are properly skeptical about the more extreme and outlandish claims of the bureaucrats. But they are all the same thorough patriots, devoted to their countries. We used to do this. All of us were subjected to civics courses which made us glad and proud to be Americans. But no more. Today it is fashionable not to praise but to blame, not to emphasize the advantages of being part of this society but rather the way we deprive individuals of opportunities and rights.

And of course every society does have shortcomings. So long as men are men and not gods, we shall falter and fail. It becomes largely a question of emphasis, whether one concentrates on one's blessings as compared with other actual societies or on one's bane as compared with "Utopia". Eric Severeld has well observed that the young can see only one dimension—forward from where we are to the future world of their hopes and ideals. Older people must, he says, from the imperatives of experience take account of two other equally valid dimensions—backward to the way things used to be and sideways to the way things are in other societies they know.

Promise of Tomorrow

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, the words "promise of tomorrow" seem a little shopworn sometimes, but people in Pennsylvania's Crawford, Mercer, and Venango Counties are making them words of action. That action is being translated into new jobs, better recreation facilities, protection from floods, sound land-use planning, a broader tax base, and a host of other benefits.

People in the three-county area were among the first to concentrate their efforts in a coordinated program to speed up resource development which will have a far-reaching impact on the economy and standards of living in the area. Early in 1964, they accepted the opportunity to launch one of the first 10 resource conservation and development projects approved by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to receive technical and finan-

cial aid from the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. Their project is named the "Penn Soil" and covers 1.5 million acres.

I have maintained an active interest in this project because two of the three counties involved—Crawford and Mercer—are located in my congressional district.

Like all resource conservation and development projects, the Penn Soil project is strictly a locally planned and supported program. More than 20 groups of local people worked with representatives of Federal and State agencies in developing the plan, which they started to carry out late in 1964.

Most of the project measures planned were inspired by the fact that the people got together and talked about their needs and recognized that this area of rich natural beauty held great potential and that the exodus of people could be stopped by developing it.

Although sponsors of the Penn Soil project expect it will take from 12 to 16 years to complete their plans, important developments are already in evidence:

First. Comprehensive land-use planning is taking place in all three counties.

Second. Important to land-use planning is the soil-survey information that is being speeded up through the project. In Mercer County, the soil survey is now complete and I understand that the information is available to anyone who needs it, even though the survey has not yet been published.

Third. A unique feature of the project is a proposed \$1 million conservation education center. The Pennsylvania General Assembly has enacted legislation that provides up to \$50,000 for purchasing 200-some acres for the center. Sponsors estimate that the center will increase income in the area by about \$100,000 annually.

Fourth. Significant headway has been made in treating critically eroded areas, including strip-mined lands. Local Boy Scouts and underprivileged boys have helped with some of this work.

Fifth. A new 1,250-acre rural recreation subdivision in Mercer County, with a 250-acre lake, is already adding \$50,000 to \$60,000 annually to local government treasuries.

Sixth. Two small watershed projects have been completed. Both include recreation benefits as well as flood prevention. They have created 100 man-years of employment and increased income nearly \$1½ million annually. Four other watershed projects are in the planning or construction stage.

The soil and water conservation districts in the three counties—which are sponsoring the resource conservation and development project jointly with the county boards of commissioners—have had strong soil- and water-conservation programs for many years. The local people have shown their initiative in solving their soil and water problems through district programs. And they have had good local leadership. It is no coincidence that David J. Woods—who is president of the Penn Soil resource conservation and development project steering com-

mittee has been chairman of the Mercer County Soil and Water Conservation District directors.

I believe the people in the Penn Soil area show the spirit of Americanism which we all admire. They are on their way to making rural America an attractive place in which to live with a future of opportunity.

This is one of the 41 areas in the United States which presently are carrying out resource conservation and development projects. I think they bear watching, for they are setting a fine example for others to follow.

The McNamara Gap

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written concerning the resignation of Secretary of Defense Robert Strange McNamara. If after 7 years in the Pentagon, Mr. McNamara were to run all the data concerning his tenure of office into a computer, he and the American public would discover an enormous increase on the liability side of the Defense balance sheet. Among the debits are the TFX—"flying Edsel"—the M-16 rifle, the loss of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, and the growth of Soviet nuclear missile strength. This "McNamara gap" is brought to light by an article that appeared in the highly respected weekly, *Barron's*, on February 5, 1968, entitled "Balance of Terror."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the *RECORD*, as follows:

BALANCE OF TERROR: THE "McNAMARA GAP" WILL COST THE NATION DEAR

With apologies to C. Northcote Parkinson, whose word is invariably Law, we would like to propound the following tentative rule of thumb: the weight of kudos heaped upon a public figure these days varies inversely with the size of his achievement. On this score, for the historically minded, we might cite the sudden rediscovery of Crispus Attucks, hitherto obscure Negro stevedore, whose sole claim to fame—he chanced to stop a bullet during the Boston Massacre—has gained him a place among the "Founders of Our Nation" in the Bobbs-Merrill "Childhood of Famous Americans" series, as well as a newly established school holiday in Newark, N.J. There is also the man whose announced resignation as Secretary of Defense last fall evoked an equally extravagant appraisal of net worth. One Democratic Senator, who may as well be nameless, hailed Robert S. McNamara as: "One of the finest public servants ever produced by this country . . . the finest Secretary of Defense . . . a man for all seasons (who) leaves behind him a legacy of accomplishments in the defense complex which will stand for many years."

In a day and age of rapid change, technological and otherwise, some weapons may be obsolete before they leave the drawing board. By the same token, barely eight weeks after the lawgiver's salute appeared in print, the quick-march of time has made a shambles of the Secretary's service record. Shortly after Mr. McNamara handed in his resignation, Great Britain dropped its option on the controversial TFX, a command decision which

the U.S. Navy is maneuvering adroitly to follow. By pulling out of the Middle and Far East, moreover, the British have exposed not only the weakness of their own position but also the folly of a U.S. strategy in Europe based heavily upon their crumbling strength. With friends like these, Mr. Secretary, who needs enemies?

"Which ones are the enemy?", in effect has come the reply. Under Mr. McNamara the civilians in the Pentagon have overridden unanimous decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, undercut the authority of field commanders and subordinated strategic and tactical imperatives—the lives of Americans in uniform, to be blunt—to the dictates of dubiously programmed computers. Some Whiz Kid—with what a House Armed Services subcommittee later condemned as "bordering on criminal negligence"—decided to substitute a cheaper powder for the intricately designed M-16 rifle, thereby causing repeated malfunction. The vulnerable *Pueblo*, operating 13 miles off North Korea, had standing orders to ignore harassment and not to fire. Finally, by urging the doctrine of nuclear parity between the U.S. and Soviet Union, refusing to deploy an effective anti-ballistic missile system and stifling weapons development, the "finest Secretary of Defense," perhaps more than any other man in Cabinet history, has come alarmingly close to tipping the balance of terror against his own country. Unlike the fraudulent missile gap of 1960, which helped him to office, what the American Security Council flatly labels the "McNamara gap" today looms perilously real.

The gulf between image and reality shows up perhaps most starkly on the fighting fronts. McNamara apologists like to boast of their man's skill at cost-effectiveness and the "far-reaching managerial revolution" which he brought to the Pentagon. To all of which we say "Tell it to the Marines"—and to the Army, Navy and Air Force. The rifle which lacked the right kind of cartridge has been cited. Two years ago (*Barron's*, December 13, 1965) on-the-scene observers reported "serious miscalculations of needs and shortages of equipment. . . . Dozens of M-13 military personnel carriers, for example, have been red-lined for lack of parts. To keep some vehicles running, the Automotive Tank Command has begun to cannibalize others." Since then, thanks to some management genius' urge to slash inventories, U.S. forces have run dangerously short of combat aircraft, to the point where the Pentagon reluctantly had to authorize the re-opening of shut-down assembly lines. Air support wasn't available for the *Pueblo* because the few planes close enough to help were rigged to carry nuclear bombs. Since cost effectiveness ruled out nuclear escorts as inefficient, the U.S.S. *Enterprise*, now cruising off Wonsan, remains tied to a slow-moving conventionally powered fleet. Further flare-ups anywhere in the world will find the U.S. defense posture dangerously strained.

Emergencies aside, the nation's longrange military planning somehow has gone awry. For decades the North Atlantic Treaty Organization served the Western world as shield; U.S. nuclear power was the sword. However, under Mr. McNamara (who really hates to waste money on arms and should be happier ladling it out at the World Bank), both shield and sword have fallen into disrepair. Largely at the behest of the so-called defense intellectuals, and with scarcely a by-your-leave to its NATO allies, the U.S. in 1961 began a unilateral retreat from the policy of massive retaliation, and toward a new doctrine of graduated response, which envisions the use of nuclear power only as a last, and long-deferred, resort. In mid-December, as he was emptying his desk at the Pentagon, Mr. McNamara had the satisfaction of seeing his brainchild promoted to official NATO strategy.

Few others in the free world will celebrate. For graduated response, perhaps more than any other issue, alienated Charles de Gaulle, who quite correctly viewed it as a softening of the U.S. resolve to defend the Continent, and led France to withdraw its forces from NATO's military command. The security of Europe thus has come to rest on a dwindling band of U.S., British and miscellaneous troops, which, instead of reinforcements, as official reliance on conventional weaponry might seem to demand, gradually are getting transportation home. This winter, Washington and London withdrew some 40,000 men, or over 10% of their total contingent, from the Continent; the Canadians and Belgians soon may follow suit. Manpower aside, graduated response, as the bloody stalemate known as McNamara's War suggests, simply is no substitute for victory.

Secretary McNamara, to be sure, rarely speaks in such terms. Instead, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union—which remains the would-be architect of U.S. destruction—he stubbornly clings to the hope of disarmament and detente. Time after time he has shown an otherwise inexplicable willingness to give the Communist world the benefit of the doubt long after grounds for reasonable doubt had vanished. Last summer, in a grim appraisal titled "The Changing Strategic Military Balance, USA vs. USSR," the authoritative American Security Council, a blue-ribbon group which includes a number of retired admirals and generals, estimated that the Communists were adding 400 missiles per year to their nuclear arsenal. After repeated denials, Mr. McNamara last week cited the same figure. The Council also averred that "the delivery capability of U.S. strategic weapons systems, as measured in megatons of nuclear yield, has been going down steadily, while the Soviet capability has been steadily growing." Hence, it concluded that by mid-1968, if not before, a dangerous "megaton gap" would begin to open in favor of the Reds. The Pentagon scoffed at the claim. Last week, however, in a significant statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee, it struck a different note. Specifically, it urged modernizing the Minuteman missile force; defending all Minuteman emplacements with Sprint antimissile systems; and developing a deadlier successor. After seven years of appeasement, retreat and defeat, maybe even the icy Secretary of Defense has lost his cool. It's high time somebody got mad.

Governmental Relations in the College and University Setting

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul E. Bragdon, director of governmental relations of New York University, recently delivered an excellent speech on the subject of lobbying and education to the American Alumni Council-American College Public Relations Association conference.

Mr. Bragdon preceptively discusses what a university can and cannot expect from Government and the best ways to deal effectively with Government higher education programs effectively.

Mr. Bragdon's speech of January 18, 1968, entitled "Governmental Relations in the College and University Setting" follows:

GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SETTING

(By Paul E. Bragdon, director of governmental relations, New York University, to the American Alumni Council-American College Public Relations Association conference for the Middle Atlantic States, Atlantic City, N.J., January 18, 1968)

On the day following adjournment of the 1965 session of the New York State Legislature, my dinner companions were the Republican leader of the upper house and the recently and happily resigned Republican State Chairman. As the legislative representative of New York City and its retiring Democratic Mayor, I expressed regret that I would not be returning to Albany as the City's representative in the following year. I added that I had just begun to learn "which shell the pea is under" in the legislative halls.

Today, approximately ten months after entering the world of higher education—I find, incidentally, that government and politics provide an excellent prep school education for the life of an administrator in higher education—I have somewhat the same sentiments in addressing you as I expressed to my dinner companions in Albany.

Inclusion of governmental relations on the program of this conference confirms my impression that considerable interest in the function exists outside as well as within my own university.

In this partial accounting to you, I will give the reasons, as I understand them, for the creation of the position of Director of Governmental Relations within the officer structure of New York University. Thereafter, I will give you my own views on:

What a governmental relations program is, and what it is not—what it can do, and what it cannot.

What order of man or woman a college or university should seek for its governmental relations officer. (Any resemblance between the person described and the speaker is purely Walter Mitty.)

What the general role, and functional relationships, of the governmental relations specialist should be within the institution. (The views expressed are those of the speaker, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the sponsoring university.)

Before proceeding, I must note that my remarks are addressed principally to my colleagues from the independent institutions. For those associated with public institutions, created and sustained in whole or substantial part by government, governmental relations, by whatever name, are ever present—a habit, an instinct—and there is a degree of sophistication not as yet uniformly evident in the private sector. As a final prefatory aside, I am not presuming to advise those administrators and faculty members with supremely sensitive detection devices for governmental contract research grants and with well-worn paths to the sources on how they can improve on the unimprovable.

Two principal reasons led the administration of New York University to create the position of Director of Governmental Relations. The first was the recognition that the University, like her sister institutions and other institutions in our society, is increasingly concerned with the actions and policies of all levels of government. The President and other top officers of the University were devoting an increasing part of their time to significant questions relating to government. Secondly, the conviction developed that the maintenance and development of our system of higher education required what some have called "a mixed economy"—that most independent institutions must develop additional financial support from public sources; both public and independent institutions, providing a common public service, should develop financial support from diverse sources, public and private. It was decided, then, that the University should have an officer whose primary commitment would be to govern-

mental questions—to assist the President and Administration in formulating policy on governmental matters, and to be concerned with the development of direct financial support from public sources for independent institutions.

Many myths—some imbued with romance and mystery, others of a more sinister cast—surround the activities known as "governmental relations" and its subdivision called "lobbying." Generally, those engaged in such activities do nothing to disabuse laymen of the notion that legerdemain is a necessary part of their craft.

It is commonly thought that "contacts," i.e., the ability to gain access to public officials, enable the governmental relations specialist to produce results marvelous to behold, instant miracles. Closed doors obviously preclude results. But "contacts" merely permit a presentation, the success of which depends on the attractiveness of the public policy involved at a given time and/or the strength of the forces supporting a position. Moreover, access does not require a governmental relations specialist, but can be gained by the old school tie, cocktail party conversation, one's trustees or a brother-in-law.

Often terms like "winning and dining" are associated with governmental relations. The bars of Albany, among other seats of government, are supposedly lined with purple-veined noses—the owners of which drop names with abandon and extract large fees from uninitiated, but otherwise sophisticated clients for little in the way of results. The fact is that, increasingly, the most respected practitioners in governmental relations are those who know the substance of the policy they espouse or oppose, and are capable of communicating their position effectively to a wide variety of public officials. And the most successful practitioners are uniformly those blessed with a position representing attractive public policy and/or supported by significant elements in the community. Thus, an extravagant program of high proof entertainment would not only be inappropriate and improper—it wouldn't work.

If access to public officials, while necessary, and a modest social program, while helpful, do not constitute a "governmental relations" program, what is the essence of such a program? Briefly, it is the substitution of a continuous and systematic program for occasional and sporadic activity. There are many analogies for a governmental relations program in existing programs within our colleges and universities. The public relations or development programs serve as useful precedents. Consider, for example, what goes into a major capital program:

1. Analysis and recognition of the status of the institution, and setting a direction for its future.
2. Appraisal of fund-raising potential, and setting of fund goal (with allocation of proceeds of drive, and establishment of a system of priorities and alternatives).
3. Initiation and maintenance of informational campaign addressed to the public-at-large and special audiences to give a favorable portrait of the institution, its educational objectives and the necessity of raising money to meet such objectives.
4. Identification of prospective individual and institutional donors, and compilation of data on such prospects.
5. Determination of best way to approach each prospect, and survey of field for possible allies in seeking gift.
6. Preparation of specific proposal for presentation to each prospect, with alternatives.
7. Patience, persistence, continuity.

By changing a few words, each of the stated steps can be translated into parts of a governmental relations program. All of which is to say that governmental relations is neither mysterious nor magical, but merely the systematic application in a different arena of the intelligence, reason and imagi-

nation employed in many other institutional activities.

At minimum, a successful governmental relations program should assure (1) information on any proposed governmental action which would affect the institution, (2) consultation on matters affecting the institution, (3) avoidance of actions which would have an unintended effect, (4) ability to affect legislation or regulations of a technical or non-controversial nature. At maximum, such program can lead to the passage of desired major legislation or to the defeat of offensive legislation. Similarly, it can produce favorable governmental decisions. As pointed out earlier, the maximum can be achieved if it represents attractive public policy at the time and/or substantial support within the community exists. Needless to say, it is part of the governmental relations program to help produce the climate conducive to maximum achievement.

In seeking a governmental relations specialist, a college or university should look, first, for a person who believes in the commitment of our society to higher education, and wants to participate in fulfilling that commitment. He should think it worth his while to help support an environment devoted to free inquiry, the pursuit of knowledge and the education and training of men and women. He should be able to understand the aspirations of his institution and the community of which it is a part. He should be a comfortable citizen of the academic community—as comfortable as possible in a time of challenge necessitating innovation and change. I am reminded of a thoughtful letter written to a friend by Dean Acheson some ten years ago, in which he says of public service:

"[There is] no better or fuller life for a man of spirit. The old Greek conception of happiness is relevant here: 'The exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence, in a life affording them scope.'

"It explains also why to everyone who has ever experienced it, the return from public life leaves one feeling flat and empty. Content, interested, busy—yes. But exhilarated—no. For one has left a life affording scope for the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence . . . The requirement of scope is hard to come by in this age, outside of public life . . . painted with all the warts, [public service] is a life of scope for the exercise of all one's vital powers, even though one may become a casualty in exercising them."

It seems to me that service in higher education is one of those endeavors "hard to come by in this age," which affords "scope," which, "painted with all its warts," permits the "exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence." And, yes, the possibility that one "may become a casualty in exercising them."

I am suggesting, of course, that the public service is a good recruiting ground for an institution's governmental relations specialist. Not just because of specific experience, but because a college or university can offer "scope," sometimes "exhilaration" and can assure avoidance of "feeling flat and empty."

We must remember, of course, that "public service" and "government service" are generic terms encompassing numerous skills, specialties, functions and levels of responsibility. As an example, while serving the Mayor of New York City, I was alternately or simultaneously a lawyer specializing in legislation with peripheral public relations responsibilities, a public relations man, a decision-maker within designated policy guidelines. I was in the position of offering judgment on a broad range of governmental and political problems—usually, it seemed, in a crisis under multiple pressures and with an array of alternatives keenly competitive in their unattractiveness.

As we dig deeper into "government service" or "public service" in pursuit of our man, we will find most commonly, I suspect that

our candidates will be lawyers with experience in or a sense of public relations, or a public relations specialist who knows when he needs to call his lawyer. I see no reason, however, why the search should be circumscribed. Why not, for example, an economist with a public relations sense who knows when to call his lawyer? More important than specialty, it seems to me, are qualities and experience, including:

Readiness to evaluate men and women on quality, character and performance, not on labels, background or other outward indicia.

A disciplined openness of mind to the significant facts.

Exercise of judgment generally, in company with responsibility, on a broad range of matters which count.

Once attired in a suitably tattered academic gown, our recruit must, of course, be placed in the administrative structure of the institution. Clearly, our man is part of the family addressing itself to the various publics outside the college or university—the general public, the media, the community and the alumni. There should be harmony and consistency, or at least agreed-upon inconsistency, in this family. I believe that the central relationships should be established in this area, and of course the same hand should hold the related strings. Obviously, however, the governmental relations specialist must be closely related to the development and planning officers and the fiscal officers of the institution—and some, quite reasonably, would see these as the primary relationships. Finally, since the governmental relations specialist will often be concerned with laws, proposed legislation and regulations with an impact on all or part of the institution, a rapport must be established with its general counsel.

Now, what about the two questions I've been asked most frequently: contract research and grants and direct lobbying. Precedent exists in the four-year colleges and smaller universities for including the contract research and grant functions in the office of the government relations specialist—and this practice seems appropriate. For the larger universities, however, both history and volume argue against the combination of functions. I have a tentative view that the administrator of the research and grant program should be under the umbrella of the governmental relations specialist, and a firmer conclusion that regular reports and periodic summaries should be transmitted as a matter of routine to the governmental relations officer.

On the question of lobbying, I would not advocate regular patrols of the legislative corridors. Rather, except on specific occasions, I would have the governmental relations specialist direct and coordinate the activities of counsel in the national and state capitols. Although the vice president of Temple University charged with responsibility for governmental relations operates successfully and most frequently in Harrisburg, I hold to the opinion that, ordinarily, the governmental relations officer should primarily function within his own institution in the development of policies and strategy and tactics to achieve implementation of such policies. Our experience with the 1967 Constitutional Convention in New York would indicate that our most effective communication with government on significant issues is achieved by making common cause with the other five independent universities with extensive graduate programs, and by acting through The Association of Colleges and Universities and The Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities.

My parting recommendation is that the judgment and experience of the governmental relations specialist should be called upon on general institutional problems, and this is so for several reasons:

Our recruit must develop a "feel" for the institution, a sense of living with its problems, so that he can perform effectively and

with high morale in his area of prime responsibility.

The perspective of a governmental relations specialist may be a useful one to add in considering a problem.

Anyone who has acted in a responsible position in government has faced a variety of difficult problems under trying conditions ("No One Knows the Troubles I've Seen" would be a suitable theme). Surprisingly, he may have dealt with the very problem under consideration. As I look at recent problems on campus, I can't help but remember my view from my City Hall window in 1964 of demonstrations, protests, sit-ins and confrontations—and my direct responsibility in 1965 for security of New York's City Hall, including the decisions on "arrest or not to arrest," "confrontation and avoidance."

And, above all else, our recruit came seeking "scope" for the "full exercise of his powers." Retention of his interest and securing the maximum value of his services depend, after all, on his finding the expected opportunities—opportunities which exist in higher education, perhaps more than in any other private area of society today.

Dollar Appeal

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, even though there have been alarms raised by our recent balance-of-payments position, the dollar continues to be well liked in the world money market.

Mr. J. A. Livingston, in the February 12 Washington Post, stated it in a more roundabout way when he said:

Maybe the world doesn't love Americans. The dollar is another matter.

The dollar continues to be backed by the great productive capacity of the United States. It has a history of 100 per cent parity with gold since 1935—a history that the lira, the franc, the guilder, the pound, and the mark have reason to envy.

The problem with our balance of payments is the liquidity situation of the United States, and Mr. Livingston compliments the President for describing this so well when he said in his Economic Report:

The United States in its international economic affairs is much like a wealthy and prosperous businessman whose liquidity has come under strain. His commercial operations remain highly successful.

His large long-term investments yield an excellent return . . . His income and his net worth are growing strongly every year . . . But he has been borrowing extensively at short-term to help finance his long-term investments. That man needs to pull back for a while to strengthen his liquidity.

Mr. Speaker, I found Mr. Livingston's article to be a good statement of the situation and commend it to our colleagues' attention by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 12, 1968]

MAYBE EUROPE DOESN'T LOVE US, BUT THE DOLLAR IS ANOTHER MATTER

(By J. A. Livingston)

Recently, I suggested to a French official in Washington that a dollar poll in Europe

would be useful. Businessmen and investors in France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands would be asked:

"Suppose you were offered a promissory note, payable in ten years in dollars, francs, marks, lire, or guilders, which IOU would you select?"

The French official asserted at once that no poll is necessary. "Times have changed. Three years ago, they'd have chosen the dollar. Maybe even two years ago. But today they'd pick the French or German or Dutch IOU. Probably the French."

I had my doubts. I felt that was a Gaullist response—a rigidly official French viewpoint.

So I tried it on a German. He didn't think anyone would choose the franc or the guilder, but the mark, yes, the mark. "You know it's a very strong currency these days."

I still had doubts. Maybe I'm guilty of Americanism, of chauvinism. My hunch is that the majority of moneyed Europeans, of informed Europeans, would choose the dollar as a store of value.

Admittedly, the devaluation of the pound in November fevered speculation in the London gold market. Surely the dollar would be next. Surely the price of gold would be raised from \$35 an ounce to \$70 and maybe even \$105.

The central banks of France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, etc., don't want any more dollars. Yet they still cooperate with the U.S. Treasury. They still play the central-bank game—Don't upset the applecart—in self-interest.

Even the French go along at times. During the sterling crisis, the Bank of France acquired \$400,000,000. Its dollar holdings rose to a billion, as against its normal quota of \$600,000,000. Those extra dollars were not promptly turned in for gold.

Nor does the drop in U.S. gold holdings since 1949 from more than \$24 billion to about \$12 billion mean that the dollar is a weak currency.

A dozen years ago, the world was short of dollars. The United States deliberately set out to lose gold—by encouraging travel abroad, granting economic and other aid, and subsidizing American companies to invest abroad.

The nervous reaction in Europe to President Johnson's plans to curb foreign lending, investing and travel is evidence that the dollar hasn't lost all its might. Maybe the world doesn't love Americans. The dollar is another matter.

In any poll abroad—Which promissory note would you choose?—the dollar has two assets. The first is economic—the great productive capacity of the United States.

The second is European history. It is pockmarked by wars, inflation and currency devaluation. Only the dollar and the Swiss franc have preserved 100 per cent parity with gold since 1937.

The Italian lira is down 97 per cent, the French franc 95 per cent, the Belgian franc 88 per cent, the Dutch guilder 50 per cent, the British pound 51 per cent and the German mark lost nearly all value.

No one has described the dollar's weakness better than President Johnson in his Economic Report to Congress.

"The United States in its international economic affairs is much like a wealthy and prosperous businessman whose liquidity has come under strain. His commercial operations remain highly successful."

"His large long-term investments yield an excellent return . . . His income and his net worth are growing strongly every year . . . But he has been borrowing extensively at short-term to help finance his long-term investments. That man needs to pull back for a while to strengthen his liquidity."

In tightening controls, the President is treating symptoms. He needs also to treat the basic weakness—inflation at home and over-extended commitments abroad. The U.S. has spread itself thin—with butter and guns.

Col. Daniel "Chappie" James

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge announced today that Col. Daniel "Chappie" James will receive one of its top freedom awards.

The Air Force colonel will receive the George Washington Honor Medal and a \$100 cash prize for a letter he wrote on his "heritage of freedom" while serving as vice commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing in Southeast Asia. The presentation is set for Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22.

Presently assigned as vice commander of the Tactical Air Command's 33d Tactical Fighter Wing, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., James added 78 combat missions over Communist North Vietnam to his battle total that included 101 missions during the Korean war.

The fighter pilot wrote in part:

Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted—no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed—our heritage of freedom, our unity as a Nation.

Invited to the White House by President Lyndon B. Johnson upon his return from the battle area last December, James reported to the President the morale of the men engaged in the air war was "great."

He said:

Fighter pilots have always had a great morale; it is the greatest fraternity in the world. They like the equipment, the challenge, and the job.

He explained to the Chief Executive and then to newsmen when questioned on the effects of the bombing:

We like to keep up the pressure. It is having an effect in slowing down goods and supplies.

Support of American ground troops fighting in South Vietnam is one of the colonel's favorite themes.

We must stop the flow of men and supplies to the South.

He said in an interview before leaving Thailand:

The ground troopers in South Vietnam depend upon us for that and we can't let them down. The Marines at Con Thien and along the DMZ are catching hell. With air support hitting at the total length of the Communist supply lines, we can put a ceiling on the amount of fire power that can be brought against our troops.

Cramming his 6-foot 4-inch, 235-pound frame into the front seat of the F-4 Phantom, James led the Thai-based fighters on a myriad of missions over the Communist north.

Colonel James entered aviation cadets in January 1943. After earning his Air Force wings, he served as a flight leader for 4 years, flying P-47's at various state-side locations. He went overseas to Clark Airbase, P.I., in 1949 and was sent to Korea from that assignment.

I include a letter from Colonel James, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1967.

The strength of the United States of America lies in its unity. It lies in free men blessed and ordained with the rights of freedom working to provide, build, enjoy and grow. Those who would subvert us—or any free people—try to disrupt this unity by breaking the small parts from the whole—driving in the wedges of fear and discontent.

I am a Negro and therefore I am subject to their constant harangue. They say: "You James are a member of a minority—you are a black man." They say: "You should be disgusted with this American society—this so-called Democracy." They say: "You can only progress so far in any field that you choose before somebody puts his foot on your neck for no other reason than you are black." They say: "You are a second-class citizen."

My heritage of freedom provides my reply. To them I say: I am a citizen of the United States of America. I am not a second class citizen and no man here is unless he thinks like one, reasons like one or performs like one. This is my country, and I believe in her, and I believe in her flag, and I'll defend her, and I'll fight for her and serve her. If she has any ills, I'll stand by her and hold her hand until in God's given time, through her wisdom and her consideration for the welfare of the entire nation, things are made right again.

Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted—no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed—our heritage of freedom, our unity as a nation.

We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other because of race, creed, religion, political party or social strata. We must stop using personal grievances as an excuse to break the laws of the land. We must not join with any lawless mob no matter what the provocation in disregard for law and order. A thief is a thief—I don't care what he gives as his reason for stealing. A mob is a mob—I don't care what the provocation is.

We can't afford it in this great country of ours. It is our responsibility to preserve our freedom and our unity. Good, thinking men must help unite those with whom they come in contact through hard work and participation. Our contributions to the total effort can be a by-product of what we achieve through excellence in our chosen fields. In our daily lives we must become a strong link in the chain of unity and freedom that has always been the strength of these United States of America.

I am an American. My heritage is bound by the tenets of freedom inherent in that simple statement. My responsibility is to allow my children to join a community of free people everywhere who have the right to say: "I am what I am . . . because I have the freedom to say it."

DANIEL JAMES, JR.,

Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Vice Commander,
8th Tactical Fighter Wing.**Proposed Constitutional Amendment****HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 59 of our colleagues—not even enough to conduct the routine business of this House—could find themselves with the power to choose the next President of the United States.

I do not question the integrity or the

honesty of any Member of this distinguished body. But no group of 59 men and women should have such power, however remote the chance that it will ever be exercised.

For this reason, I am introducing today a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would remove from the House of Representatives the mandate to select a President when no candidate in the national election receives a majority of the electoral votes. The new amendment would provide for a runoff election between the two candidates with the greatest number of electoral votes if neither receives a majority.

At the same time, I am introducing legislation to move the date of the presidential election back about 3 weeks to the second Tuesday in October. The runoff, when one is necessary, would then be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, the present election day.

This proposal would insure adequate time for the transition between administrations after a runoff election. With the increasing complexities of Government and the enormous growth in presidential power, it is unthinkable that there would not be a transitional period longer than the 2 weeks which are available under the present system when an election is thrown into the House. Shifting the date of the main election back to October would also encourage shorter, less costly presidential campaigns in an age of modern communications when a candidate no longer needs 8 or 9 weeks to reach the national electorate.

Under the system of choosing a President in the House of Representatives, as established by the 12th amendment in 1804, each State delegation casts one vote. In such an eventuality, the largest State in the Nation—with more than 19 million residents—has the same vote as the smallest State, which has fewer than 300,000 inhabitants. In fact, if the Representatives in delegations with an even number of votes divide evenly in their choice of a candidate, the entire delegation is neutralized and does not cast a single vote, regardless of the size of the State.

At the present time, for example, the Illinois delegation—fourth largest in the House—is split right down the middle between Democrats and Republicans. Such a situation cannot develop in the smallest delegations, which consist of only a single member.

A candidate controlling the votes of a majority of the House delegation in each of the 26 smallest States would become the Chief Executive of the world's most powerful nation. To control these 26 delegations, he would need the votes of only 59 Members—about 13 percent of the membership of this House—no matter what the other 376 Members might desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travesty of democracy.

Only once since 1804 has a presidential election been thrown into the House. The outcome, on that occasion in 1825, was an orgy of wheeling and dealing by candidates and Members of Congress, blatant offers of political "deals," and the election of a President who did not have

even a plurality of either the electoral vote or the popular vote.

I do not believe the American people would tolerate such a gross distortion of our democratic principles today.

This problem is presented to us with particular force this year, when many political analysts say the Nation might be confronted with just such a situation. Although there may be little likelihood that a constitutional amendment will be approved by Congress and ratified by the necessary number of States before the 1968 election, Congress can—and must—act now to make sure this frightening prospect never faces us again.

A number of proposals to provide this assurance have been introduced in each House of Congress. Some of these call for the Members of both Houses, meeting in joint session, to elect a President if no candidate in the national balloting receives a sufficient plurality. Others would abolish the system of electoral votes entirely and substitute direct popular election of the President.

The former plan would certainly be an improvement over the existing system, in that each Member rather than each State would have one vote. But it shares many of the present defects. For example, by making the President dependent on Congress for his election, it leaves the door wide open for political deals.

The national electorate, moreover, may prefer a presidential candidate of one party while the voters in each separate congressional district are returning a Congress dominated by the other party. Not only is the electorate different in each case, the same person may be motivated by different considerations in voting for the President and for his local Representative.

This, of course, is exactly what happened as recently as 1956.

The objection is even stronger if the Senate participates in choosing a President, since only one-third of the Senate seats are up for election at any one time. About 66 of the 535 electors under the joint-session plan would have been chosen by the voters from 2 to 4 years before the most recent presidential election.

As for proposals for direct popular election of the President, as desirable as this might be—and I believe it is most desirable—it has been rejected innumerable times in the past, and I can see little chance of its acceptance today.

Historically, it has aroused the opposition of the smallest States, which are assured under the electoral system of at least three votes, regardless of how small their population might be. At the same time, paradoxical as it may seem, direct popular election is now strongly opposed by many perceptive spokesmen for the large States, who recognize that the concentration of electoral votes under the winner-take-all system induces both major parties to give special attention to the needs of the large, big-city States.

Also in this political lineup are the advocates of strong State authority, who fear that popular election would lead to irresistible pressures for national laws governing voting qualifications and other electoral questions now left largely to the States.

Faced with this concerted opposition, a constitutional amendment calling for direct election of the President—even if it is approved by two-thirds of the Members in each House of Congress—would probably not be ratified by the required three-fourths of the States.

Under these conditions, I believe the Congress should take more limited—and thus more acceptable—steps to deal with the intolerable situation which now confronts the Nation. This is the principal reason for the proposed amendment which I am introducing.

Because our method of electing the President has never functioned as the Founding Fathers intended, there is another serious defect in the present system which my amendment would also correct. This is the potentially disruptive and dangerous power of electors to disobey the instructions and the wishes of the voters.

A recent example of how this undemocratic provision operates was presented in 1960, when all of Mississippi's electors and six of Alabama's 11 withheld their votes from both national candidates and cast them instead for a man who was not even a declared presidential candidate. The same man received an additional vote from an Oklahoma elector.

To prevent a similar occurrence in the future, the amendment which I am introducing would abolish the so-called electoral college and the slates of individual electors. In their place, each State would be allotted the number of electoral votes corresponding to its representation in the House and the Senate, and these votes would be cast automatically for the presidential candidate receiving the most popular votes in that State.

The authors of the Constitution, writing that remarkable document before the development of a two-party system in our country, intended that each State would choose its wisest, most distinguished citizens as electors, and that these eminent individuals would then deliberate and cast their votes. But with the growth of two major political parties after 1789, the electors came to be chosen merely as representatives of a party, and independent deliberation and voting virtually disappeared after 1800.

Today, when most people could not name a single elector who represented their State in the most recent presidential election, continuance of the electoral college is meaningless.

Under my proposed amendment to the Constitution, the candidate receiving the greatest number of electoral votes would become President. Since, however, the presence of a large number of candidates could conceivably distort the national preference as reflected at the polls, the amendment provides for a runoff between the two top candidates if neither wins a majority of the electoral vote. This seems only reasonable, since an administration with an unreliable plurality might be not only undemocratic but unstable.

The runoff already works well in a number of States where it is used in party primary elections. And I might point out that American officials recently expressed considerable disappointment that the

new Constitution of South Vietnam includes no provision for a runoff. As a result of that failure by the South Vietnamese constituent assembly, the winning presidential ticket in that country had a plurality of only 32 percent.

The situation I have been describing, in which the leading presidential candidate in this country fails to receive a majority of the electoral vote, has not occurred in more than 140 years.

Nevertheless, no one can deny that the possibility exists—and with it, the menacing prospect of confusion, deadlock, or even chaos in our efforts to select a national leader.

Mr. Speaker, to avoid that prospect and protect our democratic system of government, I urge the Congress to give my proposals its most serious consideration.

The text of my proposed amendment and legislation follow:

H.J. RES. 1086

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In lieu of the method of election provided in section 1 of article II and in the twelfth and twenty-fourth articles of amendment, the President and Vice President shall be elected as provided in this article.

"Sec. 2. Each State shall have a number of electoral votes for President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which that State may be entitled in the Congress. The places and manner of electing the President and Vice President shall be prescribed by law in each State; but the Congress may at any time by law prescribe the places and manner of electing the President and Vice President.

"Sec. 3. The people of each State shall cast their votes for the candidates for President and Vice President. The candidate for President in each State receiving the greatest number of votes shall receive that State's electoral votes for President, and the candidate for Vice President in each State receiving the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall receive that State's electoral votes for Vice President.

"Sec. 4. The person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for President, shall be president, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes; and the person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President, shall be Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes.

"Sec. 5. If no person has a majority of the whole number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, there shall be a runoff election in which the names of the two persons with the greatest number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, as the case may be, shall appear on the ballot in each of the several States. The winner of such election shall be decided in the same manner as the election provided by sections 3 and 4 of this article.

"Sec. 6. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall

have a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State.

"Sec. 7. The Congress may provide by law for the determination of any case affecting the election of the President or Vice President for which provision is not made by this article."

H.R. 15330

A bill to provide for the election of President and Vice President as required by the article of amendment to the Constitution proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the Ninetieth Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the election of President and Vice President required by section 3 of the article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by House Joint Resolution 1086 of the Ninetieth Congress shall be held on the second Tuesday in October.

(b) The runoff election required by section 5 of such proposed amendment shall be held, if necessary, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

Sec. 2. Section 25 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 7) is amended by striking out "Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every second year" and inserting in lieu thereof "second Tuesday in October, in every second year".

Sec. 3. (a) The first section of this Act shall apply only after the ratification of such proposed Constitutional amendment.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply with respect to elections of Representatives to the Congress for terms beginning after January 1 of the year during which the term of the first President and Vice President elected under such proposed Constitutional amendment commences.

Disabled American Veterans Statement Before Committee on Veterans' Affairs

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Francis J. Beaton, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 7, 1968. In my judgment it is an unusually fine statement, and speaks to the conditions of our times. I commend it to the Members, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS J. BEATON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 7, 1968

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is, indeed, a privilege and a pleasure for me, as National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, to appear before you and present our Legislative Program for the Second Session of the 90th Congress.

On behalf of the DAV National and State Officers assembled here this morning, I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the cooperation, interest, and help extended to us by your Committee throughout the past year.

We are also deeply indebted to you for your patience and understanding, and the personal consideration given to our many legislative requests.

The same compliments are extended to the very able staff members of the Committee, who have gone out of their way to assist us.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the ingredients of DAV Legislative Programs are found in resolutions adopted by our governing bodies, the National Convention and the National Executive Committee.

Our most recent National Convention, held in Denver, Colorado, July 31st through August 4th, 1967, approved more than 150 resolutions. A majority of the proposals call for modifications in existing veterans programs, while others would authorize new ones. Additionally, a limited number of proposals relate to our country's policy and position in Southeast Asia.

On this last score, with your permission, I would like to voice a few observations about the current epidemic of urban riots and anti-war demonstrations. I am thinking in particular of those who desecrate our flag, the draft-card burners and others who confuse freedom with license. Such matters may not be directly related to the immediate concerns of your Committee; but I submit that they are of general concern to all members of Congress—and to all Americans who cherish and understand the full dimensions of freedom.

Let me say first that no one, surely, understands better than the Members of Congress how precious is the right to dissent. We also recognize that our institutions have been carefully framed to accommodate all kinds of utterly opposing viewpoints—including the merits of our Vietnam policy. It so happens that the DAV is pledged by mandate of our National Convention to support our policy in Vietnam—and we are proud to be counted in that category. But we recognize the right to those in opposition to disagree.

What we do not recognize—what we do condemn—what we view with disgust and outrage—are the antics of those who abuse their freedom, make a mockery of their rights and who subvert the whole meaning of liberty.

Let there be no confusion about the identity of these willful delinquents: I am talking about the so-called demonstrators who burn their draft cards, vilify the sacrifices of American soldiers, desecrate our flag, interfere with the movement of men and supplies, sit in at the Pentagon and, in other viciously childish acts and protests, render aid and comfort to the enemies of everything we hold dear.

No single right of citizenship exists without a corresponding responsibility. Freedom is not license. The right of one individual cannot be equated as outweighing the rights of many individuals. There must be limits to tolerance. Otherwise we are inviting anarchy.

It is all well and good for crusaders to argue that personal folly and criminal disorder are the products of ignorance, want and lack of privilege. But this country, this government and this Congress are fighting ignorance, want and lack of privilege as never before in our history.

This great fight cannot and will not be sustained, if citizens cannot walk their streets in safety, if our shopkeepers are terrorized by criminals, if our police are maligned and attacked for doing their duty, if—in short—something is not done—and done soon—to insure law and order.

Kooks and cowards have a right to their kookiness and a right to be cowardly in the privacy of their own kennels. They have no right to cripple the progress of our nation and the pursuit of its legitimate policies in peace as well as war.

A man who burns his draft card or who counsels others to do so is in clear violation of the law of the land and must be prosecuted.

If there is no law to prohibit burning of the American Flag, there definitely ought to be. The Flag is more than a piece of silk or cloth. It is a symbol of all we honor and cherish.

It is heartening to know that the House of Representatives has already passed and sent to the Senate two bills to curb some of these manifestations of idiocy. I am referring to H.R. 10480 which would make the burning of or malicious damage to the flag a federal crime, and H.R. 421 which would impose severe penalties for using interstate communications to incite, organize and promote a riot.

We realize that proposals of this nature invariably invite controversy as to their constitutionality. We do not profess to be expert in constitutional law. But when anarchy becomes a "Way of Life" for certain individuals, and when people who obey the law suffer outrages beyond the point of endurance, we think a legislative solution to the problems must be found. The DAV sees the provisions of H.R. 10480 and H.R. 421 as steps in this direction and we earnestly hope the full Congress will soon concur.

Before turning to our own National Convention resolutions, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter demanding brief comment.

We would be remiss if we did not at this time express our deep appreciation to this committee, and to the Congress, for your prompt and favorable response to the historic recommendations made a year ago by President Johnson in his unprecedented veterans message to the first session of the 90th Congress. The message was the first of its kind but, as we all know, it was not the last.

Later on in this testimony I shall address myself to the newest veterans message received by Congress; but it is only fair, I think, to recap here the results of that first message. There's never any shortage of people telling you what you've done wrong. So I think it's only fair to have someone tell you occasionally what you've done right.

Among other things—

You have expanded educational allowances under the GI bill.

You have widened opportunities for veterans with educational shortcomings.

You have eliminated inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans.

You have given substantial pension boosts to some 2 million disabled veterans, widows and dependents.

In short, you took the recommendations of the President's first veterans message and contributed much to the comfort and well-being of those who, in the President's own words, "have brought greater justice and decency to the world."

Yet as always there is unfinished business. We hope, for example, that the Senate will quickly pass H.R. 12555 which the House approved last December. It is needed to protect pension rights against automatic reductions as a consequence of increases in other federal retirement benefits such as social security. We are happy that the President, too, has asked for Senate concurrence in his newest message.

I also want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to voice our special thanks and deep appreciation for the steadfast support this Committee gave to H.R. 2151 which provides for an annual audit of our accounts by the U.S. Comptroller General. As Public Law 90-208, this statute will enable us to avoid duplication and waste of effort in connection with filing our financial reports at state and city levels. Indeed, it will effectively serve to eliminate a perplexing problem that has plagued the DAV for a long time.

In particular I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of this Committee for steering the bill so competently through the full House of Representatives. He has our profound gratitude.

It is further in order, Mr. Chairman, to express our confidence in the work of the Veterans Advisory Commission whose report is due at the White House very soon.

The DAV is privileged to be represented on that Commission by a gentleman well-

known to the members of this Committee: Mr. Claude L. Callegary, of Baltimore, Md., a Past National Commander of the DAV. Mr. Callegary has had a long and distinguished record of service to the cause of America's veterans. We are proud, very proud, to have him as our Representative on the Advisory Panel.

Our National Director of Legislation, Chet Huber, was given the opportunity last October 3 to appear before the Commission and to discuss, in a general wrap-up, the recommendations of other DAV officers in previous appearances before the Commission.

The fact that the vast majority of our recommendations are concerned with the disability and death compensation programs is a reflection of the major emphasis placed on these issues by the mandates of our National Convention.

I think, in these matters, we can anticipate that the Veterans' Advisory Commission will have quite a bit to say when it finally reports. This conviction is further bolstered by the fact that the President's message last week on veterans' affairs did not come to grips with these questions. The Administration has itself acknowledged that it is looking forward to the recommendations of the Commission which has a mandate of its own for a comprehensive study of such matters.

We applaud the decision to put democracy to work in this fashion. But since we have only this opportunity to outline our own views, we cannot wait to see whether and where our philosophy may parallel the Commission's ultimate recommendations. Thus we come, Mr. Chairman, to the heart of our testimony.

After a thorough study of the subject, we have concluded that the present rates of disability and death compensation are grossly inadequate to permit the veteran or his widow a position in our society which we feel they are entitled to enjoy.

Much has been said concerning the adverse effect of the continued increase in the cost of living upon those who are compelled by circumstance to subsist on fixed incomes. The 90th Congress has already enacted legislation to ease the economic burden of military personnel, federal employees, social security beneficiaries, welfare recipients and non-service-connected pensioners. Sponsors of such legislation in each instance have documented and justified the necessity of increasing these benefits to bring them more closely in balance with the rise in the cost of living. The DAV also recognizes the need for these increases to offset the shrinking value of yesterday's dollar on today's market.

Surely, then, no one in this room needs to be reminded that disability compensation is also fixed income established by law. Or that the service connected disabled veteran has also been caught in the very same economic squeeze that has so seriously affected other federal beneficiaries.

The average increase of 10%, granted by P.L. 89-311, effective December 1, 1965, fell short by six per cent of bridging the gap between the buying power of the compensation dollar and the increase in living costs. This deficiency has since been compounded by an additional seven per cent rise in the cost of living. Moreover, it is a sad certainty that prices will continue to advance through 1968 at a rate of about four per cent. This will result in a corresponding decrease in the value of the veteran's compensation dollar.

We think it is abundantly clear that an overwhelming case exists for restoring the full value of disability compensation at the earliest possible date. This applies with special force to those who are so severely disabled as to be unemployable. This group has suffered an even greater erosion of their living standards.

It should be acknowledged that since 1933, when the present system of disability eval-

uation was established, there has been an overall increase of 154.8% in the rates of service connected disability compensation. However, during this same period, the average wage has increased nearly 60%, leaving a gap of over 400% between the increases in the rates of compensation and the wage of employed workers.

It should also be pointed out that the median annual income of full time employed veterans is now \$7,300.00.

The veteran who is rendered totally unproductive because of disability incurred as a result of military service cannot reach this level of economic security. Because his total loss of earning power came about as a result of service to his country, it seems a matter of simple justice that the compensation payments for this particular veteran should be increased to a point commensurate with that of his able-bodied wage-earning contemporaries.

Veterans who are living solely on disability compensation payments stand to suffer most as the dollar's buying power diminishes. The net effect of this will be to push the veteran yet another step down on the economic scale. To forestall this adverse circumstance, the distinguished Chairman of this Committee has recently introduced at DAV request, H.R. 14995, a bill bearing the title "Service Disabled Veterans' Compensation and Benefits Act of 1968."

We realize, Mr. Chairman, that there will be numerous and varied requests made to your Committee during the course of its hearings. We realize also that priorities in these matters must be established.

We hope and pray that serious study and thoughtful consideration of this bill and the facts set forth above will lead your Committee to give its highest priority to recommendations for well-deserved increases in the rates of service connected disability compensation. As President Johnson has said: "We have not forgotten nor shall we ever forget their service to our country."

Another significant DAV proposal on the subject of compensation calls for a long-delayed increase in single statutory awards payable for loss of limbs, body organs and arrested tuberculosis. On July 1, 1952, there was granted an increase of \$5.00 per month over the rate which had prevailed since September 1, 1946, a period of 21 years.

We believe that further consideration of the facts of this matter by the Committee will lead to recommendations for substantial increases in the special monthly compensation for these disabilities.

Moving now to the subject of service connected death benefits, Mr. Chairman, the DAV most emphatically supports the enactment of legislation to increase the present rates of Dependency and Indemnity Compensation payable to the widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans whose death resulted directly from service connected causes. Our reasons for urging the adoption of such increases are essentially the same as those expressed earlier with respect to the need for increases in the rates of service connected disability compensation.

Mr. Chairman, I would at this point like to mention, in concise fashion, a few of the proposals which represent some of the most prime and pressing problems for disabled veterans and their dependents. Nothing in the order of presentation should be construed as indicating degrees of priority.

The proposals call for: Extending the full range of wartime benefits for veterans disabled as a result of extra-hazardous service; additional monthly compensation for veterans who have suffered the service connected loss of a kidney or the loss of a lung; clothing allowances for veterans who, because of service connected disability, wear prosthetic appliances which tend to wear out or tear their clothing; raise to a realistic level the present \$1600 allowance for the purchase of an automobile; to establish an

independent Court of Veterans' Appeals; to provide an additional monthly allowance for widows who are receiving service connected death benefits and who are in need of regular Aid and Attendance; to provide for concurrent payments of compensation and pension under a specified formula; to provide additional compensation for dependents of veterans whose disability is rated not less than 40%; to increase the present burial allowance to \$400; to provide Dependency and Indemnity Compensation to widows of deceased veterans who are rated 100% service connected for 20 or more years; to extend war orphans educational benefits on a proportionate basis to children of veterans rated at not less than 40%.

As expressed earlier, Mr. Chairman, time does not allow a detailed accounting of all our National Convention Resolutions. There is an assortment of proposals relating to employment, GI home loans, insurance and the National Cemetery programs that will demand our attention during the course of this session of Congress.

In the field of insurance we favor, among other things, the enactment of legislation to increase the maximum coverage of GI insurance to \$30,000.

On the subject of housing, we request an increase in the grant for specially-adapted housing in line with the increase in building costs and an extension of this benefit to veterans who have suffered the service connected loss or loss of use of an upper and lower extremity. We also recommend that the maximum entitlement for guarantee of home loans be increased to at least \$10,000.

The National Cemetery System is a subject which has the abiding interest of the Disabled American Veterans. We support current legislative proposals calling for transfer of national cemetery operations from the Department of the Army to the Veterans' Administration.

Last October the DAV was pleased to support H. Res. 241 which transferred jurisdiction over legislation relating to the cemeteries to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. This change in control is a firm attempt to improve the cemetery situation, an attempt which has been clearly nourished by support from President Johnson in his recent message to the Congress. The President told the Congress that every veteran should have the right to burial in a National Cemetery situated reasonably close to his home. The President said "I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make certain that the recommendations of the (Veterans' Advisory) Commission include proposals to assure this right in a meaningful sense."

The President's attitude, we are pleased to note, is in marked contrast to the Administration's policy, which for the past two decades has urged halting any expansion of the Cemetery System.

Another area of veterans' benefits which is of special importance to the DAV is the VA Hospital and Medical Treatment Program.

The Disabled American Veterans has a deep and abiding interest in the continuing effort of the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery to maintain its prominence in the entire field of medical care.

One of the most serious obstacles to further progress is a shortage of adequately trained medical personnel. This shortage threatens to grow more serious as private hospitals compete for manpower. Moreover, unless more professional personnel in specialized fields are attracted to the VA, there will be a downward trend in the high level of patient care.

We are certain that this distinguished Committee will continue to give its full and close attention to this aspect of the medical program.

Another facet in this field which requires attention is the furnishing of out-patient medical treatment. Under present law this benefit is generally restricted to service con-

nected disorders. Thus, with limited exceptions, veterans suffering from totally disabling service connected disabilities are not presently entitled to outpatient treatment for non-service disabilities.

Complete medical services, including drugs and medicines, are, however, available for the non-service-connected conditions of veterans of the Spanish-American and Indian Wars and to certain pensioners found to be in need of regular Aid and Attendance.

Because of the drastic reduction in the general health of a totally disabled veteran, we think it reasonable that he be entitled to outpatient medical treatment for any disability.

The DAV has a vital interest in the highly useful services performed by the Veterans' Employment Service in the Department of Labor. We have been and will continue to be concerned about adequate staffing of this federal agency to assure that the disabled veteran receives effective job counseling, employment placement, and referral to occupational training opportunities to which he is entitled under the law.

In this connection, the President, in his recent message, placed a high degree of emphasis on the need for enlarging the opportunities for veterans' employment. The President proposed that service disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation on a part-time basis be given a training allowance. As you know, Mr. Chairman, presently a disabled veteran can take vocational rehabilitation and receive a training allowance only if he trains full-time. The President declared that "The disabled veteran should be able to keep his job while he prepares for a better one through vocational training, drawing the allowance it provides."

Mr. Chairman, my presentation this morning represents a general outline of our legislative objectives. There are many other significant proposals, both legislative and administrative, of high importance which we cannot possibly bring to notice at this hearing. It is a program that reflects the DAV's historic principle which seeks to improve the physical, social and economic well-being of men and women who sacrificed themselves for America. It focuses attention on the need for enhancing opportunity for employment and proper job placement so that the residual ability of the disabled veteran is used in the most productive way; that expert hospital and medical care be provided to restore disabled veterans to a state of good health; and to provide adequate and just compensation for service incurred disabilities. In short, we want to assure that the disabled veteran is restored to as good a position in civilian life as that to which he may have aspired had he not been disabled in the service of his country.

At present, the people of our country are particularly conscious of military service and the national defense. The intensity of the war in Vietnam has markedly stimulated public interest in that war and its related issues.

These related issues, of course, are meaningfully represented in the programs which this Committee and the Congress have approved for the benefit of the wartime disabled, his widow and orphans. These problems will continue to warrant and receive the attention of the DAV. As already indicated, the main-stream of our effort for this session of Congress is directed to improving the compensation program. As the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased, we feel it necessary to help the recipients of compensation by giving them substantial increases.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this hearing has been the high point of our Mid-winter Conference, and to say again that you have been most courteous and indulgent, and we do appreciate it.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I

should like to submit for the record, copies of our National Convention Resolutions and an additional statement which the DAV presented on October 3, 1967, to the United States Veterans' Advisory Commission. The statement sets forth a full and comprehensive account of the legislative objectives of the Disabled American Veterans.

St. Charles Industrial Development Corp. Given Approval of Ninth SBA Loan

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the progressive advancement of Missouri's business economy is being ably assisted by the Small Business Administration. A good example of the type of SBA programs utilized by the State of Missouri is the local development company loans. This program is based on the principle that each community bears a major responsibility for its own economic growth and health. Under this program loans are made exclusively to local development corporations. The local development company in turn uses this money along with its own funds to acquire or erect facilities and businesses they wish to help.

Missouri has learned the value of using SBA's local development corporation program to diversify her economy, create new jobs and stimulate business activity. My State proudly reflects the importance of the American small business community to a continued growth and prosperity. President Lyndon B. Johnson shows a keen interest in the small business community, and today he applauds the contributions made by nearly 5 million small businesses. He renewed his support of small business in his proclamation of Small Business Week, May 1967, when he stated:

We must insure that they will continue to hold a vital place in our society.

Mr. Speaker, the impact which the local development corporation program is making on Missouri's expanding economy is expressed in a news story from the Community News, O'Fallon, Mo., January 3.

I commend the St. Charles County Industrial Development Corp., and include the news story of a loan totaling \$252,000, at this point in the RECORD:

ST. CHARLES INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORP. GIVEN APPROVAL OF NINTH SBA LOAN

It has been announced that a Small Business Administration loan has been approved in Washington, D.C., to assist in construction of new facilities in St. Charles for the Pundmann Motor Company.

The announcement was made by Henry J. Elmendorf, Secretary-treasurer for the St. Charles County Industrial Development Corporation, who said he received confirmation of the action from U.S. Senators Stuart Symington and Edward Long and Congressman William Hungate.

Elmendorf said the loan, in the amount of \$252,000, was approved for the Industrial Development Corporation which will construct

new facilities for the Pundmann Motor Company and then lease the facilities to the company.

The lease will be for a term of twenty-five years with the company having the option to buy during or at the end of the lease period.

Elmendorf said facilities for the St. Charles auto agency would consist of a 26,376 square foot building located on a six acre tract in the 2600 block of West Clay st. General contractor will be Arthur Ostmann.

Elmendorf pointed out that this is the ninth loan received by the local I.D.C. from the Small Business Administration and that the total amount of approved loans now totals \$2,022,800.

Through the efforts of the I.D.C. he said, St. Charles County will now have in excess of an additional \$2,500,000 worth of real estate on the tax books when all facilities have been completed.

He said that this will make the I.D.C. one of the top owners of real estate in the county, which helps broaden the tax base for all citizens of the county. In addition, he said the nine facilities receiving assistance through the I.D.C. will employ approximately 800 persons in St. Charles County.

The total amount of money going into the Pundmann Motor project will be \$315,000. Of this \$126,000 will come from the Small Business Administration and \$126,000 will come from participating banks. The I.D.C. investment in the project will be \$63,000.

Former Congressman Eugene O'Sullivan

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I inform my colleagues of the passing of a former Member of this body, Eugene D. O'Sullivan, of Omaha, Nebr.

Gene O'Sullivan served in this House in the 81st Congress. He was a lawyer of exceptional ability. During the early part of his legal career he specialized in criminal cases and was known throughout the Midwest as an outstanding practitioner of the criminal phase of the law. Later he became an outstanding legal specialist, not only in criminal cases, but also in civil cases and general legal practice.

He was a lifelong Democrat and was a delegate to many Democratic National Conventions. He had the honor at the 1924 Democratic Convention of nominating the late Gov. Charles W. Bryan for Vice President of the United States. In that year the Democratic ticket was headed by the late John W. Davis for President, and Gov. Charles W. Bryan for Vice President.

In the beginning years of my practice of law I was associated with him in many cases and always admired his honesty, industry, and remarkable legal ability. He was always active in civic affairs pertaining to his city, county, and State. Omaha and the State of Nebraska have lost a great citizen and an outstanding American. Mr. Speaker, I insert with my remarks an obituary notice from the Omaha World-Herald of February 8, 1968, concerning our former colleague, Eugene D. O'Sullivan:

EX-CONGRESS MEMBER DIES—EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, NOTED FOR LAW WORK

Former Congressman Eugene D. O'Sullivan, died Wednesday at an Omaha hospital after a long illness.

A leader in the Democratic Party for many years, Mr. O'Sullivan had been a delegate to five Democratic National Conventions.

He was widely known as defense counsel in criminal cases but his practice also included much civil work.

Mr. O'Sullivan was elected United States Representative from the Second Nebraska District in 1948, defeating Republican Howard Buffett. He lost to Mr. Buffett two years later.

NATIVE OF KANSAS

A native of Kent, Kans., he was graduated from the Christian Brothers College at St. Joseph Mo., in 1903. After attending St. Benedict's College in Atchison, Kans., for two years, he entered Creighton University Law School. He received his law degree in 1910.

Before going to Congress, Mr. O'Sullivan served as a deputy Douglas County attorney and member of the Metropolitan Utilities District board.

In 1934 he made an unsuccessful bid for the Nebraska Governorship.

He was president of the Omaha Bar Association in 1948 and 1949.

Several criminal cases in which Mr. O'Sullivan appeared as defense counsel received broad news coverage.

In 1957 he helped upset the first-degree murder conviction of Loyd Grandsinger, 24-year-old part Indian.

ARRANGEMENTS PENDING

Grandsinger was sentenced to die in 1954 for the slaying of a state patrolman near Valentine. After an appeal failed, Mr. O'Sullivan was appointed as one of Grandsinger's new attorneys.

Grandsinger received several stays of execution while Mr. O'Sullivan and Charles Flansburg of Lincoln waged a long court fight that ended in voiding of the conviction. Grandsinger was acquitted in a second trial.

Until his illness Mr. O'Sullivan had been associated with his son, Eugene, Jr., in the firm of O'Sullivan and O'Sullivan. His home was at 3833 South Twenty-fourth Street.

Surviving besides the son is a daughter, Mrs. Robert DeVaughn of Omaha, and nine grandchildren.

Services will be 9 a.m. Saturday at St. Bridget's Church with Larkin Mortuary in charge. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery.

Judge David Diamond

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the State of New York suffered a tragic loss, Justice David Diamond passed away.

Justice Diamond's life reads like an almanac of civic achievement. He lent his wise and good counsel to a host of public services.

We, who knew him, are much the richer for his acquaintance. But many more, who indirectly benefit from his wisdom and dedication, will be the poorer for his passing.

Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to Justice Diamond, and as an expression of condolence to his wife, Mrs. David Diamond, of Buffalo, N.Y., and his daughter, Mrs. Arnold C. Sternberg, of Washington,

D.C., I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of Saturday, February 10, in today's RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE DAVID DIAMOND

For former State Supreme Court Justice David Diamond, dead now at 69, the esteem and affection felt by all who knew him reflected the qualities of character that distinguished whatever civic role he undertook.

As Buffalo corporation counsel in the administration of Mayor Holling, Judge Diamond was a powerful force in helping to make that City Hall period a benchmark of good government.

The countless enterprises for community, social or professional betterment to which he contributed his time and talents attested to the exceptional range of his interests and dedication. As a jurist, a teacher at the UB law school, and a prominent figure in the state and local bar associations, Judge Diamond worked diligently to advance justice.

Judge Diamond's concern for the wider problems of his native city found expression in his commitment to such worthy purposes as those of the Buffalo Council of Social Agencies, the International Institute of Buffalo, and the Buffalo Board of Community Relations. By the valuable services he rendered the Jewish community, as by the enlistment of his intellectual vigor on behalf of civic and cultural advancement, Judge Diamond made his years rich with good works.

Rural, Smalltown America Draws Increased Attention

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the importance of rural and smalltown growth and development is underlined in a recent issue of my newsletter, Capitol Comments, which I place in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA DRAW INCREASED ATTENTION

(By JOE L. EVINS, Fourth District, Tennessee)

Progress is being made in our effort to focus attention and resources of all levels of government on the problems of Small Town and Rural America. Your Representative this year introduced on the first day of the Second Session of the Ninetieth Congress the Rural Development Incentive Act of 1968, designed to stem the tide of out-migration from our rural areas to our already crowded and congested big cities.

This Bill would provide employment and opportunities in small town and rural areas through tax incentives to encourage industry to locate and expand in rural areas. There have been these other encouraging developments:

Creation of a Small Town America Office in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, at my request, to assist smaller communities in their programs of progress by providing them information and assistance on Federal programs of grants and assistance.

The publication of a report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, which calls for a strengthening of programs to assist the 14 million rural Americans classified as being below the poverty level. The recommendations include tax incentive provisions like those proposed in my Bill—which I have called the Rural Development Incentive Act of 1968.

Modifications of requirements for workable programs in smaller communities to avoid placing "unreasonable burdens" on smaller cities in their preparation of applications and plans for progress which are requirements for participation in a number of Federal Grant-in-aid programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The announcement that a thousand small communities have been assisted in obtaining public works through the public facility loan program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Since 1955, this program has provided more than \$422 million for construction of 1,100 facilities in small towns throughout the United States.

Announcement by the Farmers Home Administration that in fiscal 1967, 2130 grants and loans totaling \$250 million had been approved for construction of rural water and sewer systems.

Last year the importance of the development of Small Town and Rural America was accorded major recognition. It is encouraging to note that this momentum is continuing into 1968 and certainly, your Representative will endeavor to focus attention on and to urge a concentration of Federal resources for our rural areas.

The key to the success of any program is local leadership, local initiative and local participation. The Federal government can provide assistance and resources—but the leadership must come from the people themselves for growth and progress.

Many of our communities are moving ahead with their programs of growth and progress. New public facilities are being built, new industries are moving in, existing business are expanding, and jobs and opportunities are being created for our people for advancement, growth and progress.

New Safety Features for Superjets

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a number of recent aircraft accidents, my Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings last fall on this subject in an effort to find ways to make airplane travel safer. These hearings have not been concluded and I expect to schedule additional witnesses during this session of Congress.

In keeping with my long interest in and dedication to flight safety, first as a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics and now as its chairman, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the recent action taken by Pan American Airways to install new radar systems on their fleet of Boeing 747 Superjets to increase air travel comfort and safety.

Pan Am is to be commended for taking the initiative in this vital area and for investing \$1 million of its funds with Radio Corp. of America to equip each of the Superjets with an advanced technology weather radar system.

Pan Am has 25 Superjets on order and will put the world's first 747 into scheduled passenger service in late 1969.

A weather radar unit is designed to alert the crew of bad weather in the

flight path ahead of an aircraft. The unit depicts cloud formations as an image on a radar screen in the aircraft cockpit.

The RCA radar system for Pan Am's 747 fleet has a 300-mile range compared with the 150 miles of units on today's jet transports. The radar system will offer pilots greater operational reliability over single system units used today because of its improved circuitry and use of transistors instead of conventional vacuum tubes.

My committee will continue its efforts to find ways to eliminate aircraft accidents. In the meantime, Pan American has taken a big step in the right direction.

Lessons in Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of the Vietnam war—and there are many—is the tragedy of self-delusion. We have heard assertions that it was the enemy's attacks which destroyed the latest chance for negotiations, when a month went by without a real test of North Vietnam's public statement that negotiations will follow a cessation of bombing. We have heard assertions that the reverses suffered during the Tet offensive were really victories and General Westmoreland's bland statement that the enemy was seeking to cause "maximum consternation." These and too many more are reminiscent of Orwell's "Newspeak," in which war is peace, hate love, and ignorance strength.

Joseph Kraft has written a perceptive and compelling assessment of the situation in Vietnam. The column from the Washington Post of February 6, 1968, entitled "Red Glare of Battle Illuminates Lessons of Vietnam Nightmare," follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 6, 1968]

RED GLARE OF BATTLE ILLUMINATES LESSONS OF VIETNAM NIGHTMARE

(By Joseph Kraft)

There is something pathetic in the repeated assertions that the United States did not suffer a military defeat during the past week of nightmare in Vietnam. For the true point of the nightmare is very different.

The lesson of events is that the purely military logic—the logic of victory and defeat—is absurd. The events teach that there is a basic incongruity between this country's objectives in Vietnam and what it can achieve by military means.

In reading the event the first thing to notice is the most striking feature of what has happened—the element of surprise. Nobody can seriously claim that American authorities in Washington or Saigon were ready for what came. The mark of what they expected is that just before the attack on Saigon and the other cities began, Gen. William Westmoreland called off the Tet truce in the northern provinces of South Vietnam—but not around Saigon or the other major cities.

Nor was it only the place and the fury of the enemy action which caught this country off guard. Elaborate preparations were

made—arms cached, men moved, tunnels dug, positions prepared—in the very midst of the American presence. The preparations were not divined by the American authorities, nor were they made known by the local people.

Nor is that really surprising. The large American control over the economy, and the possession of captured documents by the thousand may give some the illusion that the United States is truly plugged in Vietnam. But actually the Americans there are set apart from the local population by language, customs, living standard and the certain knowledge that before many months or years, the Yankee will go home.

American diplomats are regularly surprised by what friendly Vietnamese political leaders do. American commanders can barely distinguish friendly Vietnamese from hostile ones. That the enemy could spring such a surprise only confirms the condition of a wide gulf between the Americans in Vietnam and the local people.

That gulf cannot be closed by American military power. For what happens when the American military power is applied?

Well, the events of the last week show what happens. Large sections of Saigon and Hue have been bombed from the air and raked by artillery fire. Homes, shops, and schools have been destroyed.

No doubt the use of planes and artillery was essential to rout the enemy. But ordinary Vietnamese know chiefly that their protectors are obliterating their villages and cities—that the American presence means trouble. That is why so few are actively aligned with this country.

In theory, of course, the gap between the American military and the local population should be filled by the Saigon government. But the American military presence has called forth a certain kind of government. It has called forth the regime run by the two former generals—President Nguyen Van Thieu and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky.

That is a government, as we have now seen, with a police chief who shoots captives out of hand. That is a government which counts as one of its best divisions the division which lost Hue in a couple of hours. That is a government with corrupt military authorities who do not turn out troops to help protect the American embassy. This is a government, in other words, which cannot enlist the support of the local population.

All this, to be sure, does not prove that the United States has suffered a military defeat. It proves that the United States is at the outer limit of its military power—the place where force cannot accomplish useful political results.

To be sure, more force will have to be applied to stabilize the situation in the cities, and to hold at Khesanh. But there is no point in trying to get even, or to go one up by expanding the war to North Vietnam or Laos or Cambodia.

The right thing for this country to do is the hardest thing. It is to hold firm for now, and then to move, as the President has recently been moving, down the path to the negotiated settlement which alone can serve the basic American interest.

Salute to St. Luke's Hospital Auxiliary

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of us are convinced that the reason the United States continues to remain a power—in spite of the bumbling

and faltering of this administration—is the voluntary effort of the many individuals who are willing to sacrifice so that the community may endure.

In my district in Wisconsin there are many individuals and groups who serve their area on a voluntary basis each and every day, just as there are literally thousands of such dedicated folks in the State. Today I would like to salute one such representative group which points up the strength and character of these volunteers who keep us strong.

The women who form the auxiliary of the St. Luke's Hospital in Racine work long and arduous hours for the good of mankind. They ask for nothing in return for their services and contribute mightily to their community. I am proud to salute these outstanding women for their untiring devotion to the cause which is so necessary to serve the good of all who reside in their locale. These ladies typify the spirit of the community action exhibited by them and their counterparts throughout the district I am privileged to represent.

Whither Mass Transit?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Congress passed and the President signed into law the Urban Mass Transportation Act. The 89th Congress established a Department of Transportation, in the expectation that at long last the Nation's transportation problems would be attacked in a meaningful, comprehensive way. I was one of many who had hopes that, at long last, the mad urge to pave over the countryside with highways would be tempered by a realization that mass transportation is a vital part of any national transportation program.

Unfortunately, mass transit is still a stepchild, undernourished by congressional parsimony and hidden away in the dark recesses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In the meantime, railroad passenger service continues to decline.

David C. Anderson of the Wall Street Journal has written a timely and penetrating study of this critical situation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 13, 1968]

MUTED WHISTLE-STOP—ESCALATED TERMINATION OF PASSENGER TRAINS CAUSES WOES FOR HUNDREDS OF COMMUNITIES

(By David C. Anderson)

LEOTI, KANS.—Even the biggest booster in this windblown prairie town admits that life in Leoti just hasn't been the same since the Eagle stopped coming through. "And we're more than a little bitter about it," adds one of them.

The Colorado Eagle, the Missouri Pacific Railroad's once-elegant passenger train, used to stop twice daily on its round trip between Kansas City and Pueblo, Colo., dropping off passengers, mail and, most important to local

businesses, parcel post and railway express shipments.

But all that abruptly stopped in April 1966. To get here today you may ride the Union Pacific to Oakley, 70 miles north, or the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe to Garden City, 61 miles south. From there you can hire a car, charter a plane, or hitchhike—Leoti (pop. 1,401) doesn't have bus service.

The town's plight is mirrored in hundreds of communities throughout the U.S., including many much larger places, such as Wichita Falls, Texas (pop. 101,724), Rochester, Minn. (pop. 47,797), Bloomington, Ind. (pop. 42,058) and Casper, Wyo. (pop. 38,930). In 1962, all 70 towns in Kansas with 2,500 people or more had railroad passenger service. Today, a third are without it and in the others, service has been drastically curtailed.

Chopping off passenger trains has escalated sharply of late. Of the 400 interstate passenger trains discontinued in the past decade, 50 of them have been axed since July and another 75 are on the block, says Anthony Haswell, executive director of the National Association of Railroad Passengers, a Chicago-based group seeking to preserve passenger train service.

PASSING OF PART OF AMERICAN SCENE

Many of the trains gone and going bear prestigious names—a part of the American scene itself. The New York Central's Twentieth Century Limited, perhaps the best known of all, was laid to rest in December. And the California Zephyr, whose Chicago-San Francisco run may be the most scenic in the U.S., is doomed if the Western Pacific succeeds in dropping the Western portion of the Zephyr's trip.

The Mainstreeter from St. Paul to Seattle is in jeopardy. The Northern Pacific is trying to end its run at Fargo, N.D. And, the Kansas City Southern would like to get rid of its Southern Belle, from Kansas City to New Orleans, along with all the rest of its passenger trains.

Though it's still possible to get a comfortable bed and a tasty meal on trains like the Santa Fe Super Chief, which leave Chicago each evening for the West Coast, many such trains, especially those the railroads would like to eliminate, are reduced to parodies of their former luxury.

The once formidable Wabash Cannonball, fabled in song "listen to the jingle, the rumble and the roar . . ." shed its observation parlor car long ago and recently lost its dining car. Lately it has consisted only of a baggage car, a single coach and a snack car on its all day St. Louis-Detroit run.

A recent passenger on the New York Central's Wolverine, from Detroit to Chicago, describes windows too mudcaked to yield any view. The dining car's bread was moldy, he testifies, and one of the coaches "looked as if there had been a party and nobody had cleaned up afterwards," with beer cans and bottles strewn about.

PRIORITY FOR FREIGHT TRAINS

Passenger trains typically sit still for long periods of time while conductors mutter about freight trains going through up ahead. On some trains passengers spend the dinner hour—once a time of gracious service—in a car full of food vending machines.

Railroads contend that curtailing service is the only way to keep down mounting losses—passenger revenue plummeted 23% from 1961 levels to an estimated \$480 million last year (freight revenue increased 18% in the same period). But they are touchy about gripes that they discourage passenger travel with deliberate inconvenience, dirt, discomfort and discourtesy. Such allegations are "untrue and deeply resented" said a recent Baltimore & Ohio—Chesapeake & Ohio press release.

In some cases, the railroads seem to be setting obstacles in the way of passengers who seek to board their trains. In testimony earlier this month on the application of the

Kansas City Southern Railroad to discontinue service between Kansas City and New Orleans, the railroad's attorney asked Mayor Harry C. Shute of Pittsburg, Kan., when the last time was that he had ridden a train.

"The last time I tried was last Monday," the mayor said. "With others, I went to the depot at 4 a.m. to ride the 4:10 a.m. train. We were told it would be late, so we went out for breakfast and came back only to be told it wouldn't arrive before 7 or 8. So we got a car and drove to Kansas City."

But the Interstate Commerce Commission, traditionally limited to either allowing or disallowing passenger service cuts, is seeking legislative authority to set passenger service standards. And its hearings on the downgrading of passenger service on the Southern Pacific could eventually produce ICC power to ensure "reasonable service" on passenger trains, observers say.

Railroad enthusiasts and small-town dwellers are probably involved in a futile tilt against the jet airliner, which cuts the 40-hour Chicago to Los Angeles train ride to a three hour and 50 minute hop, and the superhighway on which an intercity traveler can rival train speeds on his own schedule. Both are diverting revenue-producing mail from trains to planes and trucks, further jeopardizing passenger service. Even Mr. Haswell, who stalwartly takes the train to Washington to lobby for better passenger train service, concedes he often flies back.

These realities of modern travel are scant comfort in Leoti and other towns far from regional airlines stops and still unreachable by superhighways.

A 3-HOUR, 38-MILE RIDE

But freight service continues to both Leoti and its neighbor, Scott City (population 4,200) and the Santa Fe even runs a half-baggage, half-coach car up to Scott on spur-line from Garden City. It covers the 38 miles in three hours.

The mail, which used to come in from east and west on the Eagle, now takes at least a day longer than it used to, and may suffer longer delays in the complex of air and truck connections between Kansas City and Pueblo.

Small freight deliveries, vital to the Main Street merchant, are even more of a headache, despite the fact that motor freight service to the area has expanded since the discontinuance of the Eagle.

"It may take three days to get an irrigation engine part, when it used to be overnight," says a Scott City banker. "That's hard for the farmer whose field is burning up from drought to understand."

Prepared for such situations, Irv Wilken, Leoti's mayor and manager of the local John Deere Agency, says he has had to expand his parts inventory by 15%—\$7,000 to \$8,000—since the Eagle disappeared.

Local doctors find it difficult to convince elderly patients to go to Kansas City medical centers for treatment. Formerly it was a convenient ride on the Eagle. "Who would want to retire to a place like this?" asks Mary Herndon, a long-time Leoti resident. "Unless you can drive, you just sit."

Leroy and Ruth Keener, who operate a Scott City flower shop, must put approximately 500 extra miles on their car monthly to drive the 74-mile round trip to Garden City to meet plane, bus and truck shipments that used to arrive on the Eagle.

When an emergency, such as a sudden funeral, drives up local demand for flowers, "we just have to apologize" for lack of adequate stock, Mrs. Keener says. She once could call her Colorado suppliers as late as 3 p.m. and have all the flowers she needed when the Eagle pulled in that night. Such dependable efficiency is impossible now.

GETTING MONEY SHIPPED

As for the Scott City mortician, he now must either arrange to have bodies flown in on air taxis or drive out to pick them up him-

self. For years the dead came home to Scott City on the Eagle's baggage car.

Don Christy, president of the First National Bank in Scott City, complains of the slowdown in mail service. "It's tough getting money shipped," he says. "We used to get our clearings overnight from Kansas City." Now it takes two or three days, he says. Postmaster Homer Vaughn has another point: "Take a banker who used to transfer \$100,000 overnight. Now it takes longer and he loses the interest. I don't blame him for complaining."

Scott City's city attorney, James Wallace, reflects the upset of many of his neighbors at the loss of the train: "H—, the railroad built this country," he says. The town's library displays photos of early Scott City families, many of whom took advantage of the extension of the rail service to move west.

"That Eagle used to be one of the most beautiful trains you ever saw," recalls Mr. Wallace. "I can remember when there'd be cars from over a three county area here to meet that train."

The Missouri Pacific says the \$2 million Eagle profited for many years from luxury-loving Kansas City vacationers, but by 1963 the train was running a \$700,000 annual deficit. A 1964 cut in service reduced that year's loss to \$200,000, but in June 1965 the train lost its railway Post Office car, which had produced over \$300,000 in annual revenue. With the annual loss over the \$500,000 mark again, the railroad filed to discontinue the train.

The railroad says a 1964-65 survey showed that an average of only 1.3 passengers boarded the eastbound Eagle daily at Scott City, while a passenger boarded every 1.5 days at Leoti with lesser boardings westbound.

But some residents of the towns don't consider revenue and traffic declines a sufficient excuse. "We have operations in this bank that are unprofitable," says Scott City First National's Mr. Christy. "We maintain them as a public service."

Railroad passenger service continues to run downhill

CHICAGO.—Railroad passenger service has been running downhill for years. The following table indicates the decline in miles of road in passenger services for all Class I railroads and the number of passenger cars in service since 1929.

	Miles	Cars
1929	226,703	47,797
1939	172,031	30,353
1949	156,821	27,903
1959	99,989	17,695
1967 (est.)	69,000	10,000

Breakfast at School

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the beginning of the breakfast feeding program in Cleveland public schools was greeted with widespread favorable comments.

The program was put into effect this month by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and I wish to join with those expressing their approval.

In that connection I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared on December 15, 1967, in the Cleveland Press which terms the feeding program a "mission of mercy." I heartily concur. The editorial follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Dec. 15, 1967]

BREAKFAST AT SCHOOL

"A hungry child can't learn," says Cleveland School Supt. Paul W. Briggs. That short, simple statement tells plenty about the special problems of teaching the children of the poor.

In its fight on poverty, the Federal Government could hardly have done better than to allocate food and funds to feed some 26,000 hungry boys and girls in Cleveland juice, cereal and milk each morning. The program begins next month.

This is indeed a mission of mercy, in the best humanitarian tradition of this country. America has spent foreign aid funds to feed the hungry in many impoverished lands; it is only right that the same attention be focused on the undernourished at home.

In a related mercy mission, the Salvation Army has donated 1000 certificates valued at \$5 each for new shoes which the school system will distribute to poorly shod pupils. The Army is footing the \$5000 shoe bill this year instead of donating Christmas toys.

While it's too bad that some youngsters are losing out on toys, it is perfectly obvious that warm feet must come first. The Salvation Army has the right sense of priorities.

Sportsman's Position on Firearms Legislation

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of misrepresentation as to the position of sportsmen's groups and conservation organizations on firearms legislation. There are those who seek to leave the impression that such groups and organizations oppose firearms legislation per se. Such is not the case. Sportsmen's groups and conservation organizations support enactment of meaningful firearms legislation—legislation which would keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and irresponsible persons, but protect the right of law-abiding citizens to acquire and own firearms for sporting and home defense purposes.

The February 2, 1968, issue of the Wildlife Management Institute's Outdoor News Bulletin carried an excellent article on the subject of firearms legislation. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of the institute's views, I am inserting the text of the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONSERVATION LEADERS ASK CONGRESS TO ACT ON FIREARMS

Leaders of a number of the country's foremost conservation, wildlife, and sportsmen's groups are renewing their requests that Congress approve legislation this year that would help reduce the misuse of firearms, according to the Wildlife Management Institute. Concern is being expressed that continuation of the bitter fight between those who would ban all firearms and those who object to restrictions of any kind will harm sportsmen and other legitimate firearms users.

Acceptable legislation, the leaders say, would embody principles contained in S. 1853 and S. 1854, bills by Senator Roman L. Hruska (Neb.) and others, pending in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

In brief, S. 1853 would prohibit a manufacturer or dealer from shipping a firearm

in interstate commerce to any person in violation of state or appropriate local law; provide that no person may transport or receive in his place of residence a firearm acquired by him outside the state if such acquisition or possession is unlawful in the place of his residence; require that no carrier may deliver any handgun to a person under 21 years of age.

Another key provision of S. 1853 would require that the purchaser of a handgun in interstate commerce, mail order or over-the-counter, make an affidavit of eligibility which is filed with the purchaser's local law enforcement agency. The seller must wait at least one week after receiving evidence of delivery of the Affidavit before shipping the handgun to the buyer.

These provisions, if implemented by Congress, would correct weaknesses in the existing Federal Firearms Act. They would close loopholes mentioned time and time again by witnesses appearing at Senate and House hearings on firearms in recent years.

S. 1854 would regulate so-called destructive devices, such as bazookas, mortars, and grenades by placing them under the National Firearms Act which now controls machine guns and other gangster-type weapons. Congress will find there is tremendous national support for these two bills, conservation leaders say.

Who Are the Criminals?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Justice Department can find no authority or law to stop the American "Cong" mock takeover of Washington, D.C., nor does it find moral or social need to corral the Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns—yet, in a matter of hours after an unfortunate fracas in South Carolina, this same Justice Department has already tried and condemned the entire city; that is, all but the parties responsible for provoking the affair.

No suits or actions were brought against the taxpayers in Detroit, Watts, Newark, or a hundred other black power targets. Why Orangeburg? Another double standard?

What does the Justice Department seek from Orangeburg—to justify riot-provoking causes and encourage more violence? This raises the question, Who are the criminals under this inverted rationale?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I follow my remarks with the Associated Press release of February 14 and several letters to the editor from the local Evening Star:

UNITED STATES SUES TO INTEGRATE ORANGEBURG HOSPITAL

ORANGEBURG, S.C.—The U.S. Justice Department has filed a court suit to desegregate an Orangeburg hospital as an internal struggle threatens the town's biracial council.

The council was formed Friday in the wake of racial violence that left 3 young Negroes dead and 37 injured.

On Saturday, the Justice Department filed suit to desegregate the town's only bowling alley—target of Negro student demonstrations that led to the Thursday night violence. A second desegregation suit was filed yesterday—this one against the Orangeburg Regional Hospital.

Dr. Charles Thomas Jr., head of the town chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has withdrawn from the biracial unit in a dispute over its membership. He says the NAACP should appoint the Negro members.

"They want just a talkathon group they can control," Thomas said of city officials last night.

CLAIMS BOYCOTT EFFECTIVE

The struggle for power within the biracial unit comes at a time when the NAACP is the apparent driving force behind a "no-buying quarantine" against white businesses. Thomas claims the two-day-old boycott is 95 percent effective.

The Justice Department's second suit alleges the hospital practices racial discrimination in the assignment of rooms, floors, wards and wings and in its medical care, treatment, services and training programs.

Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark said the suit, filed in U.S. District Court in Columbia, asks for an injunction against discrimination and for court affirmation of a Jan. 8 order by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to cut off federal aid to the hospital.

The law enforcement agencies involved in Thursday night's outbreak of shooting were sharply criticized yesterday by Dr. Martin Luther King.

King said in a telegram to Atty. Gen. Clark that "evidence presented by eyewitnesses to the events in Orangeburg, S.C., shows that all the students were shot in the back and that many were wounded while lying in the ground. . . . We demand that you act now to bring to justice the perpetrators of the largest armed assault undertaken under cover of law in recent Southern history."

CURFEW AIDS BOYCOTT

Officers reported they came under fire before the students were killed and wounded. Students denied possession of any weapons.

The business boycott continues to be assisted by a dusk-to-dawn curfew in the city. Gov. Robert McNair said yesterday he has no idea when the curfew will be lifted.

McNair said 600 National Guardsmen and 200 state highway patrolmen still remain in the city. He said he foresees "a big problem" in the expense occurred maintaining the troops.

Negro requests for an investigation into the three shooting deaths were supported today by an editorial in the Orangeburg Times and Democrat.

The editorial requested that an FBI investigation probe "how deeply the black power movement is rooted on the South Carolina State College campus to determine if the All-Star bowling lanes was a target of integration or an excuse for violence."

KING'S "CAMP-IN"

Sr.: If the administration allows Martin Luther King to go through with his proposed "camp-in" in April all its talk about crime prevention will be so much empty babbling. The biggest crime in recent years is the complete abandon with which riots, strikes and civil disobedience have been allowed to flourish. It is beyond the wildest dream to imagine that this "camp-in" could take place without disturbance.

As I get the picture Dr. King thinks the complete cure for this is to abolish poverty. Even though he does mention jobs, you will notice that he avoids use of the word wages—wages being payment received for doing a job—but asks for a guaranteed annual income. This would allow the able-bodied welfare recipient to continue resting idly at home.

I submit that all the money in the world is not the cure for crime. "The devil finds work for idle hands" was never more true than today. One of the best ways to stem the tide of crime is to get all these able-bodied

"guests" of the Welfare State up off their lazy verandas and make them go to work.

Instead of Dr. King "educating" the people of Washington and other cities to the "hand-out" let him and his disciples be educated to the concept of work and acceptance of the already available jobs. Let them also be educated to the fact that it's not customary to start out at the top, but to begin at the bottom and work up. Let them be educated to the idea that pride is something that comes with earning not taking. Let Martin Luther King himself be educated to using the time, energy and money directly on the poverty stricken rather than on a wasteful disturbance.

In the beginning days of this country there was a rule, for every able-bodied citizen, of "no work, no eat." It's still a good idea!

VIRGINIA PHILLIPS.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

SIR: As many of us recall with shame and remorse the summer march on The Pentagon, we read of Martin Luther King's projected spring civil disobedience campaign with the question upon our lips. "Does this have to happen in the Capital City of a nation which finds it increasingly difficult to maintain law and order?" Or any other place in our nation?

In a Washington motel three notorious troublemakers, King, Carmichael and Rap Brown, met upon the vicious premise, "We seek to say to the nation . . . that if you don't straighten up, then you're writing your own obituary. When we come here (in the spring campaign) we will come not to beg, but to demand that the nation grant us what is truly ours."

Will a nation committed to providing for common defense and insuring domestic tranquility abide or ignore such a threat to its security and the safety of its people? Will our nation through its leaders be intimidated to grant a threatening and disobedient mob what the mob determines as its rightful inheritance? Why not a federal injunction to keep these trouble makers, and other of like mind, out of the Nation's Capital and restrain their promotion of such campaigns anywhere within the bounds of the United States of America? If the injunction should fail, why not try iron bars, without bail.

If reason, fair play and a sincere desire for the good of all cannot combine forces in legislation, social and economic development to secure the blessing of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all of our people, there seems to be scant hope for lawlessness and violence to do so.

THOMAS W. SUNDERLAND,
Pastor, Epworth Methodist Church.

SIR: First, I must say that this country is the greatest place on earth and I don't believe we should sit around and let just a few destroy all the things we stand for.

I am referring to those few who would destroy this country in the name of civil rights, and simply because they don't want to face the true facts of life. There are too many of my race that feel that the country owes them a reward just because they are Negroes. Too many want something without working for it. And because of our many, many freedoms, too many just take advantage of them.

What I am trying to say is that we have many strong laws but for some reason they are not used. This is a new day, and I feel that some of these so-called freedoms are outdated. I believe that all people must be made to respect the law of the land. We have the President, the Supreme Court and many agencies that make the law; and I do believe the President has the power to control marches on Washington like that planned by the Rev. Martin Luther King.

I am sure that nothing good can ever come out of such as this. Also, being a Negro myself, I would like to know just what these so-called civil rights want. We have come

a long way. What good will it do now to have to start all over again?

My only hope now is that we all will wake up and come to our God-given senses before it is too late.

GEORGE W. STEWMAN.

The Great Society Drops Out

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, too few of us are comprehending the true cost of the Vietnam war. One cost is the gutting of the spirit and much of the substance of President Johnson's own Great Society. As the economist, Robert Lekachman, points out in an article from the New Leader, of February 12, 1968, when social welfare spending is considered on a per capital basis, one sees that the Great Society is not merely standing still—it is in full retreat.

Professor Lekachman, who is chairman of the Economics Department of the State University of New York at Stonybrook, goes on to point out how a misassessment of the causes of inflation led the administration to call for the surtax, which set off further political demands for reduced domestic spending. The article is an excellent study in the intertwining of politics and economics which has resulted in a disarray in our priorities. It follows:

COST-PUSH OR DEMAND-PULL

(By Robert Lekachman)

The President's economic program for the coming year eerily reads much of the time as though Ho Chi Minh and Wilbur Mills had collaborated in its composition. The two notes sounded by the tired rhetoric of the Budget, the State of the Union Message, and the Economic Message are perseverance in Southeast Asia (despite "the cost of our commitment to freedom" as President Johnson humorously puts it) and the utter necessity of retrenchment at home. For some time past a sour joke, the Great Society is now a drop-out even from Lyndon Johnson's public prose.

In its new "honest" dress, the Budget includes trust fund accounts as well as the consequences of the government's vast lending operations. Thus the projected total budget outlay for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, is a majestic \$186.1 billion, a figure that has set conservative tongues to clucking. By any budgetary concept, the actual total is only \$10.4 billion above the current fiscal year's expenditures.

The only deserves emphasis because the entire \$10.4 billion goes to defense, Social Security and Medicare (financed largely out of payroll taxes), higher military and civil service pay, more generous veterans' pensions, and, unavoidably, higher interest payments on the Federal debt. If proper attention is paid to the country's increased population and higher price levels, it is plain that the sums available for social welfare in real terms per capita are considerably smaller than they have been. The Great Society is not standing still: It is in full retreat.

The details make the flesh creep. Here are some of the flowers in the large garland of program reductions: The Administration plans to close 16 Job Corps camps, and as an odd response to last summer's riots, it pro-

poses to hold down the summer youth programs. The same government which touts the passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act and advances toward victory over Tainted Tuna, also plans to curtail grants to communities for improved sewage treatment—just possibly a more important problem. Although the President does seek to shrink the space agency's swollen budget by \$447 million (over the anguished protests of Werner von Braun), he has found a quarter of a billion dollars for the idiotic, environmentally destructive supersonic transport.

The President's affection for education is notorious and the details of his early days as a schoolteacher have bored a nation. All the same, this year he plans to lop \$361 million off education programs, one of the causes, presumably, of John Gardner's resignation from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a result there will be fewer books and fewer libraries to put them in, a smaller number of laboratories and lab equipment, and fewer dormitories, although there will naturally be a great many more students seeking college admission and the price of their books and supplies will be rising.

Why has the President crippled what he labored so hard to create? Like most answers these days, the response goes back to Vietnam and Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. By now the Administration is committed to the incessant repetition of a one-note economic song: Raise taxes. As the Administration sees the world, unless Congress speedily enacts the tax surcharge, the wage-price spiral will quicken, what is left of our favorable merchandise balance of trade will vanish, and our large deficit in the over-all balance of payments will worsen.

Already under assault, the dollar will be attacked by the speculators with redoubled enthusiasm and the consequence will be either a humiliating increase of the dollar price for gold—to the benefit of South Africa, the Soviet Union, and General de Gaulle—or, even worse, a reversion to economic protectionism that will soon be emulated by other major trading nations.

The case is founded upon what economists term demand-pull influences. As this story goes, prices rose over 3 per cent last year simply because individual consumers, business investors, and government agencies in concert spent too many dollars, stimulating too many price hikes. Not all economists, myself included, accept this tale, preferring instead an emphasis upon actions by large unions and large corporations which in the jargon of the trade has been dubbed cost-push inflation. Whether out of conviction or convenience, Congressman Mills has attached himself to this wing of economic opinion.

During last November's performance of the Theater of the Absurd that the Congressman from time to time conducts for the harassment of the Administration, he grilled Charles Schultze, then still head of the Budget Bureau, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, and Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin on the official version of inflation. Mills pointed to such contradictory auguries as sluggish retail sales, high consumer saving, unused factory capacity, and the modest real growth of the economy. How, he wondered, could a tax increase master the problem when unions were capable of negotiating 5-6 per cent wage increases and large corporations were able, within generous limits, to set profit targets which necessitated higher prices for their realization?

Such a diagnosis might lead an old-fashioned trust buster to cry anew for the dissolution of General Motors and the lesser goliaths annually celebrated in *Fortune's* directory of the 500 largest American industrial corporations. The analysts might induce a modern economist to advocate further

experiment with wage-price guideposts, some version of English compulsory reporting and review, selective wage and price controls, or even general controls and rationing. Congressman Mills' conclusion is decidedly different: an insistence on further reductions in non-defense spending (he is hawkish on Vietnam), and the installation of the new principle that public spending should grow more slowly than private spending.

For what the quality may be worth, Mills has displayed exemplary consistency. In a recent *Newsweek* column, Paul Samuelson has blamed him for a year's delay in the passage of the 1964 tax cut and the consequent loss of \$10 billion in the Gross National Product. Rather bitterly, Samuelson now suggests that Mills' present tactics will compensate for the loss by causing an extra \$10 billion of inflation.

Politically the Administration's posture is uncomfortable. If the President holds the budgetary line, maintaining that all possible cuts have already been made, he risks the death of the surcharge in the House Ways and Means Committee. And even Administration stalwarts, more or less convinced that higher taxes are necessary, will in an election year breathe a small, silent prayer of thanks to their Arkansas colleague. But it is by no means certain that if the Administration yields to Mills and shaves two or three billion dollars more off the education, model cities, job retraining, and economic opportunity budgets, the Congress will act favorably upon taxes.

The point is simple enough. Since expenditure reduction and tax increases are alternative means of dampening down aggregate demand, the more there is of the first the weaker is the case of the second. Under these circumstances, it is quite possible that Mills will get what he wants, the wreckage of social programs, and the President will never receive his yearned-for recompense, the surcharge.

The contretemps is largely politically inspired, but truth to tell, the Administration's intellectual position does not deserve much better. Winning the praise of even the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Economic Report* comes out strongly against mandatory wage and price controls on the grounds, traditional to economists, that "they distort resource allocation; they require reliance either on necessarily clumsy and arbitrary rules or the inevitable imperfect decisions of Government officials; they offer countless temptations to evasion or violation; they require a vast administrative apparatus." This would be a fair statement of the conventional wisdom on this subject if the *Economic Report* were not at frequent odds with its own position.

Take one important point: Although the Council of Economic Advisors emphasizes demand elements in inflation, it does not deny the relevance of market power to recent price increases. Now it is legitimate enough to contrast free markets and government controls as allocative mechanisms to the praise of the former and the derogation of the latter, but the inconvenient fact is that wherever concentrated corporate or union power is important, corporate and union officials, not the free market, do the allocative work. Is it obvious that their work is to be preferred to that of public officials?

The Council's own criteria suggest either the substitution of public for arbitrary private allocation or a serious attempt to make powerful corporations and unions behave as though they were governed by free market forces. The first response the Council excluded. The second was embodied in the wage-price guideposts.

The original guidepost standard for wage increases was 3.2 per cent annually, roughly in line with per capita productivity increases. Last year's average settlement won unions

5.5 per cent. What the Council proposes in the face of this experience is almost embarrassing to describe. The *Economic Report* inevitably urges labor and management to behave responsibly. Then it proposes a new mechanism, a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability charged with the preparation of "studies in depth of economic conditions in those industries which are a persistent source of inflationary pressure," and provided with a mandate "to reach some consensus on appropriate general standards to guide private price and wage decisions." The last point is a retreat from the Administration's claim up to this year that such standards had already been enunciated.

As if all of this were not bad enough, the Administration is pledged to a series of controls over American travel, bank loans to foreigners, and investment in Western Europe. If these devices do not interfere with the sacred allocations of the free market, what on earth does? The President and perforce his subordinates dodge the large fact that any war represents a serious misallocation of resources. In past wars the administrative response has been general control of the economy so that whatever was left over from the appetites of the military could be reasonably allocated to the various civilian claimants. The inconsistencies of the Administration's positions are a testimonial to the general unpopularity of the Vietnam war.

A word is in order about the only novelty of the Presidential message season. This is JOBS, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. The President proposes to enlist the business community, not heretofore enthusiastic, in the solution of hard-core unemployment. He wants \$350 million to create 100,000 new jobs over the next 18 months. The rationale is this: It may cost as much as \$5,000 per trainee to absorb "severely disadvantaged" workers. Business, however public-spirited, cannot be expected to bear the training, counseling, and supervisory costs. At \$3,500 per person, business will cover its costs, a particularly intractable variety of unemployment will diminish, welfare costs will drop, and peace will return to the slums.

Understandably, the notion has won converts among the more enlightened members of the business community. In Detroit, Henry Ford seems engaged in a serious attempt to suspend the usual screening devices which automatically exclude the hard-core unemployed. Members of the Urban Coalition are publicizing the President's program and the general advisability of a greater business commitment. And indeed something may come of the program, less because of business altruism than because of labor shortage. One suspects that a good many businessmen will be receiving public subsidies for hiring and training the same people they would have recruited at their own expense. Unless standards are high, these businessmen will be making substantial profits out of the scheme.

In 1968 this may be the best we can do as a nation. But if one returns to the subject of resource allocation, the proposal illustrates the disorder of our priorities. Only a year or two ago, the Automation Commission identified something like five million public service jobs unfilled according to present definitions of staffing need. One could usefully employ several hundred thousand people just making additional mail deliveries. This might do rather more to raise growth rates than laboriously created jobs in the private sector. It is hard to preserve one's patience with an Administration which preaches rational resource allocation and cannot so much as deliver the mail on time.

The picture before us is of a President who has presided over the liquidation of the fragile period of social reform he did so much to initiate. For his pains, he has not even won the war which has caused all the trouble. Lyndon Johnson would deserve our sympathy if we did not need it all for ourselves.

Statement of the Honorable Richard D. McCarthy Upon Introduction of a Joint Resolution To Establish a JudiCorps

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the despair and rejection of the ghettoites and the slumdwellers of our inner cities cannot be stopped by bullets and blood and tear gas alone. We learned that last summer.

Nor can it be stopped by the ceaseless flow of dollars into untrained and unmotivated hands alone. We learned that last summer, too.

And we learned another bitter lesson last summer: that the violence that flared but confined itself to limited areas gave rise to hatred and other violence, not from the rioters, but from the average citizen whose fear of social war had reached paranoid proportions and sought reprisals against the underprivileged and the deprived, the causes of their discontent.

Mr. Speaker, the one common denominator in the hatred and counterhate which the violence engendered was the great need for adherence to law and order.

Those whose homes were not burned and relatives not shot at, claimed the sole cause of the riots was disrespect for the law; while the burned-out and shot-up minority claimed the violence was necessary because the law did not work.

Mr. Speaker, in their far-reaching decision, Gideon against Wainwright, in 1963, the Supreme Court declared that defendants in criminal cases must have a lawyer—as an inalienable right, not a luxury. This decision was indeed a milestone; but it did not and it could not enter that other, and far more extensive body of proceedings, the civil action.

Many of our cities today have slums where exorbitant rentals are charged for filthy, ill-kept and crowded dwellings. Yet these same cities almost all have zoning laws and health and fire ordinances. The problem here, then, is adherence.

We cannot expect every city to hire crowds of inspectors to keep daily vigils on landlords of blight. We can also not expect the individual tenants, struggling to keep their financial heads above water, to pay the high prices of a competent attorney. But our answer is not in subsidizing building inspectors. The inspectors come and go and conditions may change a little, but the tenants, the actual victims, have no hand in the undoing of their own misery. No lesson is learned, no confidence is gained.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is to provide opportunities for these people to take part in their own betterment. In the major areas of deprivation and under-privilege—over-pricing and under-standard everything—this means civil actions, and this in turn, means lawyers. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should go into the civil law profession. On the other hand,

though, I do not think we can let this call go unheeded.

I am, therefore, today introducing a joint resolution to establish a JudiCorps. The actual language of this measure directs the Attorney General and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to study the feasibility of establishing the JudiCorps and then report back to the Congress within 90 days.

The JudiCorps would be staffed by law students, paid in fellowships, and would be under the direction of law professors and other concerned lawyers who would receive \$1 a year. Their purpose would be to work as an extension of the present legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity in bringing legal facilities, both criminal and civil, at low or no cost, right into the depressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, several law schools with the help of random foundation grants are starting their own such programs. Georgetown University Law School is an excellent example. With only graduate students participating, they had in the first 6 years of their program tried over 2,500 cases, winning the following praise from District Judge J. Skelly Wright:

(Georgetown has) probably the most systematic and thorough training in trial advocacy offered anywhere in the country.

Spurred on by Supreme Court Justice Brennan's remark that 75 percent of law school graduates are unready for practice leaving law school without having confronted "one live man or woman who is in immediate need of legal advice," other pioneers like Georgetown have proven that the law schools themselves are a great untapped source of legal wealth. The JudiCorps, which I have proposed, would tap this source.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I advocate this program because it is a low-cost means of vitally extending the critical program of legal aid to the poor. We must, foremost of all, let the poor know that they can better their lot through the law, not around it. And I advocate the JudiCorps because it would involve young, intelligent, interested, and committed individuals, as does the Peace Corps, in the plight of the poverty-stricken. This strong commitment to the principle of the JudiCorps has already been eloquently expressed, Mr. Speaker, in the words of one Georgetown law student:

I came here interested in corporate practice and good living. I've been made to feel guilty if I'm not defending an indigent.

A New Program for Attacking the Problems of Narcotics Addiction and Alcoholism

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a far-reaching program for attacking the problem of narcotics addiction and alcoholism.

We have been asked to consider amending the Community Mental Health

Centers Act to deal more effectively with these problems. Since both these sicknesses are essentially symptomatic of mental disorders, the proposed amendments placing their treatment and prevention in mental health programs seem eminently logical to me.

For one thing the range of services furnished by the Community Mental Health Centers represents the range of services needed to treat and rehabilitate addicts and alcoholics.

Second, maintaining isolated facilities for these special needs would hamper the recruitment of personnel. Flexibility in staffing the programs of these centers will help meet this particular problem.

Third, the Centers are affiliated with other local agencies, maintaining contacts that are also needed in serving those who suffer addiction and alcoholism.

I support the proposed amendments and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Redwood National Park

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the contention has been made that the proposed exchange of national forest lands for privately owned lands to be included in the proposed Redwood National Park would be advantageous to people of California living in the area adjacent to the proposed Redwood National Park. This contention has been effectively refuted by Mr. LaVerne M. Nelson, the road commissioner and county engineer of Del Norte County. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Nelson's views, I include in the Record at this point the text of his December 13, 1967, letter to the Board of Supervisors of Del Norte County, Calif., and the chart to which he alludes in this letter.

DEL NORTE COUNTY,

Crescent City, Calif., December 13, 1967.

Subject: Potential loss of Road Department Forest Receipt Funds from Redwood Purchase Unit.

HON. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
County of Del Norte,
Crescent City, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: On December 11, 1967 the U.S. Forest Service presented your Honorable Board with a Fact Sheet on the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit located within the County of Del Norte.

There has been some discussion as to whether trading the purchase unit to timber companies for loss of their forested lands to the proposed federal park would be advantageous to the people of Del Norte County.

I can only speak for the Road Department. However, the loss of over \$64,000 per year to this department (1/2 of the average annual forest service receipts shown in item 3 of the Fact Sheet) would have a very serious effect on our county road system.

We have averaged annual road improvement expenditures of \$200,000 per year over the past three years. Loss of the forest service receipts presently derived from logging in the purchase unit would result in reducing future road improvement expenditures by 32 per cent. If we would not have had these

funds in the past three years, it would have meant that the recent improvements to Washington Blvd. between Northcrest Drive and Highway 101; Lake Earl Drive southerly of Fort Dick; and Pebble Beach Drive in the Marhofer Creek area could not have been accomplished.

Our road system still contains well over an estimated \$2,000,000 worth of serious road deficiencies. As traffic increases, demands for wider, straighter, and surfaced roads adds to these deficiencies. Obviously, even if we didn't lose any of the forest service receipts and could continue to expend \$200,000 per year for improvements, it would take over 10 years to overcome our present day deficiencies.

An example of the seriousness of these deficiencies is an accident that occurred on Howland Hill Road in the late afternoon of December 9, 1967. One young man was killed and a second very seriously injured because they were walking in the roadway and ground fog obscured them from a passing motorist. This road is in our improvement program for 1967-68 but financing has delayed its improvement to date. Had there been an adequate shoulder for pedestrian use, the life of this young man would very likely not have been lost.

Any decrease in road improvement expenditures in the years ahead is certain to delay correction of major road deficiencies. This can only result in unnecessary traffic accidents causing untold loss of life and suffering to users of Del Norte's road system.

I understand the U.S. Forest Service does not anticipate raising its annual cut in the remainder of the forest to compensate for this loss of logging in the purchase unit if such should occur. This primarily because they are on a sustained yield cutting program cycled for 100-110 years.

There is an estimated 1,100,000,000 board feet of timber within the 14,500 acre purchase unit. According to the county assessor, at the present tax rate this timber would yield \$397,300 worth of revenue to the general fund if it were in private ownership. The land would yield an additional \$9,000 worth of revenue. However, it is estimated that 100,000,000 board feet of timber would be harvested each year by the new private owners and this would reduce the assessed valuation annually.

Taxes returned to the county from the purchase unit over the next 12 years if it were in private ownership would likely be similar to those shown in the enclosed chart. Notice that the average annual taxes on both land and timber would be \$203,775 over a 12 year period. It's also notable that after 12 years all timber will have been harvested and the only taxes returned to the county would be \$9,000 per year on the land. Since tax deferrals on harvested timber run for 40 years, it would be many years before a timber tax on the land would again be reaped by the county.

Of course, it could be hoped that after 12 years Miller-Rellim will have made substantial improvements to their industrial complex. This could have the effect of making up the loss in timber revenue previously obtained from the purchase unit.

The purchase unit is presently on a sustained yield annual cut of 18,000,000 board feet. At present day timber prices this should bring a minimum annual revenue to the county of \$180,000 for perpetuity. However, since no sales have been made within the purchase unit during the past two years, considerably more than 18,000,000 board feet would be sold in the next few years.

A special feature of the purchase unit is that all of the 25% receipts derived from logging within it are presently allocated to Del Norte County. Funds from logging all other national forests within Del Norte County are only allocated in part to Del Norte.

Certainly we want to protect the industry we now have—industry that means jobs and

payrolls. Certainly we also want to protect our county general fund revenues. However, I sincerely hope present road revenues will in no way be sacrificed. This, I feel, would be doing a grave injustice to citizens of our country.

It would not seem logical to support trade of the purchase unit in the federal park proposal unless the Park Bill had definite provisions within it to assure that income formerly derived from the purchase unit was not lost by either the Road Department or the School System of our county.

Respectfully submitted,

LA VERNE M. NELSON,
Road Commissioner and County Engineer.

CHART SHOWING POTENTIAL 12-YEAR TAX INCOME FROM PURCHASE UNIT

Year	Taxable timber (thousands)	Timber taxes	Land taxes	Total
1.....	1,100,000	\$397,300	\$9,000	\$406,300
2.....	1,000,000	361,000	9,000	370,000
3.....	900,000	325,000	9,000	334,000
4.....	800,000	289,000	9,000	298,000
5.....	700,000	253,000	9,000	262,000
6.....	600,000	217,000	9,000	226,000
7.....	500,000	171,000	9,000	180,000
8.....	400,000	135,000	9,000	144,000
9.....	300,000	99,000	9,000	108,000
10.....	200,000	63,000	9,000	72,000
11.....	100,000	27,000	9,000	36,000
12.....	0	0	9,000	9,000
Total.....				2,445,300

Note: Average 12-year taxes: \$2,445,300 divided by 12 equals \$203,775 per year.

Use and Abuse of Credit Reports—II

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a truly gratifying response has resulted from my recent efforts to help consumers protect themselves against erroneous, incomplete, or malicious credit reports and information.

Among the letters which I have received is one from Mr. Robert J. Klein, economics editor of the highly respected Consumer Reports, a periodical published by the nonprofit Consumer's Union.

Mr. Klein expressed interest in my proposal and enclosed an article from the May, 1967, issue of Consumer Reports on the subject of credit information.

The article, entitled "When Credit Is Flatly Refused," is a close examination of the problems that all too often beset individuals who are refused credit for no apparent reason and without explanation.

Finding out why credit has been refused often is virtually impossible under present procedures governing the operation of credit rating bureaus. As the article notes, these credit bureau practices smack of a star chamber proceeding.

The magazine makes the point well when it asserts:

Credit is not everyone's right, but it has become an indispensable privilege for most. Surely, everyone should have the right to know the evidence used against him by potential creditors—just as he has a Constitutional right to confront witnesses against him—and to have the evidence corrected if wrong or amended if incomplete.

In a few days I plan to introduce a bill to establish some right of "due process" for consumers in their dealings with credit rating agencies. Because of the widespread interest in the subject matter, I commend to my colleagues attention the Consumer Report article:

Everyone knows it's easy—too easy—to buy on credit or open a charge account. But at least a few people also know how it feels to be turned down for no apparent reason.

One reports reader and her husband recently shopped at a discount store that advertised it would open charge accounts on a half-hour's notice. After applying for an account, they filled a shopping cart with goods and returned to the credit desk, only to be told they were not eligible.

"We were astounded," she wrote, "because we have at least 10 credit cards. We have paid off large purchases and are in good standing with all of them. Although we asked for an explanation of why we were 'black-balled,' we were told no further information could be given us."

She was disturbed, and rightly so. The marketplace judges buyers partly by their credit rating. A good rating is synonymous with a good name. Rejection of a credit application without explanation implies the existence of detrimental information in some file known to the commercial world but not to the applicant. That smacks of a star chamber proceeding.

The credit seller must, of course, be the judge of the information he uses in deciding whether or not to grant credit. The applicant supplies some of the information: what he earns, where he works, references, and so on. Some stores decide on that information alone. But most rely on credit bureaus.

According to the 2200-member Associated Credit Bureaus of America, a store offering "half-hour" charge accounts may be forced to make its decisions on the basis of incomplete reports from a credit bureau. That is, the data may be out of date or misleading. "In such cases," says the ACBA, "the credit granter should order an updated report." An updated report takes far longer than 30 minutes, and even so is subject to error.

"Because credit information must be assembled through fallible human sources," the ACBA tells us, "inaccuracies occasionally occur. . . . Identities may sometimes be confused, despite all precautions." It goes on to say that a buyer can get a bad name simply from having defended his own interest. If he withholds payment on faulty merchandise until the store makes good, for example, his record may show only that he was delinquent.

Any adverse information in your dossier will be kept secret from you by the store. Credit bureaus do not allow their clients to divulge it. But according to the ACBA, stores can and should refer rejected applicants to the credit bureau itself, and most bureaus will grant face-to-face interviews with consumers. Challenged information will then be checked out, the ACBA says, and errors will be corrected. If there has been a disagreement between a customer and a store, it says, "the bureau is glad to make the subject's statement a part of the record."

But, as our reader found out, the store will not always reveal the source of an adverse report or even indicate whether it comes from a credit bureau. In that case, all you can do to erase the blot on your reputation is to track down the credit bureau yourself and have things out with it.

You may be able to identify the leading bureaus in your area by asking the Chamber of Commerce or by writing to the Associated Credit Bureaus of America (6707 Southwest Freeway, Houston, Tex. 77036). If most bureaus will be glad to go over your file with you, as the ACBA says, you may be able to erase any false or misleading information about yourself.

Ironically, slipshod credit checking, while occasionally injurious to reputable buyers, may be a sign of imprudent lending policies. Stores generally want very much to sell credit. If anything, they are much too careless about whom they sell it to, relying on high finance charges and tough collection methods rather than on thorough credit checks.

Credit is not everyone's right, but it has become an indispensable privilege for most. Surely, everyone should have the right to know the evidence used against him by potential creditors—just as he has a Constitutional right to confront witnesses against him—and to have that evidence corrected if wrong or amended if incomplete.

President Johnson's Action Now Program for the Consumer

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, rarely has a Presidential message received the editorial attention now being given to President Johnson's comprehensive and realistic consumer protection message.

That message ticked off a list of things which Government must approve to serve the consumer in the growing and technically complicated marketplace of today—from a new evaluation of auto insurance to the assurance of wholesome fish and poultry control of deceptive sales practices.

The Washington Post of February 11, said the President's consumer program "offers a useful legislative program which, if enacted by Congress, will add much to the safeguards already provided."

The Christian Science Monitor of February 8 said:

At long last the consumer . . . may be coming into his own.

The Minneapolis Star of February 8 said:

The Federal government is slowly but inevitably fashioning a protective mantle for the American consumer.

I believe the President has presented the Nation with a bill of rights for the American consumer.

He has presented a program which reflects care and concern for the citizen and for his comfort, safety, and well-being.

And he has asked Congress to join him as an ally. I stand with the President as I know all responsible Members of this House do.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD editorials from the newspapers cited which commend the President for his consumer initiatives:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 11, 1968]

ARM AROUND THE CONSUMER

President Johnson's message on protection of the consumer is a hodgepodge running all the way from new weapons against sales rackets to safety on the waterways. But it offers a useful legislative program which, if enacted by Congress, will add much to the safeguards already provided.

It is quite proper that the sales rackets, especially those in the home-improvement field, drew first attention. The President cited National Better Business Bureau estimates that consumers lose between \$500 million and \$1 billion yearly to home-improvement racketeers. To deal with this menace, the Administration would give the Federal Trade Commission new powers to stop fraudulent and deceptive practices by means of court injunctions without waiting for final FTC or court decisions. No doubt that will be a very useful weapon, but much will depend upon vigorous enforcement of local laws. We hope that the President's message will center attention on Senator Tydings's package of reforms in this sphere for the District of Columbia.

Since Congress passed a salutary meat-inspection bill last year, it should have no difficulty in extending the safeguards of that measure to fish and poultry, as the President requested. Nor can there be any serious question about giving the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare authority to study the hazards of radiation and to set and enforce standards to control those hazards. Doubtless many lives can also be saved by the boat-safety program that the Secretary of Transportation will be urging.

The President has at least earned the thanks of every consumer by taking up the common beef that appliances do not last until they are paid for. No panacea is at hand for this critical weakness in our mechanized society, but the Administration is setting a group of experts to work on the problem. One of the first tasks of the proposed Consumer Counsel in the Department of Justice may well be to determine whether legislation is needed in this area of consumer interests.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 9, 1968]

CAVEAT VENDOR

At long last the consumer—who at times has been victimized by fraud, sharp practices, carelessness and gouging—may be coming into his own.

The American economy produces magnificently any day in the week. But sometimes there is a glaring slip "twixt the cup and the lip"—between the production of goods and services and the consumer's normal enjoyment of them. Once in a while appliances get out of whack too quickly. Auto insurance is high and complex. Interest charges are concealed. Some meats, fish, and poultry have gone uninspected. New products develop unsuspected hazards. "Home improvement" sharks flourish, with no office larger than a telephone booth.

President Johnson evidently believes that the consumer is finally sufficiently alert and annoyed so that there is political advantage in championing his interests. (Or maybe the White House toaster went "pfft.") But the government does seem determined. Betty Furness, the President's decorative Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, evidently is "for real" after all.

Much will now depend on whether Congress, susceptible to the interests of those who don't want government snooping and prodding, reacts to the President's consumer message. But the President proposes an eight-point program. He has asked for a consumer counsel, to operate out of the Justice Department. And the Federal Trade Commission would be given the quick-acting remedy of court injunction against home-improvement rackets and any other fraudulent or deceptive practices.

We hope Congress will give consumer legislation full support. This protects not only the consumer but also the honest businessman, for then he can pursue his course of candor and fair dealing without having some chiseler attempt to outmaneuver him.

Nearly everything in the President's message is worthy of "Action this day": Auto in-

surance merits a comprehensive study. Pleasure boats need nationwide safety standards. Hazardous radiation from color TV sets requires investigation. Industry should co-operate in providing adequate warranties and economical repairs for automobiles and household appliances. Federal inspection should be extended to fish and poultry. Interest rates should be fully disclosed. Interstate gas pipelines should be assuredly safe.

An industrial economy cannot be a quality society if these improvements are not made. Let's get moving.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Feb. 8, 1968]

GUARDING THE CONSUMER

The Federal government is slowly but inevitably fashioning a protective mantle for the American consumer. Last year, Congress passed legislation toughening federal meat inspection controls. Soon to be passed is a truth in lending bill. Still pending in committees are bills to regulate sales commissions and management fees by mutual funds, to curb fraudulent land sales, and to set safety standards on natural gas pipelines.

Now President Johnson has asked for still more protection for the consumer. He has called for a cabinet-level survey of auto insurance industry practices, and wider powers for the Federal Trade Commission to permit it to deal more quickly with deceptive sales practices. The President also asked for legislation to improve poultry and fish inspection, establish safety standards for recreational boats and equipment, and set manufacturing standards to control hazardous radiation from color television sets. In addition, the administration will seek industry's cooperation in providing adequate warranties and repairs on automobiles and appliances.

The consumer, who now has become as "holy" a figure for Congress as the veteran, is not likely to object to these programs and proposed legislation. There will be objections from some states, which see a further erosion of their powers, and from industries which feel they are being "Nader-ized."

But there is political mileage to be gained in safeguarding the health and pocketbook of the consumer, and few congressmen are going to forego this benefit. They should remember, however, that at some stage, the protective mantle they are weaving could become a straitjacket, restricting the consumer's freedom of choice.

Impressions of a Student on the Travel Tax

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, since the first mention was made by the administration of proposals for restrictive taxing of foreign travel, arguments have been developing on all fronts in opposition to almost every aspect of the tax plan.

My first reservation to the travel tax program stems from its limitation on the traditional freedom of movement that I hold to be basic to the values of any free people. The understanding, tolerance, and vast scope of educational experiences gained through international travel are self-evident and priceless benefits to our aspirations of individual self-development, mutual understanding, and international cooperation.

I feel that this aspect of the proposed travel restrictions deserves intensive con-

sideration—perhaps more consideration than any other single practical or economic argument for or against the program. Although such a tax might well prove to be technically constitutional, the people of this Nation and their representatives in Congress will not accept a severely restrictive tax on foreign travel as a legitimate means of righting an economic wrong if, at the same time, it brings forth a complex array of objections and reactions that stem from sources much deeper than economics—sources within our traditional framework of freedom of movement and the spirit of international brotherhood.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I bring the following article to the attention of my colleagues and other officials involved in the consideration of the proposed travel tax program. This thoughtful statement was submitted to me by Joseph G. Mason, a student at the University of Michigan Law School. His comments offer an interesting legal view toward the program. The questions raised in his analysis must be answered in the weeks ahead.

THE IMPRESSIONS OF A STUDENT SUMMARY OF POINTS

American national interests can be more adequately protected by means which, when compared with the proposed travel tax, are more suitably respectful to the constitutional liberties of United States citizens.

1. The right to travel abroad is an important aspect of the citizen's liberty guaranteed in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

2. Any travel tax, such as presented by the administration, severely handicaps and runs counter to intrinsic objectives of higher education.

3. The political impact of a travel tax would be to encourage the retardation of American thinking, back into unrealistic isolationism.

1. The right to travel abroad is an important aspect of the citizen's "liberty" guaranteed in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

All United States citizens have the right to move from state to state as a fundamental privilege under the Constitution, according to *Crandall v. Nevada*, 6 Wallace 35, 18 L.Ed. 745 (1868). This case stated the doctrine which shortly thereafter became the Fourteenth Amendment. The factual situation has interesting analogies to restriction of international travel. The court held that a state cannot levy a tax upon persons residing in the state who may wish to get out of it, and upon persons not residing in it who may have occasion to pass through it.

In *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 78 S. Ct. 1113, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1204 (1958), the right to travel abroad was recognized as a fundamental right of all citizens under the Fifth Amendment. The language of the case is particularly clear:

"Freedom of movement across frontiers in either direction, and inside frontiers as well, was a part of our heritage. Travel abroad, like travel within the country . . . may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic in our scheme of values." (at pp 125, 1118, 1210)

The court regarded the Constitutional right to travel as being well established and closely related to rights of free speech and association.

Recognizing the importance of each citizen's right to travel, President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress in 1958 which said:

"Any limitations on the right to travel can only be tolerated in terms of overriding re-

quirements of our national security, and must be subject to substantive and procedural guaranties." (Message from the President—Issuance of Passports, H. Doc. No. 417, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 10, p. 13046.)

Here it can be seen that the right to travel is not absolute, but there is the suggestion that the degree of restraint on travel must be weighed against the dangers to national security. Congress, then, cannot exercise its legislative powers under reasons of "national security" without due regard to the right to travel which may be affected.

The sweep of Congressional power over matters of "national security" was dealt with in *Aptheker v. Secretary of State*, 378 U.S. 500, 84 S. Ct. 1659, 12 L. Ed. 2d 992 (1964). This case held Section 6 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 unconstitutional for sweeping too broadly across the Fifth Amendment protections in its attempt to restrict passport privileges of members of Communist organizations. The right to travel is central to the discussion, and one is left with the question of whether there should be any restriction of that right when matters of "national security" are absent or only distantly related. The concurring opinion of Justice Douglas is notable on the latter point:

"Freedom of movement is kin to the right of assembly and to the right of association. Absent war, I see no way to keep a citizen from traveling within or without the country . . . unless he has been convicted of a crime or unless there is probable cause for issuing a warrant of arrest." (at 378 U.S. p. 520, S. Ct. p. 1671)

The proposed travel tax clearly restricts every citizen's Constitutional right of movement. Granted, the basic purpose of the plan is not to prevent travel to Europe, but to reduce as much as possible the amount they spend when they get there. But, is not the effect of a travel tax on many people the same as a prohibition?

2. Any travel tax, such as presented by the administration, severely handicaps and runs counter to intrinsic objectives of higher education.

In a country that places such emphasis upon the educational process. European travel contributes invaluable understanding in respect to our cultural heritage. The President's proposed travel tax will cause immediate reductions in student travel abroad. University of Michigan President, Robben Fleming, has sent a telegram to the President, urging student exemptions from the travel tax. Otherwise, he fears, education abroad will seriously suffer. Most educators agree.

The President repeatedly vows his support of open and better higher education for everyone. Just recently, he has proposed an increase in the financial aid available to students. Travel and education go hand in hand. Education in the Great Society can be complete only if it includes the enlightenment which results from association with peoples of all countries. Any educational policy which includes a travel tax, disallowing exemptions for students, is patently inconsistent with itself.

3. The political impact of a travel tax would be to encourage the retardation of American thinking, back into unrealistic isolationism.

A healthy world economy is in the United States' best interests. Such an objective is critically hampered by a travel tax policy which restricts the exchange of people and ideas. Serious consideration should be given the National Association of Travel Organizations' suggestion to "compete, not retreat" on the market for foreign visitors. It line with that alternative is the proposal by Senator Jacob K. Javits to adopt national travel policies which improve domestic travel for foreign visitors. A travel tax is not the only answer to the "balance of tourism payments."

History has shown the pitfalls of American attitudes which assume that isolation from the world community is possible. Now, more than ever, Congress should search for indirect means to achieve the same ends. And not the least of these avenues might lead through the tightening of military spending, since the greatest single budgetary expenditure is for "defense." To oversimplify a bit, who wants to see the day when an American can afford a visit to foreign countries only by enlistment in the U.S. Navy?

A Lawyer's View on Firearms Control

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the October 1967 issue of the Michigan State Bar Journal carries a well-reasoned and scholarly article entitled, "The Second Amendment and the Right To Keep and Bear Arms." The author is Nicholas V. Olds, assistant attorney general of the State of Michigan and a leading figure in the Michigan Bar. In recent years he has contributed much time and energy to the establishment and chairmanship of the State Bar Committee on Conservation Law. For the past 20 years he has served on the staff of the attorney general of the State of Michigan, assigned to handling legal work for the conservation department.

So that my colleagues will have the benefit of the views of a seasoned and respected lawyer and public servant on the question of firearms control, I am inserting the text of his article at this point in the RECORD:

THE SECOND AMENDMENT AND THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

(By Nicholas V. Olds)

"A well-regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." *United States Constitution, Amendment II.* (Emphasis supplied)

Recent events and circumstances have brought into sharp focus the question of whether the private citizen of our day still has the constitutional right to keep and bear arms for purposes not connected with the maintenance of a militia.

Reasons given for the curtailment of this right are the alarming frequency of crimes committed with deadly weapons, the assassination of President Kennedy by means of a rifle obtained from a Chicago mail-order house, and the development of nuclear weapons which have virtually outmoded conventional warfare.

THE MILITIA, A BODY OF PRIVATE CITIZENS

Historically, our constitutional right to keep and bear arms had its origin in the militia organizations which came into being prior to the American Revolution. Colonial militia groups were first formed because of the need for united action in wars with the French and Indians; however, these militia groups were composed of private citizens who kept firearms for hunting of wild animals for food and pelts, killing of animals which depredated crops, and instant defense against marauding Indians.

Each colony had its own militia organization, composed of every able-bodied man from 16 to 60. Each member was required to appear for training at his town seat for a specified number of days in a year. In emergencies, the militia commander upon direc-

tion of the colonial government called out his men, usually through a process of volunteering, but by drafting if necessary. During the French and Indian wars, the colonial militia forces joined with British regulars in about equal proportion.

The militia was well recognized at that time as an ancient British institution; but since Britain's wars after 1660 were fought largely on sea or in foreign lands by the professional soldier and seaman, the need for a militia in that country had become obsolete. However, in the American settlements the need for a citizen soldiery reasserted itself. Although the use of militia had disappeared in England, the right of private citizens to arm themselves was still acknowledged and colonial militia groups were utilized to great advantage by Britain in her wars with France. "A military organization normally reflects the society from which it springs," and this was true of the American colonial militia prior to the Revolutionary War.

NO STANDING ARMIES

As the colonies maintained no standing armies, the militia was their only defense against foreign or domestic enemies. The only regular troops were those sent out from England under the direct command of royal rather than colonial officers. The colonists objected strongly to the presence of these troops in time of peace, and one of the grievances recited in the Declaration of Independence was that the King had kept standing armies among them in times of peace without the consent of their legislatures.

When General Gage dispatched an expedition of British regulars on the night of April 18, 1775 to seize and destroy certain military stores at Concord, the colonists felt that this arbitrary attempt to disarm the citizenry violated their basic rights as British subjects. All Americans are familiar with the immortal story of the "embattled farmers" who resolutely mobilized to defend what they considered to be a righteous cause.

Following the battles of Lexington and Concord, General Gage confined the inhabitants of Boston strictly within the limits of the town, which had been occupied as an armed garrison. To procure their release, the people entered into a treaty stipulating that if they deposited their arms with their own magistrates, they would have freedom to depart with their personal effects. They delivered up their arms as agreed; and thereupon General Gage ordered that the arms be seized by his soldiery and most of the citizens detained. Their indignation at this outrage is eloquently expressed in the "Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms" drafted by representatives of the United Colonies in Philadelphia on July 6, 1775:

"They accordingly delivered up their arms, but in open violation of honour, in defiance of the obligation of treaties, which even savage nations esteem sacred, the governor ordered the arms deposited as aforesaid, that they might be preserved for their owners, to be seized by a body of soldiers; detained the greatest part of the inhabitants in the town, and compelled the few who were permitted to retire, to leave their most valuable effects behind."

ENGLISH ORIGINS OF CITIZENS' RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

In considering the natural assumption of the inhabitants of Boston that they possessed the right under English law to keep and bear arms as private citizens, as well as a unit of a militia organization, it is interesting to trace its historical origins. The right to keep and bear arms had evolved as a natural, basic right of citizens throughout the long development of the common law. However, it developed gradually, over a period of centuries, and had to be wrested from

Footnotes at end of article.

despotic monarchs who felt that an armed citizenry threatened the unlimited exercise of their despotism.

In 1328 the Statute of Northampton, 2 Edw. III, ch. 3, declared that no man should " * * go nor ride armed by night or by day in fairs, markets, nor in the presence of the justices or other minister, nor in part elsewhere * * *."

Such conduct was probably regarded as tending to terrify peaceful people and to provoke breaches of the peace, and was indictable under the common law.

The statute of 22 Car. II, ch. 25, sec. 3 (1682), provided that " * * no person who had no lands of the yearly value of 100 pounds, other than the son and heir of an esquire or other person of higher degree, should be allowed even to keep a gun."

Read in connection with the earlier statute of Edward III, this statute indicates that a right to keep and bear arms was not then regarded as a fundamental right of every Englishman.

PRIVATE ARMIES

However, from very early times land owners according to their degree and estate were required to have in readiness specified arms and equipment and men-at-arms at their own expense for military service when required by the government. These land owners, with their armed tenants and retainers, constituted the militia of the kingdom. At the time of the restoration of the monarchy in the person of Charles II, no other armed force was recognized as lawful.

However, King Charles II, having observed during his exile in France the autocratic power of a king possessing a standing army independent of the people, began to organize a body of soldiers armed, equipped, and paid out of the royal revenues as guards of his court and person.

His successor, James II, increased this nucleus into a regular army for general military service, greatly to the resentment of his subjects, Whig and Tory alike. Following the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion, James deprived many of his protestant subjects of militia status on the excuse that it was necessary for preservation of the peace and security of the government.

In the Declaration of Rights proclaimed by the Convention Parliament after the flight of James, these acts were condemned as an "endeavor to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of this kingdom" and "contrary to law." The subsequent statutory Bill of Rights based on that declaration held " * * that the raising or keeping of a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace unless it be with the consent of parliament is against the law."

It was also enacted " * * that the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defense suitable to their condition, and as allowed by law."

This assertion of the protestant subjects' right to have arms was to preserve the laws and liberties of the kingdom, not to enable their violation.

During their long controversies with the king and parliament, the American colonists had become familiar with English political history and the various charters of English liberties, including the Bill of Rights of the reign of William and Mary. In this last, the provisions relating to standing armies and the right of subjects to have arms for their defense were closely related. This right and a reliance on a citizen soldiery or militia were coupled together in colonial thought and experience.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES

About 35 states have constitutional guarantees, each varying somewhat in scope and interpretation. In the Massachusetts Bill of Rights the language is:

"The people have a right to keep and

bear arms for the common defense, and as in times of peace armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without consent of the legislature."

In that of Connecticut: "Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state."

In that of Pennsylvania: "The right of the citizens to bear arms in defense of themselves and the state shall not be questioned."

In that of South Carolina: "The people have a right to keep and bear arms for the common defense."

In that of Virginia: "A well-regulated militia composed of the body of the people is the proper, natural, and safe defense of a free state."

In some states the language is condensed into: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The language in Michigan is somewhat similar: "Every person has a right to keep and bear arms for the defense of himself and the state."

SOME CASES

In *Bliss v. Commonwealth*, 2 Litt. 90, 13 Am. Dec. 251, the Supreme Court of Kentucky decided that any restraint on the right of citizens to "bear arms in defense of themselves and the State" was unconstitutional, and this right was violated by an act to prevent carrying concealed weapons such as a pocket pistol, dirk, large knife or sword in a cane. However, a later constitutional provision gave the general assembly the right to prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons. All other states deciding this issue have held that a statute prohibiting the carrying or wearing of concealed weapons does not violate the constitutional provisions guaranteeing to citizens the right to keep and bear arms in defense of themselves and the state. For example, it is stated in *Carroll v. State*, 28 Ark. 99:

"The constitutional right to bear arms in defense of person and property does not prohibit the legislature from making police regulations for the good of society as to the manner in which such arms shall be borne." A similar decision was rendered in *Strickland v. Georgia*, 72 S.E. 260.

In *Salina v. Blaksley*, 72 Kan. 230, the Supreme Court of Kansas went further, holding that the state constitutional provision that "the people have the right to bear arms for their defense and security" limits legislative power to enact laws prohibiting the bearing of arms in the militia, but does not limit legislative power to enact laws prohibiting the promiscuous carrying of deadly weapons.

Besides prohibiting individuals from using certain weapons, there are also restrictions as to use of legal weapons on specified days. This restriction was held constitutional in *Walter v. State*, 35 Ohio C.C. 567, where it was decided that a game law² prohibiting hunting on Sunday does not unconstitutionally deprive one of the right to bear arms and protect property, but is a valid exercise of the police power.

Certain weapons such as those not usual or suitable for use in organized warfare (dirks, bowie knives, sling shots, brass knuckles, etc.) have been prohibited from use as not negating the constitutional guarantee of a right to bear arms. An example of such prohibition is a Michigan statute, 3 Comp. Laws 1929, Sec. 16751. The statute applies to all persons except peace officers, certain manufacturers, military and licensed persons, and contains no limitations as to place, time, purpose or use. It prohibits the possession of the enumerated weapons by anyone other than an excepted person in private as well as in public, in the home or elsewhere, for whatever purpose and contemplated use.³

In *People v. Persce*, 204 N.Y. 397, 97 N.E. 877, it was held that the legislature may prohibit the possession of " * * instruments (a slingshot) which are ordinarily

used for criminal and improper purposes and which are not amongst those ordinary legitimate weapons of defense and protection which are contemplated by the Constitution and the bill of rights."

And in *State v. Duke*, 42 Tex. 455, the court said:

"The arms which every person is secured the right to keep and bear (in the defense of himself or the State, subject to legislative regulation), must be such arms as are commonly kept, according to the customs of the people, and are appropriate for open and manly use in self-defense, as well as such as are proper for the defense of the State."

It was held in *People v. Brown*, 253 Mich. 537, that

"The list of weapons in section 16751, supra, is significant and demonstrates a definite intention of the legislature to protect society from a recognized menace. It does not include ordinary guns, swords, revolvers, or other weapons usually relied upon by good citizens for defense or pleasure. It is a partial inventory of the arsenal of the 'public enemy,' the 'gangster.' It describes some of the particular weapons with which he wars on the State and reddens his murderous trail . . . The statute does not infringe upon the legitimate right of personal or public defense but is within the reasonable and constitutional exercise of the police power of the State to curb crime."

In addition to constitutional restrictions on various types of weapons, certain classes such as women, young boys, the blind, tramps, and persons *non compos mentis* or dissolute in habits have been prohibited by statutes from carrying weapons.

In some statutes all persons have been prohibited from carrying concealed weapons. It has been held that military arms may not be carried in all places even by persons competent to serve in the militia; they may be excluded from courts of justice, polling places, school houses, churches, religious and political meetings, legislative halls and the like, and the carrying of military arms in street parades and other public demonstrations may be forbidden.⁴ In *Presser v. Illinois*, supra, speaking of an Illinois statute, the court said:

"We think it clear that the sections under consideration, which only forbid bodies of men to associate together as military organizations or to drill or parade with arms in cities and towns unless authorized by law, do not infringe the right of the people to keep and bear arms."

ASPECTS OF THE RIGHT WHICH CANNOT BE PROHIBITED

There are certain aspects of the right which cannot be prohibited. Legislatures cannot forbid the simple possessing or keeping of weapons even though they can restrict carrying weapons by individuals. Also, the guarantee is applicable to aliens as well as citizens. *People v. Zerillo*, 219 Mich. 635, held that while the legislature may regulate the carrying and use of firearms, it may not prohibit a person, alien or citizen from possessing a revolver for the defense of himself and his property.⁵

"The true meaning of this provision is well stated in the constitution of the State of Colorado (Art. 2, Sec. 13):

"That the right of no person to keep and bear arms in defense of his home, person or property or in aid of the civil power when thereto legally summoned, shall be called in question; but nothing herein contained shall be construed to justify the practice of carrying concealed weapons."

However, later the Michigan Supreme Court stated in *People v. Brown*, supra, that although the provision is a limitation upon the power of the legislature to enact any law to the contrary, the legislature does possess, under the police power, the right reasonably to regulate the carrying of weapons:

"The authorities cannot be reconciled ex-

Footnotes at end of article.

cept in basis of the proposition that, regardless of the basis of the right to bear arms, the State, nevertheless, has the police power to reasonably regulate it. The police power is, of course, subject to the limitation that its exercise be reasonable and it cannot constitutionally result in the prohibition of the possession of those arms which, by the common opinion and usage of law-abiding people, are proper and legitimate to be kept upon private premises for the protection of person and property."

The police power of the states to regulate the bearing of arms for the maintaining of public safety and peace is not confined merely to the establishment of conditions under which all sorts of weapons may be privately possessed, but it also takes into account the character and ordinary use of weapons and interdicts those commonly employed to violate the law. The exercise of this power must, of course, be reasonable, and cannot constitutionally result in the prohibition of those arms which, by the common opinion and usage of law-abiding people, are proper and legitimate. The right is not subject to virtual destruction or confiscation through the medium of extreme legislative proposals.

The courts should carefully scrutinize the constitutionality of laws which require a license to have a firearm (not a concealed or gangster-type weapon), or which make the right to have a gun depend upon the whim of some public officer, or which require registration of firearms or impose a discriminatory tax on them, or which totally prohibit their possession.

SECOND AMENDMENT APPLY?

When the first ten amendments to the constitution were being drafted, the people doubtless had well in mind the events which preceded the battles of Lexington and Concord. In view of the close historical connection between the weapons used by the militia and those kept by private citizens, the framers of the Second Amendment must have considered that every citizen should have the absolute right to keep and bear arms, not only to defend his country, but also to defend his person and possessions and for other lawful private reasons.

The right to bear arms is not granted by the constitution; neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The second amendment means no more than that it shall not be infringed by Congress and has no effect other than to restrict the powers of the national government,⁸ and, hopefully, the powers of the states. In 11 Am. Jur., Constitutional Law, Section 7, page 607, it is said:

"It has been aptly said that written Constitutions sanctify and confirm great principles, but do not bring them into existence, and that a Constitution is not the cause, but a consequence, of personal and political freedom."

To what extent is the federal right to keep and bear arms applicable to the states?

A text-writer, following the views of some state courts in very early decisions, says that the second amendment of the U.S. Constitution "seems to be of a nature to bind both the state and national legislatures, and doubtless it does."

But the U.S. Supreme Court has twice expressly decided that this second amendment to the Constitution of the United States is a limitation only upon the power of congress and the national government, and not upon that of the states.⁹

Until recent years, a number of decisions before and after the *Presser* case held that the first ten amendments did not restrict the states, but were a restraint only upon congress. The court states in *Ex parte Spies*, 123 U.S. 131:

"The first ten articles of amendment were not intended to limit the powers of the state

government in respect to their own people, but to operate on the national government alone; this was decided more than a half century ago, and that decision has been steadily adhered to since."

However, the Supreme Court is gradually inclining to hold that all provisions of the Bill of Rights have been incorporated into the constitution, as applied to the states, by enactment of the 14th amendment.

In 1962, William J. Brennan, Jr., associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, lectured at the New York University School of Law on the subject "The Bill of Rights and the States." As to natural or basic rights he says:

"The constitutions of the original states anticipated the national Constitution in declaring the doctrine that there are human liberties which are inalienable. This doctrine has ever since been the center and core of the American idea of limited government. The government of each state was the creation of the people of the state; the source of power was the people of that state. The only end and aim of government was to secure the people in their natural and civil rights."

Justice Brennan traces the history of cases which mark the steady progress of the court toward applying the provisions of the Bill of Rights to the states. He cites as an example the case of *Adamson v. California*, 332 U.S. 46, where an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court by Admiral Dewey Adamson while California was waiting to execute him for murder. The appellant contended violation of certain rights accorded him by the Bill of Rights and claimed protection of these rights through the vehicle of the Fourteenth amendment, Sec. 1:

"No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any citizen of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Nevertheless, the majority of the court still clung to the doctrine of the old decisions, holding that the Bill of Rights was not applicable to the states by the fourteenth amendment. Justice Black, however, wrote a notable dissent, contending that the fourteenth amendment was meant by its framers to make the Bill of Rights (first ten amendments) binding upon the states.

Justice Brennan indicates in his article that, although the Supreme Court has not accepted the incorporation of the Bill of Rights as a whole, it has proceeded piecemeal to hold that certain of the ten amendments restrict the states. He points out that the Supreme Court has extended the protection of the fourteenth amendment as to freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly and petition under the first; as against searches and seizures under the fourth; as to just compensation in eminent domain proceedings and rights granted to accused with respect to confessions under the fifth; and as to furnishing of counsel to an accused in criminal cases under the sixth.

But what about the right to bear arms, is it too a natural, basic right? A quote from Justice Brennan's lecture supports an affirmative answer:

"The Bill of Rights is the primary source of expressed information as to what is meant by constitutional liberty. The safeguards enshrined in it are deeply etched in the foundations of America's freedoms."

This statement strengthens the assertion that the second amendment expresses a basic right. Our founding fathers thought the right to bear arms so important that it was incorporated in the Bill of Rights directly after the first amendment protecting freedom of speech and religion.

Norman Redlich, professor of law at New York University School of Law, in an article concerning this same subject, the Bill of Rights,¹⁰ also reviews decisions of the

Supreme Court which extend many of these restrictions to the states. In addition to those mentioned, he includes the eighth amendment. He predicts the future in these words:

"As already indicated, however, most of the major provisions of the Bill of Rights have either been incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment, or are likely to be in the near future."

If the United States Supreme Court were confronted today with the specific issue of the right to bear arms contained in the second amendment, there is a reasonable probability that it would extend the restrictions of this amendment to all of the states.

DOES THE SECOND AMENDMENT APPLY TO THE INDIVIDUAL?

Does the federal guarantee of the right to keep and bear arms apply only to the organized militia and not to the individual? Blackstone regarded the right to keep and bear arms as being equally important to citizens as the primary rights of personal security, personal liberty and of private property, in that it was sometimes necessary to vindicate those rights when violated by a tyrannical government. He expressed this principle in Chapter I, "Of the Rights of Persons," under the subheading "Of the Absolute Rights of Individuals:"

"The fifth and last auxiliary right of the subject, * * * is that of having arms for their defense, suitable to their condition and degree, and such as are allowed by law. Which is also declared by the same statute, and it is indeed a public allowance, under due restrictions, of the natural right of resistance and self-preservation, when the sanctions of society and laws are found insufficient to restrain the violence of oppression."

Section 200 is a summary of the chapter: "In these several articles consist the rights, or, as they are frequently termed, the liberties of Englishmen: liberties, more generally talked of than thoroughly understood; and yet highly necessary to be perfectly known and considered by every man of rank or property, lest his ignorance of the points whereon they are founded should hurry him into faction and licentiousness on the one hand, or a pusillanimous indifference and criminal submission on the other. And we have seen that these rights consist, primarily, in the free employment of personal security, of personal liberty, and of private property. So long as these remain inviolate, the subject is perfectly free; for every species of compulsive tyranny and oppression must act in opposition to one or other of these rights, having no other object upon which it can possibly be employed. To preserve these from violation, it is necessary that the constitution of parliament be supported in its full vigor; and limits, certainly known, be set to the royal prerogative. And, lastly, to vindicate these rights when actually attacked or violated, the subjects of England are entitled, in the first place, to the regular administration and free course of justice in the courts of law; next, to the right of petitioning the king and parliament for redress of grievances; and lastly, to the right of having and using arms for self-preservation and defense."

Thus, Blackstone believed that the right to have and bear arms was considered a basic right under the old English common law.

In *United States v. Miller*, 33 L. Ed. 1206 (1939), the United States Supreme Court considered and recognized the origin and *raison d'être* of the militia. Although the court held that the defendant in this case had violated the national firearms act by possession of a sawed-off shotgun capable of concealment, it reviewed the basic constitutional principles involved by stating (p. 1209):

"The Constitution as originally adopted granted to the Congress power 'To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union', etc., . . .

"With obvious purpose to assure the con-

tinuation and render possible the effectiveness of such forces the declaration and guarantee of the Second Amendment were made. It must be interpreted and applied with that end in view.

"The Militia which the States were expected to maintain and train is set in contrast with Troops which they were forbidden to keep without the consent of Congress. The sentiment of the time strongly disfavored standing armies; the common view was that adequate defense of country and laws could be secured through the Militia—civilians primarily, soldiers on occasions.

"The significance attributed to the term Militia appears from the debates in the Convention, the history and legislation of Colonies and States, and the writings of approved commentators. These show plainly enough that the Militia comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense. 'A body of citizens enrolled for military discipline.' And further that ordinarily when called for service these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time." (Emphasis supplied)

It is interest that the report of this case shows that no person appeared before the court on behalf of the defendants (appellees); and the case was decided entirely on arguments made by the United States.

SECOND AMENDMENT

Although the second amendment refers to a "well-regulated Militia" by way of preamble, nevertheless the imperative language of the amendment states, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." (Emphasis supplied)

As previously argued, the trend of the Supreme Court is toward application of the first ten amendments to the states by virtue of the fourteenth amendment. However, the positive command of the second amendment that the "people" shall not be deprived of their right to keep and bear arms, reinforces the argument that the fourteenth amendment not only imposes the commands of the first ten upon the states as sovereign governments but also accords the protective mantle of the second to the people residing in the states.

Inasmuch as the term "militia" in its historical context means every able-bodied adult male citizen, the command of the second amendment would seem to afford to individuals the constitutional right (although somewhat qualified) to keep and bear arms.¹¹

There are several compelling reasons why the people as individuals should have the right to keep and bear arms.

If the body of law-abiding citizens is legally disarmed, it follows that they are thereby deprived of the means of defense against a lawless minority which is always able by some means to supply itself with lethal instruments.

If anything, the disarming of the populace would encourage the criminal in his activities, knowing that he would be dealing with an unarmed and defenseless citizenry.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

This phase of the problem was thoroughly reviewed in a pamphlet entitled "Pistol Regulation, Its Principles and History," by Karl T. Frederick, published by the National Rifle Association, Washington, D.C., 1964. This publication relates the results of the New York Sullivan Act, one of the most restrictive gun laws in the nation. This report shows that in 1963 there was an 8.1 percent rise in homicides compared to the previous year; and that out of 549 homicides committed during 1963, guns were used in 138 cases; knives, sharp instruments and physical force in the remaining 411. On page 25 it states:

"The folly of the law lies in the fact that to a great extent it disarms the decent and law-abiding citizen through its requirement

of a license to purchase or possess a pistol. We must not be understood as asserting that the purchase of pistols should not be surrounded with safeguards. A license to purchase, however, places upon the citizen a burden of hardship which is an effective bar to his procuring the weapon for legitimate purposes in the case of all but the most determined person. This is proved by the fact that during the first year of the Sullivan law the purchase of pistols by legitimate buyers in New York fell off by approximately 94 percent. That such a result was not desirable is shown by the steady increase in homicides and other crimes of violence and the rapid rise in robbery-insurance rates since that time."

Also, even in this modern day, it would be an extreme injustice to farmers to remove from them the means of eliminating wild animals which still prey upon their crops and livestock. This situation was picturesquely illustrated by the Michigan Supreme Court in *People v. Zerillo*, 219 Mich. 635, 639-640:

"Must an alien owner of a farm sit with folded arms and watch henhawks steal his chickens? No, the act permits him to kill noxious birds and animals, when necessary, in defense of his person or property. But what is he going to use for that purpose? Until the occasion arises, if this statute is given the construction contended for by the people, it is a crime for him to possess a firearm, and he, therefore, cannot be prepared to exercise the leave granted without committing a crime. Woodchucks could burrow in his yard and meadows with impunity, owls rob his hen roost, rats run about his feet at chore time, and in some sections of the State, wolves could sit on his very door step, and howl defiance. Even the predatory skunk, in the open season, would be more offensively armed than the unnaturalized farmer faring forth to drive it away. Must such a farmer whistle off the dog discovered in the act of killing his sheep? Another statute gives him the right to kill such a dog discovered in the act. Must he request the burglar to come unarmed because he has been unarmed by the law? This act, if construed as contended for by the people, is so sharp shod as to calk itself."

As a further cogent reason for justification of the right of the individual to keep and bear arms, modern history itself illustrates the urgent need for a citizenry equipped to defend itself in a national crisis. Prior to World War II England had enforced such restrictive laws on the possession of ordinary weapons that the populace found itself disarmed and defenseless in the face of imminent invasion by Hitler's hordes in 1940. During this crisis the *American Rifleman* published the following appeal from the American Committee for Defense of British Homes:

"Send a Gun to Defend a British Home. British civilians faced with threat of invasions, desperately need arms for the defense of their homes. The American Committee for Defense of British Homes has organized to collect gifts of pistols—rifles—revolvers—shotguns—binoculars from American civilians who wish to answer the call and aid in defense of British homes."

Winston Churchill dramatically emphasized the likelihood of such action in two famous speeches in 1940: "... we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

"We shall defend every village, every town and every city. The vast mass of London itself, fought street by street, could easily devour an entire hostile army; and we would rather see London laid in ruins and ashes than that it should be tamely and abjectly enslaved."

Even though the all-inclusive destructiveness of nuclear weapons would seem to elim-

inate the need for the armed citizen, it is still an axiom of warfare that the overwhelming of a country's military force, is always followed by the imposition of occupation troops upon the citizenry. It is not within the American tradition and spirit to submit meekly to any such invasion. No matter how desperate our situation at the time, in the event of an enemy occupation Americans would continue to resist individually and collectively, with any weapons at hand.

The very frightfulness of nuclear armament has so far precluded its common use and modern warfare is still confined to local areas and conventional weapons, as in Korea, Israel and Vietnam. The Cubans are a prime example of a people under the heel of a dictator who, if they were supplied with ordinary armaments, would have at least a chance to effect their liberation.

In considering any hasty proposals for disarming our populace, contemporary history should supply valuable and hard-learned lessons.

PROPOSALS TO RESTRICT

The assassination of President Kennedy brought on a flurry of congressional proposals for restrictions on the purchase and transportation of all species of weapons in interstate commerce. The main bill then pending was the Dodd Bill, S. 975, introduced by Senator Dodd of Connecticut. The provisions of this bill as introduced were generally considered reasonable; but immediately following the assassination, Senator Dodd proposed amendments of a more severely restrictive nature.

Many of these extreme proposals resulted from the fact that the President was shot by means of a rifle with a telescopic sight, purchased from a Chicago mail-order house.

Fortunately, as the congressional hearings continued, cooler minds began to prevail. Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, stated on August 10, 1964, that "calm judgment" and "refusal to act precipitously on anti-firearms legislation" were needed. As a consequence, none of this proposed legislation has yet been reported out of the committee.

In combatting such proposals we are fighting not against reason but against emotion. The nature of a democratic government is such that it may be temporarily dominated by crises which inflame the popular mind, and it is erroneously thought at the moment that all the ills can be cured by restrictive legislation. But it would be utterly ridiculous and foolhardy to believe that a man bent upon assassinating the President could be effectively deterred by any statute regulating or prohibiting the purchase and possession of lethal weapons.

NEED FOR GROUP ACTION

In a statement on the Bill of Rights in January, 1963¹² Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court spoke the following realistic words:

"We have a Bill of Rights designed to keep government out of private domains. But the fences have been broken down; and machinery to restore them has been denied. The Bill of Rights—with the judicial gloss it has acquired—plainly is not adequate to protect the individual against the growing bureaucracy. He faces a formidable opponent in government, even when he is endowed with funds and with courage. The individual is almost certain to be plowed under, unless he has a well-organized active political group to speak for him." (Emphasis supplied)

Some such groups have already spoken emphatically and effectively on the issue concerning the right of individual citizens to bear arms.

The American Rifle Association, through its officers and president, appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee and made its presentations against the proposals.

The Board of Commissioners of the State

Footnotes at end of article.

Bar of Michigan on February 28, 1964 adopted a resolution opposing the restrictive amendments to S. 1975.¹⁵ This resolution pointed out that Michigan, being a leader in the sale of hunting licenses, might lose considerably because such restrictions would tend to discourage persons desiring to engage in this extensive and salutary form of recreation. The resolution further indicated that: "It is the view of the State Bar of Michigan that any law restricting rights granted under the Second Amendment is not a function of Congress but that any necessary regulation should be made by State statute under the police power which rests in the States and not in the Federal government."

In September, 1964 the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners at its annual meeting passed a resolution stating in part:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved * * * that legislative proposals at all levels which require a license or permit to purchase or possess a firearm ordinarily used in outdoor recreation by hunting or shooting, or which leave the right to possess such a firearm dependent upon the whim or will of a public officer, or which require the registration of such a firearm, or which impose a confiscatory tax or unreasonable regulation on such firearms, or which totally prohibit the possession of such firearms—all such proposals should be vigorously opposed and rejected."

PROBABLE VIEW OF SUPREME COURT

Had these highly restrictive bills been passed, in effect disarming the entire citizenry of the United States, what would be the view of the United States Supreme Court when confronted by this issue?

In his 1963 statement on the Bill of Rights¹⁶ Justice Douglas remarked:

"Fear of assassination often produces restraints compatible with dictatorship, not democracy."

Great constitutional questions are not decided by the Supreme Court in a vacuum. That august body scrupulously considers all factors, circumstances and conditions, past, present and future, which bear upon the meaning of the issue and its effect upon our necessities and culture. It is therefore logical to assume that in deciding the question here at hand the Supreme Court would give proper weight to all facets of the problem, in an atmosphere apart from the temporary hysteria which generated the drastic proposals now pending in Congress.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions which may be drawn from this body of fact and argument are:

(1) The second amendment applies not only to states, but also protects the individual citizen in his right "to keep and bear arms" for the defense of himself, his property and his country.

(2) If Congress legislates with respect to this subject under the commerce clause, it should do so in such fashion as not to infringe unreasonably on the exercise of that right by the "people."

(3) All states, those not having protective clauses in their constitutions as well as those that have, may enact reasonable regulations as to the purchase and use of firearms under the police power. This power must be aimed at the correction of a clearly identified evil; and it cannot be so extreme as to accomplish a virtual disarmament of the people.

FOOTNOTES

¹ ROTCM 145-20, American Military History 1607-1958, Headquarters, Department of the Army, July, 1959, p. 11.

² 97 Ohio Laws, 463, 470.

³ *People v. Brown*, 253 Mich. 537, 539.

⁴ *Commonwealth v. Murphy*, 166 Mass. 171, 44 N.E. 138.

⁵ Sec. 5, Art. II Michigan Constitution (1908).

⁶ *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542.

⁷ Bishop, Statutory Crimes, Sec. 792.

⁸ *Cruikshank*, op. cit., and *Presser v. Illinois*, 116 U.S. 252.

⁹ 36 N.Y.U. Law Rev., p. 761.

¹⁰ 37 N.Y.U. Law Rev., p. 787.

¹¹ Op. cit., Footnote 1, p. 18.

¹² Winston Churchill's Speech on Dunkirk. House of Commons, June 4, 1940.

¹³ Winston Churchill's Radio Broadcast, July 14, 1940.

¹⁴ 38 N.Y.U. Law Rev., p. 210.

¹⁵ This matter was again brought before the Board of Commissioners of the State Bar of Michigan on April 14, 1967 with respect to pending bills before Congress, namely H 5384 and S 1, and after discussion thereon was tabled.

¹⁶ Ibid.

Gold Cover Removal: A Threat or a Solution?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the promoted stampede to remove the gold cover from our U.S. currency appears lacking in any merit, and can only create new problems rather than provide a solution. The causation would remain untouched and a greater fiscal problem might well be the only result.

President Johnson, in his Economic Report to Congress on February 1, had this to say:

U.S. gold reserves have declined to about \$12 billion. This is still ample to cope with foreseeable demands on our gold stock. But persistent large U.S. deficits would threaten the entire international monetary system.

The question is then raised as to whether the gold cover removal is sought for U.S. needs or the world banking community under the 1944 Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

In fact, the President in his February 1 message confirms this reasoning in his comment:

I am, therefore, asking the Congress to take prompt action to free our gold reserves so that they can unequivocally fulfill their true purpose—to insure the international convertibility of the dollar into gold at \$35 per ounce.

If the "they" means the U.S. Congress, how did the true purpose of Congress become a purpose to stabilize the mistakes and misgivings of a bunch of international bankers?

Since the President in his message concedes we have sufficient reserves to cope with demands on the U.S. gold stock, why the need for any action by Congress at all?

If the international bankers need the U.S. gold kitty for their manipulations, certainly they are aware that under the Federal Reserve Act, section 11(c), they can reduce the gold reserve below the statutory 25 percent under suspensions of 30 days and extension of periods not exceeding 15 days. And the only penalty is a slight tax against the Federal Reserve of 1 percent per annum.

The purpose for the bill then appears but an attempt to bamboozle through Congress a bill not needed or necessary except to free the Federal Reserve from any 1 percent penalty tax because of

their action in suspending the gold reserve below the established 25 percent of currency in circulation.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that the truth is lacking, but rather that a full open disclosure of all the facts are not being told. I include the Federal Reserve Act, section 11(c), and articles from the Wall Street Journal dated May 22, 1967, and January 24, 1968, following my remarks:

CHANGES IN TEXT OF EXISTING STATUTES

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the text of existing Federal statutes or parts thereof which the bill, as reported, would amend or repeal is printed below, with the proposed changes shown (a) by enclosing in black brackets material to be omitted, (b) by printing the new matter in italic type, and (c) by printing in roman type those provisions in which no change is to be made.

Federal Reserve Act

POWERS OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

SEC. 11. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall be authorized and empowered:

(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding thirty days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding fifteen days, any reserve requirements specified in this Act: *Provided*, That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this Act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further*, That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 per centum, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 per centum per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 per centum, and when said reserve falls below 20 per centum, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ per centum per annum upon each 2½ per centum or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 per centum]. [The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.]

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 22, 1967]

THE CASE AGAINST DE-EMPHASIZING GOLD

(This article is a reply to an earlier essay by John Parke Young advocating that the U.S. alter its gold policy. What Mr. Young suggested, briefly, is that the U.S. work toward the point where it would redeem foreigners' dollars for gold only at its own option. Mr. Groseclose is a partner in Groseclose, William & Associates, a Washington-based economic consulting firm.)

(By Elgin Groseclose)

That the value of the dollar is determined by the strength of the U.S. economy is an assumption yet to be proved, and to date the money managers are fearful of putting it to the proof. The proper truth is that value of the dollar depends upon the liquidity of the U.S. economy.

An analogy with business will illustrate. It is a maxim of financial management that businesses go bankrupt not from want of trade but from want of working capital. The strength of a business enterprise is its power to produce. The liquidity of a business depends upon its ability to produce and sell at a profit, that is, to generate a flow of dollars sufficient at all times to meet its dollar costs. The immediate cause of all business failures is thus not lack of business (i.e. volume), but lack of cash to meet bills presented for payment.

The recent misfortune of the Douglas air-

craft enterprise, which forced it to merge with McDonnell, did not arise from lack of customers or orders—perhaps from the opposite, from a volume of business beyond the capacity of its working capital. The Krupp interests of Germany have recently experienced the same pinch of an insufficiency of cash to support the business being done, compelling a financial reorganization.

This simplest principle of financial management is seemingly unfamiliar to exponents of a credit dollar.

ONLY GOLD IS UNIVERSAL

What cash is to a business enterprise, gold is to sovereignties. However willing foreigners may be to take dollars (and they take them today not so much because the dollar is strong but because it is the least weak among many weak currencies), when they accept dollars they receive nothing more than a due bill. Dollar due bills remain at par only because and only so long as the U.S. Treasury continues to redeem them on demand with the only cash that has universal validity, with gold.

That the dollar today is not as "good as gold," despite our enormous economic power and productivity, is plainly evidenced by the fact that foreigners have for some years been drawing down gold for dollars. Why should they prefer gold for dollars, which bear an attractive interest yield, while gold does not?

The bald fact is that today the U.S. Government is insolvent. Insolvency is the condition before bankruptcy. National bankruptcy occurs when the sovereignty ceases to pay out gold to meet obligations due, when currency convertibility is suspended. The U.S. Government has been insolvent for 34 years.

Bankruptcy was successfully avoided so long as the principal creditors were domestic. By its sovereign power and by legal fiat, the Government prevented domestic creditors from demanding redemption of their currency by the expedient of declaring the possession of monetary gold a crime.

Since the Federal fiat ends at the frontier, the Treasury continued to meet foreign claims for redemption, by gold payments at the statutory rate. Until 1949, mainly as a result of the war, foreigners were debtors on balance, and not in position to press redemption. Beginning in 1949, primarily as a result of the foreign aid program and the Administration slogan "get the dollars out," the balance turned, and with the exception of 1957, the U.S. economy has been in chronic deficit since. Since 1949, gold has been flowing out until the reserve is now down to nearly half the 1949 figure.

The diminished outflow of the past two years is not the result of rising confidence in the dollar, but of pressures put upon foreign central banks not to convert their dollar holdings. These pressures have recently been officially confirmed in Germany. Without these pressures and other expedients there can be little doubt that the Treasury would be compelled to suspend gold convertibility, that is, officially to declare bankruptcy.

Can these pressures be maintained? Can gold in fact be disestablished, and can the stability of the dollar be maintained under such disestablishment? No doubt the policy framers in Washington, confident in the political economic and military power of this country, believe it can. To date they have been able, except in the case of France, to persuade the principal central banks to refrain from further conversion of dollars.

Regrettably for their hopes, however, counter-pressures are arising that are not so easily restrained. These pressures are becoming increasingly insistent. They arise from the inchoate and unorganized demand for gold not from banks and institutions, but from a public that is free to express itself in almost every part of the world except the Communist and other totalitarian countries,

the U.S. and Great Britain. In these countries, individuals are forbidden by powerful governments to hold monetary gold.

Elsewhere governments are unable to coerce the people so easily. Last year, it appears that for the first time since the rise of the powerful network of central banks, these individual buyers took more gold than the mines could supply from new production. The difference was met from the London Gold Pool, which the U.S. Treasury is committed to replenish as need arises.

The question then arises: Assuming U.S. economic, political and military power is able to restrain foreign central banks from converting their dollar holdings into gold, is it powerful enough to compel them to satisfy the popular demand for gold at the cost of their own reserves, or conversely, compel them to refrain from satisfying such demand?

In short, the practical object of a credit dollar, without gold, can be achieved only if all countries that use dollars as monetary reserves adopt the same inconvertibility.

Would dollar stability be achieved by universal inconvertibility, with all currencies linked to the dollar, and the dollar maintained at parity with such other currencies by regulating (if that were possible) our balance of payments and by keeping a constant surplus of trade and services?

Let us assume that sufficient power could be so exerted. What would be the practical consequences?

WHERE WOULD GOLD COME FROM?

Since none of the principal sovereignties whose currencies dominate world trade (Canada perhaps excepted) produce sufficient gold to satisfy their own industrial demand for the metal, from where would they replenish their supplies? South Africa, the principal supplier of gold today, can sell all the gold it produces at \$35 an ounce. Should the U.S. Treasury declare it was no longer interested in buying gold (and supposing it could persuade the other central banks to adopt the same course) what would be the effect, say, upon South African gold producers?

Traditionally, and to the present time, despite political alienation from Britain, South African mine production is sold through London agencies. Would it continue to be so sold? Some inconvenience might result from setting up other market mechanisms, but the effects can hardly be doubted. The enormous private demand for gold would be satisfied by sales from South Africa direct. What would be the consequences of U.S. Treasury aloofness to this market? None, for the U.S. has not been a buyer of gold on balance since 1949.

What would buyers pay for this gold? To put the question in reverse, what would sellers ask for their gold? Would they accept 35 inconvertible dollars per ounce when they have been used to getting 35 convertible dollars per ounce? This is hardly likely. And certainly bidders would arise who would prefer an ounce of gold to 35 inconvertible dollars.

A better grasp of the monetary problem would be gained by more reading of historical experience, more familiarity with actual business and less with monetary theory, particularly current monetary theory.

Throughout history the value of money has been a compound of intrinsic worth of the medium and the authority or confidence enjoyed by the issuing agency. Remove the latter and barter results; remove the former and monetary chaos follows. Historically, precious metals became the principal medium of barter by reason of their intrinsic utility and convenience for trade, second by the certification of the weight and fineness of the bar or ingot by an accepted authority.

At first this authority was a respected trader of Babylonia or adjacent countries. Later it was the temple—in Rome, the temple of Juno Moneta, the "Warner" (from

which we obtain the word "money"). Eventually the function of striking metal into coinage was absorbed by the state. The power of the state to declare it legal tender for debt, and its willingness to accept it in payment of taxes, gave the official standard a value beyond—but not to the exclusion of—its intrinsic (metal) content. Since, however, the fiat of the state is coterminous only with the power of its arms, the legal tender or fiat value of money ends at the frontier, and beyond that its worth is measured by the intrinsic content. (Even within the frontier the fiat of the state is not always supreme.)

PAPER TREASURE

Marco Polo brought back from his China travels a rosy description of the "means whereby the Great Khan may have, in fact has, more treasure than all the Kings of the world." The means was the issuance of pieces of paper (papermaking being a Chinese invention) bearing the imperial seal, which were declared exchangeable everywhere in payment of taxes or dues, and for which the emperor's subjects were compelled to turn in their gold.

"This paper currency," Marco Polo wrote, "is circulated in every part of the Great Khan's dominions; nor dares any person, at the peril of his life, refuse to accept it. . . . All his majesty's armies are paid with this currency. . . . Upon these grounds it may certainly be affirmed that the Great Khan has a greater command of treasure than any other sovereign in the universe."

As a substitute for gold, however, the device was a failure, for the Mongols, though powerful enough to conquer all of Asia and half of Europe, were not powerful enough to compel everywhere acceptance of their paper money. In his enthusiasm Marco Polo neglected to mention that the paper was at a discount of 50% to gold, and he did not remain in China long enough to observe the economic havoc caused by the use of paper money.

Later instances could be multiplied, for the history of Europe from Roman times on is that of currency debasement and monetary inflation, in the earliest years by coin clipping and alloying, and after the introduction of paper money in the 13th century, by imitation of the Chinese example.

While it is ultimately true that the soundness of the money of a sovereignty depends upon the vigor and productive power of its economy, the reverse is also true that the vigor and productivity of the economy depends upon a sound and stable money. Historians have generally agreed that a chief source of Byzantine influence and power, sustaining the sovereignty through eight centuries of political and military impotence, was the bezant, which down to the Latin conquest of the 13th century was the accepted standard of account and exchange from the Baltic to Ceylon. This was due to the fact, unparalleled in history, that since its first issuance by Constantine the Great the bezant continued to be minted by the Byzantine authorities at its original weight and fineness.

Today the dollar is the unchallenged standard of the world. Probably two-thirds of the world's trade, whether in U.S. commodities and services or not, is quoted, transacted or paid for in dollars. It would be a universal tragedy if the views of theoreticians and jingoists were to prevail, that the economic might of the U.S. is sufficient to protect the dollar and enforce its acceptance throughout the globe at its nominal equivalence of gold.

A final question can only be dealt with briefly. Given the state of monetary decay, what is the viable solution? An inconvertible dollar we reject, for the reasons just described. A return to full convertibility—the object of the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy—is a theoretical ideal, but unrealistic in today's condition of thinned and inadequate gold reserves.

The only practical solution is the historical

procedure for insolvency: A declaration of bankruptcy and a writing down of creditors' claims to the measure of the liquidable assets. With sovereignties this is done by a revaluation of the currency. Undoubtedly such a procedure here would have the same effects as elsewhere—it would merely set the stage for a new spiral of inflation, and is therefore abhorred by conservatives. For this reason, a further step is required, to preserve the discipline of gold upon the money managers: A Constitutional provision limiting the power of the Federal Government to regulate the money.

A precedent is found in the oaths that in ancient Greece, following the Solonian debasement of the drachma, the diakasts were required to take on assuming office, that they would not tamper with the currency. It is a paradox of history that it was the influence of this oath, coupled with the Greek tradition, that preserved the integrity of the bezant for so many centuries and maintained the influence of Byzantium far more effectively than the armies of its emperors.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1968]
TRAGIC—AND DEAR—TALE OF TWO DEFICITS
(By Harley L. Lutz)

The setting and the theme of this tale differ from those portrayed in Mr. Dickens' "Tale of Two Cities." London and Paris are involved, but so are all other national capitals from Washington across Europe and Asia to Saigon.

The theme of this brief tale is not heroism, selfless devotion and sacrifice, but economic and financial mismanagement and their retributive consequences. These consequences were summed up by Mr. Micawber when he said that the result of outgo in excess of income was misery. Ordinarily, one deficit would be enough to warrant the Micawber judgment, but when the affliction extends to two of the same, it is misery compounded.

The U.S. is in this situation today. It has had a chronic budget deficit for the greater part of three decades, and over the past 17 years it has had a serious deficit in the international payments account.

Superficially it would appear that these deficits, singly or in combination, have not produced the melancholy result that would have been anticipated under economic concepts now regarded as obsolete. The gross national product has increased by leaps and bounds, personal and business incomes have soared and the money supply has been expanded steadily. It has been assumed that we could support both a military war abroad and an economic war against poverty at home.

For some time cracks have been showing in the wall and foundation of this prosperity, but until recently they have been disregarded or whitewashed over. Neither of our wars has been going well; inflation continues and an increasing proportion of GNP growth has reflected price rise rather than more real output; interest rates are at or near an all-time high; the Federal budget has gone into orbit, and the little island of personal freedom continues to be eroded further by the vast ocean of centralized power that surrounds it.

Legally, the dollar has not been devalued since 1934, but it has lost more than half of the purchasing power it represented after that action. It has recently been under severe attack, not only from some who may seek its destruction but also from others whose confidence in its future may be weakening. It may be only coincidence that the President's new program for its support followed closely after a warning from the 21-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that "belt-tightening" was imperative.

CONTROL FACTORS

Some similarities between domestic and international deficits will be noted, and at-

tention will then be directed to the basic factors involved in their control, as distinguished from temporary or stopgap measures.

First, the two types of deficit are alike in that each measures a gap between receipts and outgo. In the popular view this is known as an unbalanced budget. However, since all bills incurred are eventually paid there is, actually, a balance between available funds and expenditures. The popular distrust of an unbalanced budget is intuitively sound, despite the New Economics, for the methods of obtaining the money to pay all of the bills are not always palatable. In the case of a domestic budget deficit these methods would include prompt increase of taxes or borrowing. If popular resistance to higher taxes is sufficiently strong, enough debt paper can be forced into the market to cover even an astronomical budget deficit.

Likewise, the international accounts are always balanced out, the deficit being the measure of the supplemental funds needed to produce this result. The debtor country has no taxing jurisdiction beyond its own borders, but it can restrict imports by tariff duties and import quotas. It can levy discriminating taxes on foreign investment, restrict foreign travel, subsidize exports, and so on. Such actions are self-defeating, for they can be, and often are, countered by other countries to the detriment of world trade. Foreign loans can be floated if investors are found, who are willing to take the risk. In the end, all other measures failing, the payments gap is closed by transfer of gold. The so-called "Big Ten" nations have engaged in a diligent search for an operable method of assisting even the affluent countries with short-run payments difficulties.

Second, it can be argued that our policy of budget deficits and their recent trend toward larger amounts have been an important factor in our balance of payments difficulty. This view is essentially correct but some qualifications should be noted.

Deficit financing, continued as long as it has been in our case, increases the money supply, which in turn exerts upward pressure on prices. Wage increases, granted not only as cost of living adjustments as prices rise but also as concessions in union bargaining, contribute to the spiraling interaction of prices and costs.

A high price market is a good place in which to sell but not so good in which to buy. Foreign producers push their wares in such a market, and foreign buyers turn elsewhere for better bargains. The rising imports of steel, automobiles, textiles and other products testify to the advantage of our inflation-induced "sellers' market. Rising costs and prices may have hurt our export volume, but despite the inflation we have still had a sufficient advantage, absolute and comparative, to maintain a substantial margin of exports over imports in the sector of private transactions, including visible and invisible items.

It would appear, therefore, that if the only factors involved up to now had been the private dealings between American business and individuals on one hand, and foreign business and individuals on the other, there would have been thus far no imbalance of payments against us. This does not mean that a reckless fiscal and monetary policy can be defended or that it could safely be pursued indefinitely. By such a policy we could, in time, price ourselves out of foreign markets by letting the cost-price spiral rise beyond the point of which the boasted American "know-how" could maintain a competitive position in world trade.

It does mean, however, that to the present the unbalancing factor in our international payments equation has not been the budget policy, damaging as that has been to the economy and the value of the dollar. Rather, it has been the outflow of Government spending abroad. Corollary to this outflow has

been the diminishing confidence of foreigners in the dollar, induced by our own disregard for its value at home.

The foreign aid program began with the Marshall Plan, which was limited in amount and duration. The purpose was rehabilitation of war-damaged countries, and there was concern then over the "dollar gap," which meant that other countries did not have enough dollars to buy all that they needed, nor could they earn dollars until the war damage to their industrial complex had been repaired. Like almost every other Government program, foreign aid was not terminated as scheduled but was continued and expanded in amount and coverage. Since 1946 well over \$100 billion have been spent, lent without recourse, or given away, and the dollar gap has been transformed into a dollar glut.

It follows that the principal source of both types of deficit has been the errors, wrong judgments and confused purposes of Government policy. After a period of large, rising budget deficits deliberately incurred in the mistaken view that a price-inflated rise in the GNP was as good as an increase of real output, the citizens are asked to pay higher taxes. After flooding the world with dollars in the mistaken view that we were thereby cementing firm friendships and buying solid support for democracy, American style, business firms and individuals are to be subjected to regulation and harassment.

NOT JUST TRIMMING

It is clear that remedial action, in the case of both types of deficit, must begin at the source of the trouble if anything like satisfactory long-term results are to be achieved. And it is a long-term problem in each case, not just a question of trimming the budget deficit or of shrinking the balance of payments gap for a year or so.

So much should be obvious. Nevertheless, most of the proposals thus far indicate, or imply, a short-run approach. The tax surcharge and the curbs on European travel are to be effective for two years. Mandatory control of foreign investment is not definitely limited, but its undue prolongation would seriously damage both political and economic relations with the countries to which it applies.

Two matters of particular concern stand out in the President's program made public at the year end. The first is the emphasis on the responsibility of business firms and individuals for reducing the payments gap, as if this gap had been caused by their excesses. Nothing was said in the official statement about reducing the cost of the Vietnam war or the scope of foreign aid. Instead, we are to "continue to meet our international responsibilities in defense of freedom" without a reappraisal of their effectiveness as a contribution to our own security.

The second conspicuous feature of the new program is its vulnerability to reprisal abroad, and its naive assumption that we can persuade other countries to adopt, in our behalf, measures exactly contrary to those we plan to apply against them.

For example, we shall stop foreign investment but we shall ask foreigners to buy more corporate and Treasury securities; we shall restrict foreign travel but we plan a program to attract more foreign visitors to this country; we shall ask our NATO allies to assume more of the cost of troop support in Europe, but to do this by purchasing more of the necessary supplies in our high-cost market; we shall ask countries with payments surpluses to bring their international accounts into equilibrium by exporting less and importing more. All of this is more of a strain than international altruism is likely to bear, especially when there has been time for second thoughts after the pressure missions sent to various countries to "explain" the new program.

LINT-PICKING APPROACH

An example of lint-picking in the official statement is the instruction to the Secretary of Defense to "find ways to reduce the foreign exchange impact of personal spending by U.S. forces and their dependents in Europe." The most effective way to do this would be to limit such spending to the post exchanges and to stock these exchanges with American products only. It would then be off limits for a soldier's wife to buy even radishes and strawberries in a local market.

Beyond doubt, the future stability of the dollar is a matter of grave concern for the entire trading and investing world. Much too late the gravity of the situation has had official attention, but the contradictory and self-defeating program that the President's advisers have produced is inadequate and unconvincing. These advisers would have served the President and the country better if they had coupled their insistence on a tax increase with a really drastic reduction of the budget. This would convince the people that higher taxes would not be used to support spending as usual.

These advisers should also have pointed out that the record of our foreign spending, lending and giving away has not been, in all respects, a tribute to our managerial skill and political acumen, and that a searching review of foreign commitments could be profitable contribution to reduction of the payments gap. It is futile to rely for very long on the good will and cooperation of other nations to eliminate this gap, and it will be disastrous to continue doling out, or pouring out, gold for the purpose.

After that, and once reckless spending in excess of income at home has been halted, the stability of the dollar at home and abroad will be assured. No other course is likely to save it.

Travel Levy Looks Worse

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago Daily News editorial on Monday, February 12, contained a very thought provoking analysis of the President's foolhardy travel tax proposal. The editorial follows:

TRAVEL LEVY LOOKS WORSE

The more we hear about the proposed tax on travel overseas the worse it sounds.

Even if it works as its authors intend, it would not cut the so-called tourist deficit by half a billion dollars, as some have contended, but only by \$100,000,000. The rest of this half billion would be domestic revenue, from the tax itself and from increased customs collections. This has no bearing on the international balance of payments.

Washington has been using a figure of \$2 billion for the extent of the present tourist deficit. This is artificially high. In 1966 the deficit was \$1.6 billion, including a questionable transportation item. Without this it was only about \$1 billion. American tourists visiting Expo 67 in Montreal, a once-in-a-lifetime occurrence, accounted for most of the increase last year, and their spending would not have been affected by the proposed tax.

The tax plainly invites retaliation at a time when the tourist pendulum is swinging strongly toward a balance without these restrictions. Americans spent \$1.4 billion in foreign countries other than Mexico and Canada in 1966, an increase of 41 per cent in six years. Foreigners from these other countries spent \$560,000,000 in the United States in 1966, an increase of 155 per cent in six years. This promising growth is nearly four

times as rapid as that of U.S. tourist spending and offers the only long-range answer to the problem. Foreign countermeasures, like those the United States now proposes, could halt this development quickly.

The announced tourist deficit takes no account of sizable purchases by foreign countries of U.S.-built aircraft and similar travel-connected dollar spending. Air France, for example, has bought or ordered jets worth \$410,000,000 in recent years, with options amounting to another \$300,000,000. The company will spend \$37,000,000 of its dollar earnings this year for operating expenses in this country, another \$30,000,000 for aircraft components and spare parts, and is installing a \$30,000,000 U.S. computer system.

If international traffic is cut back by U.S. action at least some of these outlays will be curtailed. Japan has cautioned it might have to reconsider jetliner orders in the United States. There are many vulnerable points.

Most ominous of all, the tourist tax seems slated in Congress to become a stringbag for any number of other protectionist measures. Their individual backers, lumped together, could override the genuine and justified opposition to the travel tax as such. In an election year the temptations to indulge in this congressional horsetrading are magnified. A generation of hard-won progress toward freer trade and travel, with all their multiple benefits, could be reversed.

Project Ketch: Underground Explosion of AEC

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 there will be a forum at Lock Haven, Pa., to discuss the proposed atomic explosion for the creation of an underground natural gas storage area near the Clinton-Clearfield County line.

I would suggest that the sure way to halt such a plan is for the Commonwealth to insist that Columbia Gas System Service Corp., sole beneficiary of any such project, assume full liability for whatever damages might occur to water, land, property, and people.

If the company, which is promoting expenditure of enormous Federal funds so that it will have a subsidized reservoir to store its product, is willing to put its assets on the line to protect the innocent public, then perhaps citizens of the Commonwealth will have a measure of safety assurance that is otherwise absent. There is certainly no reason for the Atomic Energy Commission or any other Government agency to accept responsibility for the property and health hazards that can come from an atomic explosion and the accompanying release of radioactive gases.

Many Pennsylvania residents have already been subjected to heavy shock by the proposal to set off a blast in the Clinton-Clearfield County area when final results of the pilot test in New Mexico last December may not be known for another year or two.

The AEC's underground spree is another indication of the need for investigating the Commission and its programs. If, as reported in the Washington Post of January 31, there are to be between 40 and 50 atomic underground explosions

in the coming year, Congress should determine whether the cost justifies the need. If the experiments are necessary to the defense of this country, there will be no objection; if they are no more essential than the blast proposed for Pennsylvania, then it is time to find out why they are even under consideration at a time when the administration budget is so far out of balance.

Congress will also want to know how many AEC employees are engaged in this type of activity and whether or not it would be possible to reduce personnel in the interest of economy.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to insert in the RECORD three items from the Pittsburgh Press. The first, an editorial appearing last December 12, points up the possible danger of the underground blasts and asks to what extent the Government should provide subsidies for private profit. On January 26, one news story quoted a Pittsburgh professor who warns against permitting the proposed blast in Pennsylvania and another explained the length of time required to determine the results of the New Mexico experiment. The articles follow:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Dec. 12, 1967]

CRANKING UP "GASBUGGY"

"Project Gasbuggy" was a rather self-disparaging title for an event of such era-opening promise. The world's first commercial nuclear explosion underground in Northwest New Mexico Sunday.

Phase one, at least, was a success. A 26-kiloton atomic bomb stuffed into a 4240-foot hole was fired with a rumble heard 55 miles away. (Hiroshima was hit with a 20-kiloton A-bomb.)

The Atomic Energy Commission, which set off the blast in co-operation with the El Paso Natural Gas Co., said it worked; that is, it melted and vaporized enough rock to produce a skyscraper size gas storage tank deep underground. And no radiation is said to have escaped to the surface.

It will take months of "cooling" and testing, however, before the final results are in. If gas flows copiously into the storage tank, as expected, and is sufficiently free of nuclear contamination, "Gasbuggy" will turn into a Cadillac. And if other areas could be exploited similarly, the nation's gas reserves could be doubled (from the present 317 trillion cubic feet).

Even before "Gasbuggy" was fired, other companies were planning other peaceful atomic explosions to extend copper mining, oil extraction and coal mining.

The blast Sunday (which took place across the state from the first A-bomb test at Alamogordo in July, 1945) opens the door to the exploitation of a whole new world of natural riches now locked deep in the earth.

As we enter into this era, however, let's remember two things: we are playing with fire, and we are dealing in big money.

Despite an understandable eagerness to use nuclear explosions to exploit natural resources, there have to be absolutely fool-proof safeguards against the leakage of radiation. We can't have that stuff on the loose.

It is very well for the Government and industry to co-operate in this endeavor. But we are going to get into the question of what belongs to the people and what is open to private industry. The "shale oil" question—the estimated \$3.5 trillion of oil in Rocky Mountain beds—is an example.

Should the U.S. conduct the explosion for a fee and let companies reap windfall profits? Or should the resources be regarded as in the public domain and profits used for public purposes (such as digging us out of the na-

tional debt, which now stands at 345 billion dollars)?

Congress should be debating this issue. As the "Gasbuggy" explosion shows, we are rapidly heading into a new era.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 26, 1968]

PITT PROF RAPS A-BLAST PLAN—GAS-CAVITY PROJECT CALLED HAZARDOUS

A Pittsburgh professor of radiation-physics urged today in a letter to Gov. Raymond P. Shafer a change in the site of the proposed experimental "Project Ketch" underground atomic explosion.

Prof. Ernest J. Sternglass, a consistent critic of underground atomic blasts, criticized the proposed explosion to create a test gas-storage cavity 30 miles north of State College, Centre County.

The professor cited "serious potential health hazards to the population of our state that could arise if the . . . explosion . . . were to be carried out."

Dr. Sternglass suggested that the sponsoring Columbia Gas Co. and Livermore Laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission be required to perform any such experiment somewhere else.

He added that such a site should be "in areas of low population density, far from the large dairy-farming regions of Eastern Pennsylvania."

Otherwise, he warned, radioactivity "might be released into the atmosphere" if anything goes wrong with the experiment's massive safety precautions—such as planning the blast three miles under solid rock.

"An accidental release of even small amounts of radioactive iodine-131 and strontium-90 would do irreparable harm," he said—possibly even threatening infants and unborn children with leukemia.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 26, 1968]

GASBUGGY SUCCESS HINTED—NEW MEXICO PROJECT MAY NEED 1 TO 2 YEARS FOR FINAL RESULTS

The underground nuclear explosion, detonated last Dec. 10 in New Mexico to release natural gas, may have been successful, U.S. officials at the 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva report.

Project Gasbuggy liberated a great amount of gas and the radioactivity in the gas was less than had been expected. Final results of the Government-industry experiment, however, may not be known for one to two years, participants in the project caution.

Use of nuclear explosives to form an underground gas storage area in Pennsylvania have been discussed.

Preliminary technical data was released yesterday on the project of the El Paso Natural Gas Co., the U.S. Dept. of Interior's Bureau of Mines and the Atomic Energy Commission to determine whether nuclear explosives can be used to stimulate the production and recovery of natural gas from formation where gas can not be economically recoverable under present methods.

Vietnam War Petition

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 19 members of the William Roger Greeley chapter of the Laymen's League, the First Parish Church in Lexington, Mass., have sent me an important and timely petition in regard to the conduct of the Vietnam war and I am sub-

mitting it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It merits the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives, for I think that the statements of this conscientious group of citizens reflect the growing concern throughout the Nation.

The petition follows:

We believe that United States policy with respect to Vietnam is leading to an "escalation of moral numbness." We are especially disturbed by the recent statement by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert Barnett that an individual can be moral but that a nation should not always be expected to act morally.

We feel that in order to put Vietnam in proper perspective the United States government should: (a) deal more realistically with the meaning of the cold war, (b) develop and enunciate a clearer policy toward China, and (c) examine the morality of our position in Vietnam.

More on New Haven's Community Progress, Inc.

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 12, 1968, I am introducing parts 3 and 4 of the New Haven Register's series on Community Progress, Inc., New Haven's community action program, as follows:

CPI IN CONFLICT: RESEARCH DOLLARS BUY CONFUSION, NO CONCLUSION

(By William E. Keish, Jr., and Donald Dallas)

The deeper the exploration of CPI "research" the greater the evidences of confusion, the fewer the indications of the kind of "conclusions" which Webster defines.

"Research: . . . critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having for its aim the discovery of new facts and their correct interpretation, the revision of accepted conclusions, theories or laws in the light of newly discovered facts, or the practical applications of such new or revised conclusions." (Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.)

U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo has charged that Community Progress research efforts "have wasted \$625,000." Some of this impression, say CPI officials, springs from the fact that the agency has been given money to make several highly theoretical studies which do not have an instant "practical" application in the war on poverty. But even where down-to-earth results might be expected, Community Progress seems to stub its research toe.

Even more startling, the CPI Manpower Division has been spending about \$65,000 a year on employment and training data since 1965. This averages out to more than \$1,000 a week for research analysis of what the Manpower Division is doing. Yet there seems almost nothing—in the middle of this public crisis for CPI—which the Manpower Division can produce to show the effectiveness of its overall program—and very little to describe specifically what is going on.

CPI research for the New Haven Housing Authority was designed to get sociological data on the placement of large, low-income families in private dwellings through rent subsidies. According to CPI's report to the Ford Foundation, this study was finished a year ago for use of the Housing Authority. However, Director of Public Housing Robert

T. Wolfe said last week that the report has not yet been completed "satisfactorily."

It is "too long and wordy," said Wolfe, who further explained it is in the process of being tightened up before it is forwarded to federal officials.

The editing job has now been going on for a year or more. Although the report's "evaluation" is good, Wolfe said, the final payment on the \$30,000 contract with PCI has not been made because it has not been officially accepted.

The research work covered the initial 27 families in the Housing Authority's program. The contract was signed in 1963. It wasn't until two years later, in 1965, that the actual research began because that was when the large, low-income families were first placed in private accommodations in different city neighborhoods. The CPI study was to reach conclusions which New Haven could use in enlarging the "scattered site" plan.

Apparently pushed by the need to take action in providing poor people with housing regardless of delays in delivering the survey, Wolfe's agency has gone ahead and placed a total of 174 families in private housing. He expects to provide similar quarters for another 100 or more in the near future.

WELFARE AGENCIES STUDY

Still another early research effort financed by CPI was designed to help the Community Council of New Haven find out what persons were using what New Haven social and welfare agencies and how often.

Some \$28,000 was spent for a 2½-year period simply considering the best ways to proceed with this project. The project itself was never carried out.

But the Community Council did attempt to get money from both the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Ford Foundation to put the plan into effect. It asked OEO for \$600,000. The Council was turned away at both places, apparently because those in charge of giving out the money felt the plan of action was much too complicated, and saw little hope of success. So perhaps the initial \$28,000 pre-study study paid off as a sort of caution signal.

Reportedly, the plan has since been simplified and there is a possibility the Council may secure some funds to put it into effect.

DELAYED RELEASE

Another report, an attempt to evaluate a Unified Social Services (USS) project here that poured in extensive welfare services for poor people in the Farnam Courts housing project was dated August 1967.

Strangely, it was one of only two reports—others remain unavailable—that were released to The Register by CPI just a few days ago. The other just-released report, concerning CPI's "neighborhood services," was dated Dec. 1, 1965. The delay in releasing the reports is something CPI officials explain with silence.

The USS-study points out, as now seems more or less customary at CPI, that "the original plan for evaluation (of the Unified Social Services project) . . . could not be completed because of a discontinuance in federal funding."

It also says, "The question of whether Unified Social Services was generally effective or not cannot be answered definitively because of the lack of comparison groups of residents who did not receive social services."

Thus, in a couple of opening sentences a kind of bar-door excuse (one that can swing in either direction) seems to be established for any failure in the whole research effort. First, it's incomplete because there isn't enough money; and second, you can't check the accuracy because there's no control-group to use in making sensible comparisons.

Aside from this, the report on Unified Social Services seems to be a standard example of that kind of sociological study which leaves ordinary citizens and ordinary readers

bemused. One of its apparently-significant paragraphs says:

"In summary it appears that non-professional involvement leads to more input in cases but better outcomes occur for medium contact cases when both professional and non-professionals are involved. Although long-term cases in general are more successful, however, this success rate is only slightly higher than that achieved by medium contact cases served by the combination of professional and non-professional. From a program planning point of view, therefore, it would seem that the most efficient use of resources may require that professional-non-professional team social service be preferred with cases of medium input. This would maximize success at reduced costs because of less amount of service and use of lower paid non-professionals."

The statement is taken out of context and it is made in professional terms. But it may illustrate, to some degree, the difficulties that CPI has had with applying research to reality.

REPORT'S PURPOSE

The basic purpose of this USS research report was to relate CPI "opportunity" programs in employment, education, and housing to the various neighborhood social services which were to help the poor be more successful in those programs. The report avoids hard and firm conclusions about how successful any single one of these general categories of CPI efforts might have been.

But it does note more relative success in employment and housing than in education and it suggests—in another totally unsurprising deduction—that "the immediacy of the payoff" may be the "key factor that determines successful outcomes." This conclusion seems to mean, very simply, that a poor person is likely to respond more enthusiastically and strive more earnestly for something with an immediate advantage for him—like a job or a low-rent apartment—than for something as relatively vague as a grammar school diploma.

PRACTICAL RESEARCH

Turning to the more "practical" or "management oriented" research, the CPI report to Ford of last year points out "The most heavily evaluated programs have been in manpower and employment. On the other end of the scale, perhaps the most poorly evaluated have been in community participation and education. Reports and studies from the various programs are not uniform in format or approach, because of the ad hoc patchwork style of development."

Joseph Marcel, director of the CPI Manpower Division, points out that the separate employment and training data collection and processing unit has cost CPI about \$65,000 a year since 1965. This is where an average of \$1,000 a week for manpower data comes in. Yet he admits there is no data on the effectiveness of the overall program, and very little on specific parts of it. CPI does not know, for example, how many of the people who were placed on jobs are still on them, what quality of jobs they hold or what financial gains—if any—they have made. The \$65,000 is separate and distinct from CPI's "Research Division" costs. The two major CPI divisions each had their own data departments, techniques—and costs. These divisions are Manpower and Community Services formerly Neighborhood Services.

EDUCATION UNIT

In educational areas the same inconclusiveness prevails.

Concerning the Ford Foundation education unit in the Board of Education from 1963-1965, the 1967 report to Ford also points out, "Very little in the way of conclusive results emerged from any of these studies."

But, in general, it goes on, none of the programs studied "seemed to have much impact on the overall quality of classroom edu-

cation." The report concludes a "more general total attack on the problem should be made."

The new focus, it says, should be on the "way the system operates so that the structure and pattern can be changed to more nearly fit the individual needs of students."

But except for these reformist implications the CPI research on education seems just as unspecific as the analysis in other fields.

A report which CPI compiled and submitted to the Ford Foundation last summer was entitled "New Directions"—and it may have something specific to say in regard to New Haven educational programs, plans, and projects.

But CPI has repeatedly refused to release this document to the press or to the public—because, as one CPI official explained it, CPI is afraid of unduly "Raising hopes."

What is necessarily one of the great oddities—and one of the great ironies—of the way CPI has mired itself in its own swampy research, is the fact that the research specialists of a great university, Yale, have done little or nothing to keep it on the right track.

Back in its original 1962 presentation—outlining with Ford Foundation dollars the "Opening Opportunities" in New Haven—Community Progress, Inc. attached to the document a letter signed by Kingman Brewster Jr., Yale University president:

"I want to record Yale's support and my personal enthusiasm for the program of social and educational development for which New Haven seeks support from the Ford Foundation . . . I see the proposed program as an opportunity for mutual benefit and contribution on the part of both the City and the University."

YALE INDIVIDUALS

In 1967, however, the picture had changed. "Individual Yale faculty members participate (in research) from time to time, but it is difficult to engage them for sustained periods," says one report made last summer to the Ford Foundation.

"Yale and other local colleges and universities have been involved with CPI in numerous effective, though scattered and unco-ordinated, ways," it says in another place. And finally in a more plaintive vein, it asks the question: "Where do agencies such as CPI look for research work and assistance?"

The question is a good one—primarily because the welter of mixed-up, uninformative, and unfinished research projects at CPI is a real and immediate dilemma for New Haven citizens who expect so much of CPI.

CPI IN CONFLICT: BRAIN DRAIN TAKING ITS TOLL ON EFFORT HERE

(By Donald Dallas and William E. Keish, Jr.)

"Deputy Director, with demonstrated administrative and supervisory experience in public agency management or related field. Excellent fringe benefits. Salary open." (A CPI want ad.)

"And a-way we go!" (Comedian Jackie Gleason.)

New Haven's "Opening Opportunities" program has helped not only to find work for some of the city's hard-core unemployed, but it also has opened many employment opportunities for top-salaried Community Progress Inc. (CPI) executives and planners who have left here for bigger and better paying jobs.

"CPI has been one of the nation's most important training groups for leaders in anti-poverty and urban-improvement programs," according to CPI itself.

For instance, of the 19 highest-paid persons listed on the CPI payroll in May, 1966—19 months ago—only six are still with the anti-poverty organization.

If Milton A. Brown, the \$20,000-per-year director of the community services division,

had to sing a chorus of "That Old Gang of Mine," he would have to do a solo. He's the only one of the original top men who has stayed with the operation since 1962.

FORMER OFFICIALS

Gone are Mitchell Sviridoff, the first executive director of CPI; George Bennett, original director of the manpower division; Howard Hallman, deputy director under Sviridoff; Bernard Shiffman, director of program development and training; Elmer Luchterhand, director of the research division; David A. Altschuler, director of administration; and Miss Mary White, educational consultant, all of whom had a hand in plotting the course taken by CPI.

In a recent news release, CPI said:

"In its five-year history, CPI has attracted a considerable number of well qualified professionals who, though they could have commanded higher salaries in private industry or with other agencies, chose to work in New Haven because of the challenge and promise they found here."

"In casting their lot with the New Haven program, they have exposed themselves to controversy and harassment by elements in the community which have not seriously attempted to understand or work with the purposes and methods of a human resources program. Moreover, the uncertain funding of the anti-poverty program is such that no employee is assured of tenure or the normal protections associated with other kinds of employment."

While CPI thus assumes its standard posture of self-praise, about the activities and progress of executive-level personnel, there are some people who feel that the comings-and-goings in key offices have not helped the program.

"Whatever you want to call it, 'Upward Bound,' 'Opening Opportunities,' 'Headstart,' 'Higher Horizons'—you name it and the executives had it," says one humorously inclined employee of Community Progress. "They all liked Jackie Gleason's catch-phrase, 'Away we go!'"

SVIRIDOFF DEPARTS

Of all the departures, Director Mitchell Sviridoff's was obviously the biggest blow to leadership and continuity in CPI.

Jeanne R. Lowe, in her 1967 book "Cities in a Race With Time," writes: "One important and informed observer from outside New Haven has suggested that Community Progress did not start early enough to plan programs with the people and develop the talents in neighborhoods. He feels that CPI has been authoritarian and has been imposed on the people from the top. 'If you pull Mike (Sviridoff) out, nothing is there, because the people haven't been utilized enough.'"

New Executive Director Lawrence N. Spitz seems to agree, in substance, with the kernel of this criticism. Describing the "one error" of the CPI early years in an address last Tuesday before the Rotary Club, Spitz stated that CPI "did not involve the people of the ghetto as they should have been." One member of the CPI Board of Directors, who feels that a number of the Gialmo criticisms are valid, dated the time of major CPI internal troubles with Sviridoff's apparently-sudden departure to the Lindsay administration in New York.

Sviridoff had been working part time with Lindsay, building up a human resources "plan" for New York. But he had assured the CPI Board of Directors he would not take the New York job on a permanent basis, the board member asserted.

Sviridoff, who was making \$25,000 per year when he left New Haven, took the New York Human Resources Administration post at \$40,000. The search for a new executive director thus had to be launched with little if any advance warning, and it was many months before the board could find Spitz to take the helm of CPI.

After a year with Lindsay, Sviridoff again made headlines with a surprise announcement of his resignation from that key post to take a \$50,000 a year job as executive vice president for Urban Affairs of the Ford Foundation. The New York Times wrote an editorial accusing Sviridoff of copping out when things got rough. Sviridoff argued it was a better job, and would give him more opportunity to influence national policy.

WORK IMPEDED

Other executive "opportunities" also hurt CPI in its attempt to open new opportunities to the poor. In the report of last summer to the Ford Foundation, for example, CPI points out:

"Several factors which the agency is working to offset have impeded the development of citizen participation at the level and rate originally projected. One has been the departure of several experienced staff members to direct community action programs in other cities." New people, obviously, would have to get to know the neighborhoods and their people before they could help develop further citizen participation.

"Fortunately," the report goes on, "they have been replaced, in most cases, by staff members with excellent potential. The training of these persons has been accelerated so that adequately trained and seasoned staff will be available for the citizen-participation program."

Apparently this has not been enough. CPI director Spitz is presently still in the process of assembling his own team to run the operation.

And CPI is currently looking for not only a deputy director, but it is also advertising for a director of program development to plan community action programs with resident groups.

Another criticism of this movement "upward and out" is directed by CPI, in the Ford report, not only to the top-level administrators, but also to the indigenous personnel it trains.

"In a number of instances," says the report, "the very success of CPI opportunity programs have proved to be an obstacle to the participation (by the poor) effort."

"This is because leaders in the participation structure have moved from their original neighborhoods as the opportunity programs have helped them to improve their economic condition. In some cases, the community action program has stimulated these leaders to enroll in school or in advanced opportunity programs, leaving them without the time required for neighborhood leadership."

One of many critics who feels strongly that this "up and out" process in neighborhood leadership should be reversed to "up and back," is the Rev. Robert Jones, executive director of the Fair Haven Parents Ministry, a social service program partially financed by CPI.

Like the others, Jones feels strongly that indigenous leaders should be encouraged to work in their home neighborhoods, to share the results of their training and opportunity programs with the more unfortunate. CPI apparently feels this way too, but has not yet shown an ability to change its structure or incentives to encourage such movement.

Complains Jones: "So much of their money has gone into research. That's a thing of the past."

"You go into the community itself, and find out from the community itself, what services need to be offered."

INADEQUATE STAFF

This is what CPI itself has several times said it plans to do. But whatever its original well-staffed situation, it apparently does not have the staff to do the job at present.

The fact is, the first-level originators at CPI have gone—and the agency is now under "second-generation" leadership all the way.

Sviridoff is at the Ford Foundation, where

he repeatedly refuses to be interviewed by The Register about his views on CPI.

Bennett is the director of the Federal government's community-action agency. Hallman is chief consultant to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Manpower. Shiffman is the deputy commissioner of the New York City Welfare Department. Luchterhand is teaching at Columbia and Brooklyn Colleges. Altschuler has resigned to resume his business.

Besides Altschuler, who was serving as director of the division of administration at \$18,000-per-year, other recent CPI losses included Isadore Wexler, who received an annual salary of \$14,292 as a department specialist; the comptroller, James T. Melillo Jr., who was paid \$12,360 a year; and Edmund Clark, the assistant director of the Community Action Institute, whose salary was \$11,000.

Wexler, like Altschuler, resigned, while Melillo and Clark took jobs with the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington, D.C. In both instances, they received higher salaries than what CPI paid them.

SALARY DISPUTE

The departure of Melillo and Clark was used by Spitz in rebutting criticism levelled by U.S. Rep. Robert N. Giaimo about high salaries of CPI personnel. If CPI's salaries are so high, argued Spitz, how come these men left for better paying positions with the federal government?

When Sviridoff left, that was also the signal for many others to start looking elsewhere for jobs. Among them was Thomas Seesel, who was the director of project processing and review. He is now director of the division on Equal Opportunity in the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

Others who have left CPI, the positions they held here, and the new jobs they hold, are as follows:

Rocco Fazio, a former administrative assistant, to manpower specialist, North Carolina Fund; Edward Fortes, former manpower evaluator, to director of the New Haven Commission on Equal Opportunity (CEO); William Iverson, former associate director of the Community Action Institute, to director of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Center; Russell McCabe, former Job Corps coordinator, to the manpower section of the Department of Labor in Boston; Samuel Santoro, former director of the Elm Haven project, to the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources in Pittsburgh, Pa.; Leonard Weller, former associate research director, to the teaching staff at Bar Ilan University, Israel; and William Will, former associate director of program development and training, to director of the Philadelphia Model Cities Program.

OTHERS WHO LEFT

Others who have departed the CPI staff are:

Alfred Dennis, Job Corps coordinator, to director of placement and job development Job Corps, New York City; Lawrence Shobe, social worker, to executive director, Greater Middletown Community Action Agency; Margaret McMillan, a CPI co-ordinator, to field representative and program analyst with OEO; Robert Hill, of the Community Action Institute, to director of the Opportunities Industrial Center; Jon Christianson, a vocational counselor, to the Community Renewal Team, Hartford; Alex Harth, assistant co-ordinator of the Unified Social Services demonstration program, and John Pollard, neighborhood worker in Fair Haven, to the Connecticut Department of Community Affairs, Hartford; Arthur Solomon, an assistant to the Manpower director, to Manpower director, United Progress Organization, Washington; Richard Brooks, assistant to Sviridoff, to director of the Thames Valley Community Action Program; Allan Talbot, director of administration, to Urban America Inc., Wash-

ington; and Francis Looney, director of Unified Social Services, to the social work department, Hartford Board of Education.

Among those who have gone to the Boston community-action agency in directors' positions are Thomas Flood, a former CPI neighborhood co-ordinator in the Hill; Donald Forest, a former Manpower evaluator; and Burton Carlson, a former member of the project processing and program review staff.

This is an impressive list of alumni for an agency five years old.

The "proof of the high calibre of CPI personnel, past and present, is the large number who have moved on to much higher-paying positions in the northeast and elsewhere in the nation," says CPI—in implicit defense of a high salary schedule for executives and junior executives.

But stability and a sense of local commitment might have accomplished more for CPI than its role as a rung on the ladder to success. The problem today is that the programs must all be staffed and restaffed by new administrators while the same poor people in the same poor neighborhoods wait for the CPI promises to bear fruit for them, too.

St. Valentine Day Massacre in Indiana

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my protest against what can only be described as a "St. Valentine Day Massacre" which took place in my State of Indiana yesterday, February 14, 1968.

The massacre to which I refer is no less than the massacre of the legislative process by two judges of the U.S. court, and their decision yesterday poses a problem so grave in terms of the fair and equitable process of our system of government that I call on the House Committee on the Judiciary immediately to conduct an investigation of their action.

The action of which I speak was a decision handed down by a 2-to-1 majority of a three-judge Federal panel in a case involving the correction of the 1965 congressional districting statute passed by the Indiana Legislature which plan was in 1967 found unconstitutional.

There are several reasons that I have in making so serious a charge and why I feel that an investigation is in order.

In 1965 the Indiana General Assembly passed a statute creating 11 congressional districts. In 1967 this statute was declared unconstitutional on grounds that it did not conform to the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling.

The Indiana General Assembly, however, in 1967, as at present is a politically divided one with a Republican House and a Democratic Senate, and was not able to come to agreement on a statute correcting the districts so as to conform them to the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote doctrine.

In view of the action of this Congress last year to prohibit at-large congressional elections the only recourse in this situation was for a three-judge Federal Court to make the appropriate corrections. The three-judge court, however, in a 2-to-1 decision went far beyond the appropriate bounds of judicial action and almost completely rewrote the 11 con-

gressional districts of Indiana. The two-judge majority ignored for the most part the existing 1965 constitutional districts and wrote a completely new plan with the obvious purpose of defeating incumbent Democratic Congressmen from Indiana and replacing them with Republicans. In order to achieve this nakedly political purpose the two Federal judges, both Republicans and one a former Republican State chairman in Indiana who was appointed to the Federal bench on the recommendation of the U.S. Senator William Jenner, drew up a plan that moved an estimated 1,215 million citizens of Indiana into new congressional districts, more than one quarter of the people in Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that this politically motivated judicial gerrymandering is gravely vulnerable on at least two counts. In the first place the court usurped the prerogative of the Legislature of Indiana by completely revamping the congressional district lines. In four other States where congressional districting has been declared unconstitutional and where the Federal courts have corrected them, the courts recognized the last expression of the State legislature as being the starting point of adjusting districts in order to conform with the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote mandate, and the courts in all these cases made only those corrections necessary to increase the underpopulated districts and decrease the overpopulated districts so as to bring them in line with the one-man, one-vote doctrine.

The Indiana case represents the first time that a three-judge Federal court has taken upon itself to get into the political thicket of such a case and to usurp the legislative powers of a State government.

I think it is more important in this respect, Mr. Speaker, to quote here from the dissenting opinion of Judge S. Hugh Dillon. He said:

It is not, however, constitutionally permissible for this court to enter the political arena as the majority has done and to impose upon the powers of a coordinate political department, the General Assembly of Indiana, by adopting a re-districting scheme of its own devising bearing no reasonable relationship to the plan last adopted by the last General Assembly. The plain error into which the majority has fallen is that it has misconceived the failure of the politically divided General Assembly to enact a new districting plan to have somehow given carte blanche to this court or to a majority thereof, to usurp all legislative prerogatives and to attack the problem as if Chapter 205 of the Acts 1965 [1965 State statute] . . . had never been enacted. But such is not the law, on the contrary, all courts which have spoken on the subject have unanimously held that the judicial power is limited to reviewing the last (albeit unconstitutional) legislative act and to making such corrections as are necessary to bring it into conformity with the "one man, one vote" principal. This must be so since it has long been the law that the courts have no power to perform administrative actions.

In my judgment, here, it should be pointed out that only 140,000 persons needed to be moved from their existing districts in order to bring the three underpopulated districts and the eight overpopulated districts in line with the Supreme Court one-man, one-vote doctrine.

As Judge Dillon stated further in his dissenting opinion—

The majority plan moves a total of 1,215,606 persons from districts created by Chapter 205 into other districts! This gross deviation of more than one thousand percent demonstrates beyond a doubt that the majority plan is not an objective one of necessary correction, but rather is an original and novel plan conforming only to the subjective impulses of the majority.

The congressional redistricting plan adopted by the two Republican judges has a greater deviation in population than a plan passed by the Senate of the Indiana General Assembly of 1967. Moreover, Judge Dillon demonstrates in his dissenting opinion that by moving 140,000 people in the 1965 plan of the Indiana Legislature the one-man, one-vote doctrine can become a reality in Indiana in that, by splitting only four townships out of more than one thousand townships in Indiana and by splitting only 12 of 92 counties in Indiana, the 1965 plan of the legislature can be brought directly in line with the one-man, one-vote doctrine. Indeed, were this done, the greatest deviation in any one district from the ideal population would be 118 persons while the greatest variation in any district in the plan adopted by the Republican judges has a variation of 6,705.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of the House of Representatives, whatever their party, can only be offended at this St. Valentine's Day massacre of the legislative process by politically motivated Federal judges for what can happen in one State can surely happen in another State. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, renew my call on the House Judiciary Committee to make a full and thorough investigation of this action.

The 47th Anniversary of Armenian People's Revolt Against Soviet Union

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 18 will mark the 47th anniversary of the Armenian people's revolt against the Soviet Union. Despite their heroism, however, the brave Armenians were overcome by force of arms and remain to this day captives of communism. They are, unfortunately, forbidden to celebrate this great day in their history by their present Red tyrants.

The uprising of the Armenian people in 1921 was especially tragic since the Soviets has seized their land only 2 months earlier under the guise of protecting it. Freedom-loving people everywhere share the desire of the Armenians to be free and independent, and we must take practical steps to keep up their courage and determination.

One effective method of calling the world's attention to the captivity of millions of Armenians and other peoples would be for the House to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Another would be for the Voice of Amer-

ica to provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave Armenian people and all the other captives of communism. We must use every means available to deliver the message of truth to them so that their resistance will not be weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

President Johnson's Proposal To Assure the Citizen Healthy, Wholesome, Edible Fish Products

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I welcome President Johnson's recommendation that we pass the Wholesome Fish Act of 1968, and I trust the House will move quickly to comply with his request. This is a piece of consumer protection legislation we have long needed.

The President is correct. The regulation of fish and fish products in the United States is spotty and ineffectual, varying greatly among jurisdictions. There are voluntary programs, and there are compulsory programs, but neither kind is very successful.

The Public Health Service, for example, has administered the national shellfish sanitation program since 1925. With the help of various States and agency representatives, the Public Health Service has supervised growing areas and plant processing and has encouraged State certification of shellfish shippers. But there is no direct Federal control over intrastate production, and the voluntary nature of the program reduces its effectiveness.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior operates another voluntary program. It makes a fee-for-service inspection available to any applicant having a financial interest in a fish product. But coverage of products, plants, and vessels is small—only about 1 percent—and the Bureau has no way to condemn or to restrict the movement of low-quality seafood.

Perhaps the most effective program is administered by the Food and Drug Administration under provisions of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Factory inspection and laboratory analysis of samples ensure the integrity of products covered.

But the Food and Drug Administration program, limited to interstate commerce, cannot take in fish products packed and marketed within a State. It can inspect only a fraction of American processing plants. It has no capability to survey fish or fish products packed in foreign countries.

It is true that we already have a variety of fish inspection programs, but gaps in the laws are allowing billions of pounds of uninspected fish and fish

products to reach the unsuspecting consumer. I urge the House to support the President's request for the Wholesome Fish Act of 1968. This act is needed to assure the housewife and the citizen that the food they place on their table is safe, wholesome, and edible.

Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., one of the three major drug firms presently involved in an antibiotics antitrust suit, has their home plant in my congressional district. It has come to my attention that the president of the company, Mr. John J. Powers, Jr., in his concern for the integrity of the company and the impact this litigation will have on the company and its employees, sent a letter to all Pfizer employees giving them his word and views on the antitrust suit.

At this point, I include with my remarks Mr. Powers' letter and the press statement mentioned in that letter:

CHAS. PFIZER & CO., INC.,

New York, N.Y., January 8, 1968.

To All Pfizer Employees:

As you know, a jury in the Federal Court in Manhattan rendered a verdict on December 29th against Pfizer, American Cyanamid and Bristol-Myers (Squibb and Upjohn were charged as co-conspirators but not defendants) in the antibiotics antitrust suit filed in 1961 by the Department of Justice and covering events which occurred in the period 1953-1961. I am enclosing a copy of the press statement which states the Company's position on the verdict.

To our press statement I want to add my personal word—I was in the top management of our Company at that time and I tell you *there was no conspiracy* to fix prices or monopolize the market for broad spectrum antibiotics or anything else. We will appeal and we will continue to fight to win.

My concern and yours too is, first of all, the integrity of the Company and, second, the impact this may have on the Company. I want to talk to you personally and directly about these two points and give you some of my impressions about the case.

My main interest is that you should understand that the integrity of the Company is untouched by this inference case. This was a case based as we said in our release on "unjustified inference and suspicion" and nothing else. There was no direct evidence of conspiracy submitted by the government. It seems to me that the primary element in this case was pricing and the contention by the government that an inference of conspiracy among Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, Upjohn and Pfizer should be drawn from the fact that during the period November 1953 to July 1960 there was a close similarity and stability of published catalog prices among these companies for tetracycline products as well as Terramycin and Aureomycin, and further, that these prices were unusually and suspiciously high. Yet no satisfactory standard was provided by the government as to what constitutes a "high" price or as to whether the prices listed by the companies were unusual or unique for significant new discoveries in the pharmaceutical industry.

It is a peculiarity of this case that the government did not go back to the begin-

ning of the broad spectrum market which it defined as including Aureomycin, Terramycin, the tetracycline products and, interestingly, Chloromycetin, although Parke, Davis was not included in the suit. The fact is that broad spectrum catalog prices were reduced four times prior to 1953 and this showed a familiar pattern of activity for a new drug market. Broad spectrum products were priced at closely similar levels prior to 1953 and this similarity continued after 1953, obviously not as the result of any action taken in 1953.

The government chose the settlement of the tetracycline patent interference between Pfizer and Cyanamid in November/December 1953 as marking the beginning of the alleged "conspiracy". And the settlement two years later of the Pfizer infringement action against Bristol, Squibb and Upjohn was claimed to be the time when these three companies joined the inferred "conspiracy". But even the evidence submitted by the government indicated that both these settlements had normal, even obvious, business reasons and there was no evidence that any understanding about price or monopolization was arrived at by those who negotiated these settlements. Nor was it claimed that either of the settlement agreements themselves was illegal. The jury was simply asked to infer that those involved in these meetings must have entered into a conspiracy regarding prices and monopolization. But I repeat, there was no conspiracy. Pfizer's decisions were arrived at independently by its own management group.

Finally, I would like to point out that although there were a number of patent aspects involved in the case, the government did not claim that our tetracycline patent is invalid or unenforceable. Furthermore, it is clear that no one knew of the existence of tetracycline until it was discovered by our Dr. Lloyd Conover. The government conceded the importance of this discovery.

As to the impact on the Company, first let me say there are several procedural steps to be taken in the trial court and, if necessary, appeals will be taken all the way to the Supreme Court.

With regard to suits for treble damages, here is what this is about: When a company loses an antitrust case—and the case is not "lost" until all appeals are exhausted—the law provides, within certain limitations, that anyone who has been injured as a result of such violation of the antitrust laws can use the final judgment as evidence in a suit for such damages as he may be able to prove. Without trying to get into all the legal technicalities involved, let me simply say that this particular case presents to any possible claimant a number of somewhat unusual and difficult legal questions to overcome. As a matter of plain common sense, whatever the state of the law, it is hard for me to see how or to what extent resellers of these drugs at a mark-up would have suffered injuries or damages. As to sales in areas where bidding was normally employed, the bidding was intensely competitive—a fact which was established in the case. These are not all the problems such claimants would meet, but this may give you some appreciation of the fact that, while the Company may have to face some unusual liabilities, the position of claimants, in this situation, is far from clear. There may be considerable publicity with respect to suits of this type and the damages claimed will more than likely be greatly inflated. This is the usual way such claims are made. However, if any damages at all are awarded or paid, it is fair to assume that they will be substantially less than the original claim.

Therefore as we look at the situation today, we see only that the Company with its great strengths will continue to grow and prosper and that its future is bright.

I know that each of you shares with me a sense of surprise and severe disappoint-

ment that this verdict has been rendered against Pfizer. Let me assure you that our legal staff and outside counsel are all most capable people and that we have every confidence in their handling of the case and its appeal. I know, too, that all of you have a deep interest in the success and growth of the Company and you want to assist in any way that you can at this time. For myself and for you, our best contribution will be simply this: to work together to make 1968 the most outstanding year in the history of our great Company. And let's start with a great first quarter.

My very best wishes to you and your family for the New Year.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. POWERS, JR.

PFIZER TO FIGHT ANTITRUST JURY VERDICT

NEW YORK, December 30.—A jury in the Federal Court in Manhattan rendered a verdict late Friday evening against Pfizer, American Cyanamid Co., and Bristol-Myers Co. in the antibiotics antitrust suit filed in August, 1961 by the Department of Justice. Pfizer today issued the following statement:

"We disagree with and are deeply disappointed by the verdict and we shall continue to fight vigorously for vindication. The verdict, in our view, could only have been based upon unjustified inference and suspicion. Each of the steps taken by Pfizer in marketing its broad spectrum antibiotic products was based upon normal and independent business practices. These facts could appear 'suspicious' only if the existence of a conspiracy were assumed. No direct proof of conspiracy has ever been offered—and indeed no conspiracy existed.

"We at the same time recognize that the jury was confronted with a formidable task. Day after day, it was faced with a profusion of complex facts dealing with chemistry, Patent Office practice, licensing, sales and marketing, economics and accounting. The jury was then asked to apply vague principles of antitrust law to this record of more than 5,000 transcript pages and more than 1,000 pages of documentary exhibits.

"We did not conspire with anyone and we did not monopolize. We made our own decisions, independently and for the best interests of our company—and we believe for the best interests of the public. It is unfortunate that the trial occurred in an atmosphere of unfavorable publicity about the drug industry, emanating over the years and during the trial from Congressional investigations and debates.

"We are not guilty of the charges made against us, and we look forward to pursuing this case further in the courts."

John J. Powers, Jr., president of Pfizer, addressing himself to all Pfizer employees, reminded them that "the case is in the hands of our capable legal staff and outside counsel, and the rest of us should devote our attention to making 1968 the best year in Pfizer's history."

President's Message Marks National Commitment To Fight Crime

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's crime message to Congress is eloquent testimony to his—and the Nation's—aroused desire to eradicate crime.

America faces no more serious problem than its soaring crime rate. Crime's tragic cost is written in wrecked lives, lost

property, unsafe streets, and insecure homes.

While none are untouched with its effects—there has been too much talk and too little action to fight crime. With the President's message today, let America declare—loud and clear—a national commitment to take bold and immediate action to stem the rising tide of crime.

The President's comprehensive anti-crime program will help crime prevention, improve criminal detention, and modernize penal correction. It calls for action at all levels of government—and by all concerned citizens.

We will no longer tolerate the wanton violation of our laws, destruction of our property, and injury to our citizens. We have the President's program for action in hand—let us move swiftly to write it into law.

Poles Contribute to World Culture

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the great contributions to world culture made by the people of Poland over the years have been those in the fields of poetry and prose.

People of Polish extraction in many lands, including the United States, have had occasion during the recent anniversary of Poland's Millennium to recall these outstanding works.

Clearly, Polish poets and writers have played an important role in keeping the spirit of Poland alive in its difficult days of oppression.

Mr. Speaker, a splendid recollection of the great poets and writers of Poland over the years has been compiled by the Polish-American Journal and, with permission, I include the text of the article in my remarks:

GREAT POETS KEPT POLISH SPIRIT ALIVE

Eliza Orzeszkowa, an eminent Polish novelist of the late 19th century, once wrote to Joseph Conrad severely criticizing him for writing in English. Had she lived longer she might have come to realize that the acclaim Conrad received as a Master of English prose was something of which every Pole could be proud.

When another distinguished Pole asked Conrad why he did not use his native language, the author replied: "Sir, I hold our beautiful Polish literature in too high esteem to introduce to it my poor writing. To write in Polish is a great thing. For that one must be a writer like Mickiewicz or Krasinski."

The two poets Conrad mentioned are hardly known in the English-speaking world, yet the brilliant output of these and other superlative writers kept the spirit of Poland alive during the 150 years the country was dismembered by Russia, Austria and Prussia. Conrad's greatest respect for Poland's greatest writers is shared by people of Polish ancestry who this year are observing Poland's Millennium.

Adam Mickiewicz (1798-1855) is the most beloved and supreme Polish poet. His "Pan Tadeusz" ranks probably as the one genuine world epic of recent centuries. In it he drew a marvelous and many-sided portrait of Polish country life and national culture at the time of Napoleon's invasion of Russia. In this and other works—ballads, sonnets, odes and a Promethean dramatic poem,

"Forefathers' Eve"—Mickiewicz kept up the morale of the nation and instilled it with a faith in a better world. He saw the resurrection of Poland linked with mankind's future. Actively aiding the freedom movements of all the nations of Europe, he also founded in Paris the newspaper called "The Tribune of the Peoples."

Zygmunt Krasinski (1812-59) wrote his masterpiece, "The Undivine Comedy," when only 21. While motivated by intense patriotic feelings and although written in 1833, this dramatic work projects a remarkable vision of the revolutionary epoch of the 20th century.

Another contemporary of Mickiewicz, Julius Slowacki (1809-49), also dedicated his poetry to the rebirth of Poland. Slowacki's verse "sparkles with all the colors of the rainbow." In sheer lyricism and linguistic invention, he even surpasses Mickiewicz. His poetic dramas, fantasies and allegorical narrative poems draw psychological portraits of the Poles. In his sublime work, "The King-Spirit," Slowacki traced the working of the national genius in Poland's men of history.

A contemporary of these three romantic poets but ignored in his own lifetime was the proto-symbolist, Cyprian K. Norwid (1821-83), who created an intellectual poetic language adept at handling both abstract and concrete ideas. An apostle of freedom (he has two poems in memory of John Brown), Norwid held that liberation was only a means for him to face his duty to better himself and society.

Poland had many great poets, beginning with Jan Kochanowski (1530-84), whose lyric power was unrivaled before Mickiewicz's time, and the "Christian Horace," Maciej Sarbiewski (1595-1640) whose Latin lyrics were known throughout Europe. Ignacy Krasicki (1735-1801), an archbishop, wrote fables and satires that exposed the laziness, pride and drunkenness of the nobles and bad monks of the 18th century.

Other writers whose works vividly mirrored the ruling classes were Mikolaj Rej (1505-69) called the "father of Polish Literature," and comedy playwright Alexandro Fredro (1793-1876).

Great poets emerged in modern times, including Jan Kasprzowicz (1860-1926), Leopold Staff (1878-1957), Julian Tuwim (1894-1954) and Stanislaus Wyspianski (1869-1907), whose poetic drama "The Wedding" is the most lofty of a number of plays.

Notable among other brilliant poets are Szymon Szymonowicz (1558-1629), Maria Konopnicka (1842-1910), Adam Asnyk (1838-97), Antoni Lange (1862-1929), Casimir Tetmajer (1865-1940) and among living bards, Zbigniew Herbert and poets in exile Casimir Wierzyński and Czeslaw Milosz.

Henry Sienkiewicz (1846-1916), author of "Quo Vadis" and a trilogy dealing with Poland's 17th century struggle against Cossacks, Tatars, Swedes, Russians, Germans and Turks, is the most widely translated Polish novelist.

He and Wladyslaw Reymont (1868-1925), author of the matchless prose epic "The Peasants," won Nobel prizes, but Stefan Zeromski (1864-1925) ranks as the foremost master of Polish prose.

In language rivaling the highest type of lyric poetry, Zeromski's novels depict problems of social evil with great power and realism. His humanitarianism is equalled only by that of Boleslaw Prus (Alexander Glownacki (1845-1912), whose "The Doll" and "Emancipated Women" give unequalled pictures of Polish life in the late 19th century.

A masterful saga of provincial Polish society at the turn of the century is the six-volume "Nights and Days" by Maria Dabrowska (1892-1965). Special mention should be made of Jozef Ignacy Kraszewski (1812-87), half of whose 600 volumes were popular historical novels devoted to the same patriotic goal that Sienkiewicz called "the strengthening of hearts."

Hard Words Versus Hardware

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Frank W. Davis, president of the Fort Worth Division of General Dynamics made a speech dealing with the F-111, a product of his company. I need not call attention to the controversy which has raged over this plane, but I would call attention of each Member of this body to Mr. Davis' speech which in my estimation certainly places everything in its right perspective.

The speech follows:

HARD WORDS VERSUS HARDWARE

(An address by Frank W. Davis, president, Fort Worth Division of General Dynamics)

I would like to take this opportunity to bring you up to date on the F-111 program and to provide you with some background information which, I believe, may be useful.

Perhaps the first question I should answer is why General Dynamics has remained silent since 1963 in the face of such continued harsh criticism of the F-111 program. The answer is really quite simple. We are airplane builders and not debaters; and having learned from the original hearings how much time and effort were required to engage in the debate, we decided against diluting our efforts in what I think would have been a fruitless endeavor. At times it has been difficult to keep our cool, but I believe we are further along for having done so.

You must realize that in this kind of debate, the attacker who has no responsibility for the success of the program is free of any obligation to produce anything to support his position. However, those of us who bear the burden of responsibility and are in a position to know the facts are under obligation not only to observe facts but must ultimately back up our brave words with action and hardware—we have to produce. Since shouts of alarm normally make more news than calm action, any charge, however distorted, is likely to get printed somewhere. Anything going according to plan does not create much of a stir.

If all of this is true, why have we chosen now to stand up and join the battle of words?

The first reason is that the situation has changed. We are delivering aircraft to the Tactical Air Command at Nellis Air Force Base, and the Air Force crews there are doing an outstanding job with the F-111. So, now the hardware is speaking for itself.

It is, of course, speaking through the users. They operate the F-111, they like it, and they are proud of it. So, the difference is that now we have a real airplane in the hands of real pilots, giving a good account of itself, and we believe that the facts will speak louder than the criticisms. We, of course, want to help in the amplification of this voice.

A second reason for opening up is that four years of turning the other cheek has not produced any discernible letup in the viciousness of attacks against the F-111.

To look at the criticism in some perspective, let's see how it started and speculate a little on why it continues. After that I would like to give you some cold facts which you may find useful with your friends.

I heard Senator Jackson say he started the original investigation. Inasmuch as he is from the state of Washington, I think we can surmise that it was on behalf of the defeated competitor, Boeing, even though Boeing says it did not ask for the investigation. He used the investigating committee

of Senator McClellan, of which he is a member, as the instrument for the hearings.

It didn't take long after the hearings started for fireworks to develop between the Committee and the Department of Defense.

Why should this fire be burning as merrily as ever after nearly five years? The simplest answer, and very possibly the most nearly correct one, is that both Senator McClellan and Secretary McNamara are men of great endurance.

But I might add, so are we. And we are on the right side in this contest. What we are doing is constructive. It's dynamic, it's breaking the technological frontier, and it's breaking new ground on many management frontiers.

Now let's list some of the misunderstandings about the F-111 program, and then consider a few facts and figures which will help straighten out these misunderstandings and misconceptions.

Had you listened to the opponents of the program who make all the noise, you would have concluded that our design was second best, that our prices have escalated, that the Navy airplane is hopelessly overweight, that the program is far behind schedule, that the performance is completely unsatisfactory, that the airplane is of questionable safety, that the pilots don't like it, and that commonality is a failure.

Let's go through these items now and see what can be said about each.

Was our design second best? I think not. In scoring the proposals submitted by the competitors, the Evaluation Group, consisting of 284 civilian and military experts, scored General Dynamics over Boeing by 175.6 to 172.1. The Military Source Selection Board took those scores and weighted the various elements to give more emphasis to those of greater importance, and after those sources were added up, General Dynamics was still the winner, 662.4 to 654.2. It's very clear from this that General Dynamics had the best design, not the second best.

If that is so, and I can assure you it is, how has the opposite impression been made? In spite of the fact that the Military Source Selection Board had these scores before it, it chose to recommend Boeing as the contractor. It had every right to do this if it wanted to. This recommendation was endorsed on up the line. This fact has been distorted to give the impression that there was unanimity in the choice of Boeing, except for Secretary McNamara. That simply isn't so. This false notion was then firmly implanted by repetition—saying it over and over again.

The facts of the scoring as I have relayed them to you are buried on pages 1911 and 1912 of the TFX contract investigation. The figures are from the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force. There are a thousand pages of testimony from disgruntled witnesses before the first "gruntled" one took the stand, and that was "yours truly." No wonder it's hard for reporters to dig out the truth when they have deadlines to meet.

As to price escalation, on the F-111 Research and Development program, our bid submitted in 1962 with the proposal was for \$478.9 million for the 23-airplane R&D program. We were put in work under letter contract, and the final price was negotiated in 1964 at \$2 million less than our proposal. That doesn't sound to me like price escalation.

Nevertheless, the R&D program is pictured as having grown tremendously. "Prices have soared," I believe is the phrase which critics have used.

What has happened is that, subsequent to the original contract, the Air Force has added to that contract the cost of developing the ground-support equipment, the cost of spares to support the test program, the cost of the Strategic Air Command and United Kingdom versions, the cost of the advanced Mark

II avionics system for the third wing and on, and many other elements of additional task which will raise the contract value to something like \$1.2 billion. But that isn't price escalation growing out of the program problems as our opponents would lead one to believe.

On the F-111 production program, we made our first firm bid in 1965 for 431 aircraft at \$1.889 billion. A year later, we arrived at a negotiated settlement with the Air Force at \$1.653 billion, over \$200 million less. Sixty-two aircraft were then added, making the 493 currently under contract. That contract was not finally negotiated until 1967, and for the 493 it was \$1.821 billion, or somewhat less than the original bid for 431 aircraft. That happens to be \$3.7 million each for 493 aircraft. But that doesn't include the engines and other government-furnished equipment.

If these are the facts, and I again assure you they are—they are a matter of record—how can the opponents of the program make a charge of price escalation? It's very simple. In 1962 during the competition, the competitors and the Air Force and the Department of Defense all made their separate estimates of what a 1700-airplane program might cost. The assumption was that all 1700 would be just like the proposal design, and they would be built at a certain rate during a certain period of time.

When the opponents of the program want to make the price escalation argument, they usually use one of the planning estimates for the average cost of the airplane and compare it to the average cost of one of the 493 aircraft. An obviously unfair comparison. I would hasten to add, however, that they have some firmer ground in that planning estimates today are higher by a considerable margin than the planning estimates were in 1962. These estimates are redone about two or three times a year for all programs, and unless one considers the planning estimates associated with all other programs as well as the F-111 in 1962 and compares those with planning estimates in 1967, and unless he takes into account the program changes in all programs, which is a very difficult thing to do, a fair comparison cannot be made. Nevertheless, opponents of the program plausibly recite these distorted comparisons to prove whatever point they wish to make.

It has been repeated ad nauseam that the Navy airplane is overweight. This has been projected to all sorts of conclusions. The fact is that the Navy set a weight target in 1961 which was out of reach for an airplane having the characteristics of an F-111B. In trying to meet that target we probably have created the lightest aircraft in history in the sense of having no weight in excess of that necessary to meet the requirements for strength and load-carrying ability. More effort and more money have been spent on weight saving and weight avoidance in the F-111 than in any prior aircraft program. Among other things it was lightweight structures that made it possible for the B-36 and B-58 to do things that many people had declared impossible, and the same designers who did the impossible have been designing the F-111 structure.

From a purely contractual standpoint, we stand somewhere between 7½ and 11 percent overweight. But offsetting this, we have provided a 9 percent increase in maximum lift and an 8.2 percent improvement in weight ratio.

Weight ratio is the measure of structural efficiency having a major effect on aircraft performance. The 8.2 percent improvement in weight ratio provides 27 percent improvement in range. But most important, the Navy says officially that the F-111B will be able to operate from all the carriers it was designed for, and without having to modify the carriers for its weight.

For those who say the program is hopelessly behind schedule, I would point out that we

delivered the first research and development aircraft 11 days ahead of a very tight 25-month schedule. All 23 R&D aircraft were delivered an average of only 17 days behind the schedule in the contract.

Of importance, also, is the fact that we were able to incorporate most of the changes, such as weight improvements, at a point two-thirds of the way through deliveries of R&D aircraft. This kind of change is not normally incorporated until the production aircraft.

The Navy schedule has been and is now primarily keyed to the development of the Phoenix missile system—a very advanced and sophisticated air-to-air system. The development of the aircraft and the development of the Phoenix missile are currently in consonance with one another.

Had there been a requirement for getting the Navy F-111B into service prior to the Phoenix system, I believe we could have met it inasmuch as the Air Force airplanes are being delivered to the inventory right now. The fact that there wasn't such a requirement has allowed time for incorporation of a substantial number of improvements into the Navy aircraft which should make them even better. These include a higher-thrust engine, more visibility over the nose, and some further refinements to the low-speed handling characteristics which are already outstanding.

I recently went aboard a carrier in an A-3, and if the F-111B doesn't go aboard easier than that, I'll eat it.

A number of charges have been made that F-111 performance is unsatisfactory. Let's take a look at some of the performance objectives.

The airplane was to have intercontinental range. It has.

The airplane was to have supersonic low-level penetration capability. It has.

It was to be capable of short-field operation. It is.

It was to provide a highly accurate navigation and bombing system. It does.

It was to provide a nuclear capability and an iron bomb capability. It does.

It was to provide unprecedented reliability and maintainability features. It does.

The airplane was designed to operate at 30 hours per month with a 35-man-hour-per-flight-hour maintenance requirement. In the current "Harvest Reaper" program, airplanes were scheduled for 45 hours per month and have actually been averaging 60 hours per month with some as high as 90.

It was to provide an airplane satisfactory for carrier operation; and while individual characteristics such as low landing speed and good low-speed handling characteristics have been demonstrated, actual operation aboard a carrier will not occur until next spring.

Improved crew safety was also to be provided through the use of an escape capsule. This was first demonstrated successfully in real life on October 19 when Dave Thigpen and Max Gordon ejected from an F-111 and walked away without a scratch.

If we look at the record of century series fighters, we find that in the first 5000 hours of flight the number of major accidents was as follows:

- The F-100 had 7.
- The F-101 had 11.
- The F-102 had 9.
- The F-104 had 14.
- The F-105 had 8.
- The F-106 had 7.
- The F-4 had 6.
- The F-111 had only 2.

If we include this last F-111 accident at about 5300 hours, our record would be three, which is less than half the lowest of any other airplane.

Two major objectives at the beginning of the F-111 program were to provide an improved fighter-bomber for the Air Force and

an improved fleet air defense system for the Navy.

If we compare the F-111 with the best fighter-bomber in service today, we find it provides twice the range, with twice the payload, is 20 percent faster, is 58 percent shorter on takeoff and landings, and provides 8 times better navigational accuracy with its inertial navigation system.

As compared to the next best fleet air defense system, it provides twice the loiter with one and one-half times the missiles. The missiles have three times the range. It provides six times as many kills per salvo. It will operate from 500 miles greater distance with the same bomb load, and its approach speed for the carrier landing is 15 to 20 knots slower.

Another charge is that the F-111 does not meet its specification requirements. Here, let me make a distinction between objectives, requirements, and specifications. I have already cited a number of the objectives of the F-111 program which are currently being met. Let's take one for example: the objective of providing a fighter with intercontinental range. Obviously the F-111 has intercontinental range. It has been flown to Europe without external fuel tanks and without additional fueling from a tanker—this was the objective. The military requirement is a quantitative expression of this objective. A range of so many miles. The requirement is set high enough to take into account operational problems such as headwinds, weather, and provides for landing at a number of different airfields.

Military requirements are set before the proposals are made. Since they must be set several years in advance of the time the hardware appears, they can at best be only an approximation of what inventions and ingenuity can produce. They should be, and generally are, set very high in order to stimulate the highest level of ultimate performance.

Specifications are developed as the design proposal is being made, and thus represent a further refinement in the projection of what the designers may be able to produce in the ultimate hardware. These may or may not exactly match the requirements. In the case of the F-111 the specifications were negotiated by the government buyers, in many cases, considerably above the performance level of the requirements. These specifications become the contract obligations, which the company has to meet. Changes throughout the program to accommodate government-requested modifications, or performance of government-furnished equipment, of course, modify the specifications.

Thus we see that the specifications for development weapons like the F-111 represent targets of excellence based on projections of what we think the state-of-the-art and our ingenuity can produce. We expect the specifications to be set high. There are literally hundreds of them, and in the airplane business as in real life we expect to exceed some, to meet some, and to miss some.

This kind of specification is a very different thing from the kind provided by your architect or contractor when you build a house. With a house, you know that a six-inch thick concrete wall can be constructed. You know that the rafters and floor joists can be of a certain material and spacing; you know the plumbing and electrical fixtures called for can be obtained. This is simply a matter of performing to requirements which you know can be met. With a development program like the F-111, many specification items will appear which no one knows at the time of the writing can be achieved. We do know that if you were to set all of the specifications low enough—so that you could be sure of meeting them—the airplane would be obsolete before the ink was dry.

Let's look now at where we stand on the F-111 program in this context. If we take 20

items of performance, one-half Air Force and one-half Navy, including speed, altitude, and range, et cetera, and compare our performance with the military requirements as laid down in 1962, it appears today we will exceed seven, meet five, and miss eight. Neither the "exceeds" nor the "misses" are very great or critical. If we were to adjust the military requirements for government-approved changes and performance of government-furnished equipment, we would exceed 12, meet five, and miss three.

I explained that the specifications on the whole were more demanding than the requirements, and that specifications are always adjusted for government changes and government furnished equipment. With respect to these, we would exceed seven, miss six, and meet seven.

There were 16 items chosen on which bonuses and penalties were established by the contract. At the present writing, we have won two of these for sure. We may win another. It appears we will tie on seven or eight, and may lose on five to seven.

From this array, I would say two things are apparent. One, the requirements as laid down were not too far off the mark in projecting what the state-of-the-art could produce; and two, as a contractor we have done commendably well against a very demanding set of specifications.

One of the tricks which has been used by foes of the program is to invent a requirement which does not exist. A recent example of this was a statement that the airplane could not fly over Pikes Peak with a full load of bombs in military power. The intent of the statement was to show that the airplane was woefully inadequate in terms of combat ceiling. The fact is that the airplanes in flight test have been consistently bettering the altitude requirements. A full load of bombs for the F-111 is over 20 tons of bombs hung virtually all over the airplane, and I know of no target having the elevation of Pikes Peak which would require that kind of a bomb load. I don't know of a target at all at that elevation.

The other little lulu in this charade is that while military power sounds like it ought to be full power, it is only 45 percent of full power on the TF-30 engines in the F-111. It happens to be the power without afterburning.

Another trick of F-111 foes is to state that the Marine Corps does not want the airplane. The implication is that it's because the airplane is no good. But, in fact, the Marine Corps has never been involved in the F-111. It was not designed for any mission assigned to Marine Corps aviation.

These are just a couple of examples of the kind of fallacies which have been used to attack the F-111 program.

Another one, obviously directed towards the Department of Defense, is that commonality is a failure. The argument is, of course, based on the premise that you can design a special airplane to do a particular mission better than an airplane compromised by other mission requirements. Since this is obviously true, the unsophisticated reader or listener is led to believe that commonality is a failure. Let's look at it.

You, your wife, and four children all need transportation, and it could be held with this logic that the transportation of each individual is best served if he has his own vehicle, specifically designed to his needs. And if you were an indulgent father, and had more money than you could use, you might actually provide this type of transportation. But in the real world, most of us compromise, and somewhere along the line you have a family car, and it does provide satisfactory transportation, and it does not send you to the poorhouse.

In the case of major weapon systems, such as the F-111, the United States is fund-limited. There are simply more ideas of how

to do the job, costing more dollars than the taxpayers are willing or able to supply. It makes sense, then, to develop a weapon to meet a broad spectrum of requirements. In 1967 it is easy to see that the United States, in order to fulfill its commitments throughout the world, needs air weapons versatile enough to meet a variety of threats. We have the Koreans, Lebanese, Cubans, and Vietnamese, to name but a few, posing a different kind of threat and calling for a different level of response. This was recognized when the requirements of the F-111 were laid down.

When this kind of requirement is coupled with the advanced technology represented by the variable-sweep wing, the fan-afterburning engine, and the F-111 avionics, it is possible to produce an airplane of great versatility. Given a design with a higher level of versatility and some foresight, it is possible to envision a basic design developing into a family of airplanes for a wide variety of missions. Thus, we have the F-111A/D for the Tactical Air Command, the F-111B for the Navy, the F-111C for Australia, and F-111K for Britain, the FB-111 for the Strategic Air Command, and probably several versions of reconnaissance 111s.

In the past, versatile airplanes have just happened and in a few cases have been put to use in more than one way—the F-4 is such an airplane. The F-111 is the first airplane built with this idea specifically in mind, and to that end it is successful and commonality is successful. *It takes no genius to recognize that a program for a family of aircraft growing from one common design is less expensive than an equal number of separate unrelated programs.*

A few years ago reliability and maintainability were considered qualitative design features, but they were made quantitative specification requirements on the F-111 with great success. In the same way, versatility was a matter of chance in the past, but it became a specification requirement for the F-111, leading directly to commonality.

It has been charged that pilots don't like the airplane. About 230 different pilots have flown the airplane, or flown in it, and I have yet to find one who did not come away with an increased enthusiasm for the airplane and program.

Nevertheless, accurate quotations have been taken from test pilots' reports indicating a number of deficiencies in the F-111. What is seldom explained is that the test pilot's job is to search diligently for anything about the airplane which can be improved, and the reports must be considered in that context.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Dr. Frosch, put this neatly to bed in a recent speech by reading a group of critical statements from Navy test pilots. They sounded like double-trouble and as though they must be about the F-111. Dr. Frosch then went on to explain that those remarks came from the Navy preliminary evaluation of the F-4 airplane in 1958; and as we all know, that has since become a first-class airplane for both the Navy and the Air Force.

I hope I have been able to give you the background information which will help you to be proud of the F-111, as I am, and as the men who fly it are.

Lithuanian Independence

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 50th year since the tiny nation of Lithuania declared its inde-

pendence and joined the community of free nations.

For the first 20 years, the brave people of Lithuania worked hard to develop a stable economy, educational system, and a free political system. They knew that there could only be a future for their children and their children's children if freedom of choice prevailed in their land.

However, this dream was not to flourish. The Lithuanians, forced through political circumstances and the growing tensions in Europe in 1939, had to admit Russian personnel to erect airbases on her territory. In short order, the Russians engineered a fixed election and on August 3, 1940, occupied Lithuania.

When the Nazis drove the Russians out, it was too late to make a difference to the Lithuanian people. The Nazis were not about to allow the little country to enjoy independence. It was merely a case of exchanging one totalitarian regime for another. Finally, in 1944, the Soviet Union reconquered Lithuania. Since that time the Baltic nation has become another innocent victim of Communist imperialism.

Just as the Soviets tried to destroy other cultures and religions, so they tried to russify the Lithuanians. Through it all, these proud people have fought constant pressures and harassments in order to maintain their own language, customs and religious beliefs. They are a living symbol of the strength of man's faith in freedom, justice and equality.

Let us hope and pray they will soon realize their dream of a free Lithuania.

What Patriotism Means to Me

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an essay by one of my constituents, Susan Arden. Miss Arden, who lives in Westchester, Ill., has written eloquently on the subject, "What Patriotism Means to Me."

I am confident that this young lady speaks for the overwhelming majority of her generation.

The essay follows:

WHAT PATRIOTISM MEANS TO ME

(By Susan Arden)

I am devoted to my country in the same way I am devoted to the people I love. Because I live in a nation whose actions may be influenced by my ideas, there are responsibilities I owe my country. I must express what I feel my nation should do, and follow its actions with concern and interest. I remain loyal toward my country, for I know that its leaders speak on my behalf. Only when I fail to communicate with them, only when I cease to work in maintaining our relationship, will we grow apart. Then the loss will be all mine, and I will be to blame.

I naturally hold pride in my nation's worthy achievements, but I also experience disappointment in its mistakes and anger in its wrongs. But my country is only human in its make-up; its government the extension of

imperfect people, and, as such, subject to their vices as well as their virtues. I stand by my nation, expecting others to do the same, to work for a better today and a brighter tomorrow.

Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of hearing Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien address the 19th annual banquet of the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education in Philadelphia on February 10, 1968. It struck me that his historical presentation of the fight for a higher minimum wage would be a helpful reminder to Members of Congress of some of the progress we have made in this Nation since 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the Postmaster General's address:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE 19TH ANNUAL COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION BANQUET, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., FEBRUARY 10, 1968

Thank you very much, Ed Toohey, Rev. Barnhart, Senator Clark, Mayor Tate and Mrs. Tate, Congressman Bill Green, Congressman Bill Barrett, Congressman Jim Byrne, Congressman Joshua Ellberg.

Presidents, officers and members of organized labor's Committee on Political Education.

I am delighted to be here with so many long time friends and associates tonight.

Perhaps the finest friend of labor as mayor of any city in the nation is a man who has gained a national reputation for leadership and vision—Jim Tate.

You know, next to the Presidency, the toughest administrative job in this country is that of mayor of a large city. Just think of today's problems—rebuilding our cities, providing decent housing, unsmiling traffic, and a thousand and one vital but often thankless tasks—and you can see why being mayor is like swimming up Schuylkill River wearing a cement life jacket—but Jim Tate has certainly proven himself an able and powerful swimmer.

Of course, this city has outstanding representation in the Congress of the United States with Bill Barrett, Bob Nix, Jim Byrne, Joshua Ellberg along with a man who now wears a second hat as Democratic City Chairman, Bill Green. I have worked intimately with all of these great legislators and you can be proud of them. This city, this state and the Nation owes each of these outstanding Americans a great deal of gratitude.

As everyone in this room is keenly aware, Pennsylvania's needs, your needs, are forcefully presented in the Senate of the United States by a man whose energy and commitment to more effective government is unsurpassed. As Chairman of the powerful and important subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senator Joe Clark is in a position to make his commitment to a fair shake for labor count in the right place—and he does just that.

My friends, I want to remind all of you here tonight of a fact that is very well known in Washington, on Capitol Hill and in the White House. Senator Joe Clark's record on labor issues—99%—during the last 11 years is one

of the most outstanding of any Senator any time from any state.

And that, of course, is one of the major reasons why he has received the endorsement of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO for his third term in the Senate. Your President, George Meany, has given Joe Clark one of the warmest endorsements I've ever heard.

"No member of the labor movement," President Meany wrote, "can quarrel with the continuing support you have given forward-looking measures in the fields of education, consumer legislation, health measures, improvements in the Social Security System, housing, and to all other progressive measures we have endorsed."

And when your President closes his letter with a sentiment with which I agree 100 per cent—"With all good wishes for your success in the 1968 election . . . George Meany."

Before I come here today, I spoke with another man who knows how to get things accomplished—President Lyndon Baines Johnson. He asked me to give you a message, and I think it is one worth remembering. "Today," the President said, "many of labor's old battle cries are fading away. The slogans that once fired labor's blood: yellow dog contract, the lockout, the company police, company unions, strikebreakers, blacklisting, non-recognition, arbitrary firing for union activity, starvation wages—have largely vanished. Today, the working man in this country is the envy of the world. Chances are he lives in a nice home—maybe in a suburb. Chances are he knows more about battling with crabgrass than trudging on a picket line. But, though the old drama is gone, though the villains are not so easily spotted, there are still anti-labor forces in this country . . . underground perhaps, but ready to move when the climate is right. The strength that labor enjoys, the power of labor's voice were not inherited; neither were they thrust upon labor. They were won. They were won in battle after battle. They were won through the bitter sacrifices of families who wouldn't give in, who would rather starve than knuckle under. If labor for one moment forgets how it got where it is, if it neglects its own history of struggle, then it is setting the scene for its own decline."

I think that is a message we should all ponder.

I personally remember years ago when Detroit's Cadillac Square was crammed with tens of thousands on Labor Day. Now it is difficult to fill a hall. The crowds are out with their boats on the lake or turning a steak into cinders on the backyard barbeque.

Perhaps there's no longer a need for Labor Day rallies . . . but I think we should all remember that eternal vigilance is the price of prosperity as well as freedom.

I know you haven't forgotten that fact here in Philadelphia. You have proven it—on the record—time after time—at no time more effectively and dramatically than in your recent city election. The effectiveness of COPE is proof that though the old rallying cries may be muted, the spirit is not. It warms my heart to hear the exhortation Register and Vote. As one who likes to consider himself a pro—I salute you—you have proven you are truly pros.

Coming here today on the plane, I heard an interesting conversation across the aisle.

There were two very prosperous and self-satisfied looking gentlemen, and another, not so well dressed or sure of himself. But this third fellow made up in friendliness for his obvious lack of worldly goods.

He tried several times to strike up a conversation with these over-stuffed fellows.

Finally, one said, stiffly: "Name is Scrooge; Republican, retired, married, two sons; doctors." The other followed suit: "Name is Clinkscals, Republican, retired, married, two sons; lawyers."

The little man looked abashed for a

moment and then said slowly and quietly: "Name is Smith, Democrat, still working, never married, two sons—both Republicans."

I also remember another trip to Philadelphia in November 1960, with a young man who was seeking your support, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I wonder how many of you remember the condition of our economy in those days.

Here's how John F. Kennedy described what was then the dismal present and his hope for a better future.

"I believe," he said that night in Convention Hall, "in an America where every man, or woman, who wants to work can find work—a full week's work for a full week's pay; where every man or woman of talent can use those talents; where the waste of idle men and idle machines, of steel mills half shut down, and coal mines boarded up, of chronic recessions and slumps, can be limited; where a growing economy provides new jobs and new markets for a growing nation . . ."

Well, this Keystone State was one of those that gave John F. Kennedy the thin margin of victory. You gave him your votes. And he gave you all that he could give . . . his vision . . . his imagination . . . his inspiration . . . his ability to get this country moving . . . and, finally, he gave his life.

When he was struck down, Lyndon Johnson kept faith with John Kennedy. He took the torch so tragically handed to him. He created the finest monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the kind of monument he would have wished for—the enactment of John F. Kennedy's New Frontier program. And President Johnson did more. He took an economy that President Kennedy had gotten off dead center and moving, and kept it moving. As a result, next month the American economy will reach a new milestone as it enters its eighth year of sustained economic advance, the longest in our history. Each month we see the creation of more jobs, more and higher incomes, rising living standards.

When John Kennedy spoke here in Philadelphia in November, 1960, do you know what the unemployment rate was? Four per cent? Five per cent? Six per cent? Surely, you say, it couldn't have been more than six per cent. But it was. Seven per cent . . . seven per cent of the working force was out of work. That was the legacy left to us by the Republicans.

And do you remember what the minimum wage was back in those days? One dollar an hour. Forty dollars a week.

While still a Senator, John Kennedy worked to increase the minimum wage by 25 per cent. The conservatives were opposed, claiming that \$1.25 minimum wage would cause massive unemployment.

Well, John Kennedy kept his pledge to the nation's working men and women. He managed to get the minimum wage up to \$1.25 . . . and he extended coverage to 4 million more workers.

And what about the gloom-filled predictions of catastrophe? Nonsense, of course. More people having more money meant, as common sense might indicate, that the economy picked up tempo. More jobs were created. No jobs were destroyed.

The Democratic Party under President Kennedy kept its pledge to labor. We could have rested on our laurels. But we didn't.

The very first legislative battle fought by Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson in the Roosevelt Administration was for the initial minimum wage bill. It was almost political suicide in those days for a Congressman from Texas to vote for minimum wage. But Lyndon Johnson not only voted for it, he signed a petition to get action on the bill. The bill passed, and the revolutionary principle of a minimum wage was established. It almost seems funny now that so many conservatives were so frightened about paying a minimum of two bits an hour. That was the first mini-

mum wage. Twenty-five cents an hour. Ten dollars a week.

Well, on September 23, 1966, twenty-eight years after the first law was passed, President Johnson had the pleasure of signing the most recent minimum wage law: Sixty-four dollars a week . . . and coverage was increased by eight million more workers, a thirty per cent increase.

Again, we are not satisfied. As President Johnson said when he signed that law, though he was proud of the moment, "My ambition is that no man should have to work for a minimum wage, but that every man should have skills that he can sell for more."

That is typical of President Johnson's approach to government. While he is justifiably proud of the great accomplishments of his administration, he is not going to sit around reciting history.

The President clearly understands that anyone who tries to win elections by merely reciting the record is misjudging the voter. Yesterday is the past. Tomorrow is what counts.

While many applaud the significant gains of the last several years, most take them for granted, and some even assume they have always existed.

America looks, and rightly so, toward the future. Not what did you do, not even what did you do for me lately? But what will you do tomorrow and next year?

This is the question that is asked. This is the question we must answer.

And the Johnson Administration has its goals for the future. We do have an unfinished agenda. Our program is no less than a new Bill of Rights.

The President feels that Americans have the right to be protected from misrepresentation and sharp practice.

The President feels that every American child has the right to a healthful start in life.

The President feels a more than \$800 billion-a-year nation should be able to afford good housing, that Americans should have a right to live in a decent place of their choice—that every American must have full equality—full opportunity—in every phase of American life.

The President will settle for nothing less than that.

The President feels deeply that all Americans have a right to a job, to be gainfully employed. That's why the President working together with business and labor, seeks to place the half-million hard-core urban unemployed in training programs that will lead to useful work.

There is also a right that Americans must enjoy. The right of safety on our streets. It is President Johnson who first proposed the Safe Streets Act and it is President Johnson who will see it enacted into law.

As the President said in the State of the Union address, "there is no more urgent business before this Congress than to pass the Safe Streets Act this year that I proposed last year. Law and order must prevail."

And finally, Americans must never relinquish their hope of living in a world of peace and security, to enjoy their right to live in peace and security. Americans, because of our position of power, cannot afford the luxury of most other people in the world. We cannot afford to sit on our hands and dream of the wonders of peace. If there is to be a better world, we must work for it, here and abroad. Freedom cannot be an island. It is indivisible. If we lose our nerve, if we accept easy and irresponsible positions, based either on too much force or too little backbone, we are weakening our own freedom and denying freedom to friendly nations in South Vietnam and elsewhere.

This, then, is our hope and our plan—our vision of America's future. We plan to continue working for a better America and a better world. We pray with all our hearts that God will see those plans fulfilled.

Why Lincoln Grew a Beard

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February we honor one of the greatest men that this country has ever produced, Abraham Lincoln. Not only was his life a sage of dedication to national service but it was also filled with countless examples of the man's humanity.

One of these intriguing stories of Abraham Lincoln is retold in the February 1968, edition of the Reader's Digest, in an article entitled "Why Lincoln Grew a Beard." It was first published in the publication "Lincoln's Little Correspondent," by Hertha Paul.

It tells the story of how 11-year-old Grace Bedell, of Westfield, N.Y., wrote Mr. Lincoln in October of 1860 to urge him to grow a beard to help him win votes for the Presidency. Later Lincoln stopped at Westfield, chatted with Grace and assured her that he would, indeed, let his whiskers grow.

It is a charming story and one in which those of us from Chautauque County, N.Y., take great pride. I am pleased to place the Reader's Digest story at this point in the Record:

WHY LINCOLN GREW A BEARD

Though he wore his beard only four years, today we cannot think of Abraham Lincoln without whiskers. He often talked about the little girl in upstate New York who was responsible for the famous beard. Few know her name; there is no mention of Grace Bedell in some of the thickest Lincoln books. But Lincoln himself would tell the story with relish and add, with a chuckle, "How small a thing will sometimes change the whole aspect of our lives!"

Grace Bedell sat in her little attic room looking at the picture her father had brought from the fair. It was not a drawing and it was not a painting; there were neither lines nor colors in it, and yet you could make out every hair on Mr. Lincoln's head and every crease in his clothing. It was the first photograph Grace had ever seen. It gave her an uncanny feeling that the gaunt man himself was looking at her.

Grace's dingy old lamp drew strange, shadowy patterns on the black-and-white photograph. The features seemed to come alive. A frame of shadows lay around the thin face and filled it out. The hollow cheeks were gone. Whiskers!

How becoming, Grace thought. Somebody ought to tell him. She reached for pen and ink and began to write:

WESTFIELD,
CHAUTAUQUE COUNTY, N.Y.,
October 15, 1860.

HON. A. B. LINCOLN.

DEAR SIR: I am a little girl 11 years old, but want you should be President of the United States very much so I hope you won't think me very bold to write to such a great man as you are.

Have you any little girls about as large as I am if so give them my love and tell her to write me if you cannot answer this letter. I have got four brothers and part of them will vote for you any way and if you will let your whiskers grow I will try to get the rest of them to vote for you. You would look a great deal better for your face is so thin. All the ladies like whiskers and they would tease

their husbands to vote for you and then you would be President.

GRACE BEDELL.

At that time about 50 letters a day arrived at the Lincoln campaign headquarters. Only those from friends and very important people got past the two young secretaries, John Nicolay and John Hay. Nicolay in particular went about the job in dead earnest.

John Hay leaned back in his chair, and picked up another batch of letters.

"Now," he said, "the little girls start telling the Chief how to get elected."

"Wastebasket," said Nicolay crisply.

"She has an original idea," Hay grinned. "Thinks he ought to grow whiskers."

"Throw it away and get on with your work, Hay."

"I'll do no such thing, my dear Nicolay. Out of the mouths of babes—"

A stocky, blue-eyes, scraggly bearded man swaggered in without knocking. He said, "Good morning, young fellows," and Hay said, "I appeal to you, Mr. Herndon—"

Nicolay ignored him. "Let's have no more whiskers. No little girl. Let's have a little responsibility."

"Little girl?" Herndon's eyes turned suddenly gentle, seeking the inner door. It was ajar, and Billy Herndon lowered his voice. "He loves them. Can't pass one in the street without stopping to talk to her, and each of them is his 'little sister.' What were you saying about a little girl?"

"I said to drop her into the wastebasket!" Nicolay was thoroughly angry. "And then, Hay, you'd better rush the reply to the governor of Pennsylvania. That is pressing—"

"Why? He's old enough to be patient," said Lincoln's calm voice from the inner door.

And it was not long afterward that Grace got the following letter:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.,
October 19, 1860.

MISS GRACE BEDELL,
Westfield, N.Y.

MY DEAR LITTLE MISS: Your very agreeable letter of the 15th is received. I regret the necessity of saying I have no daughters. I have three sons, one seventeen, one nine, and one seven years of age. They, with their mother, constitute my whole family. As to the whiskers, having never worn any, do you not think people would call it a piece of silly affection (*sic*) if I were to begin it now?

Your very sincere well-wisher,

A. LINCOLN.

Word came that on February 16 a special train carrying the newly elected Mr. Lincoln to the White House would stop at a station near Westfield. The Bedell family arrived to find "Hail to the Chief" spelled out in big letters on a streamer across the tracks and the Star-Spangled Banner flying from the station roof.

As Grace looked around at the swarms of strange people, there was a sudden hush. A thousand ears strained to listen. "Here she comes!"

Grace stretched as high on her toes as she could and saw the top of a black funnel pass slowly behind many heads, hissing and puffing smoke, and then the flat roof of a car, and another, and a third with the Stars and Stripes fluttering over the platform.

A very tall, very black hat, quietly sticking out of a lot of fidgety black hats—this was all Grace could see. Cries of "Speech! Speech!" rose above the din, and Grace held her breath. All around there suddenly was dead silence.

"Ladies and gentlemen," someone said, "I have no speech to make and no time to speak in. I appear before you that I may see you, and that you may see me."

Grace felt ice-cold. It was *he*. She stretched so that it hurt, but all she saw was the wrinkled stovepipe hat.

"And I'm willing to admit that so far as

the ladies are concerned I have the best of the bargain."

Laughter rippled, swelled, burst through the crowd as though a spell were broken.

Lincoln was speaking again. "I have but one question, standing here beneath the flag of our country: Will you stand by me as I stand by the flag?"

Hands and hats and women's handkerchiefs rose into the air amid thundering echoes: "Yes—yes—we sure will, Abe!"

Once more she heard the voice that made you feel you had heard it all your life. "I have a little correspondent in this place," he said. "This little lady saw from the first what great improvement might be made in my appearance. If she is present, I would like to speak to her. Her name is Grace Bedell."

Her father took Grace's hand and led her forward. She went without knowing how, without noticing that a path was opened for them and that they were trailed by pointing fingers and whispers. She went to him who had asked for her by name.

There were steps ahead, and her father gave her a boost up to the platform in sight of a thousand people, up to a pair of big, blackbooted feet. Somewhere above she heard a slow chuckle. "She wrote me that she thought I'd look better if I wore whiskers—"

He stooped. Grace felt strong hands under her arms. Suddenly, as effortlessly as if she had no weight at all, she was raised high in the air, kissed on both cheeks, and gently set down again. And her cheeks burned not only from bliss but from a scratching.

The thousand people were forgotten. Grace looked and laughed happily, for up there, sprouting darkly all around the rugged face, and covering cheeks and jaw so that only the upper lip remained free, were the whiskers.

"You see I let them grow for you, Grace," said Mr. Lincoln.

Grace could do nothing but look at the tall, gaunt, plain, great man. He took her hand. She heard him say that he hoped to see his little friend again sometime; she understood that this moment had to end. He helped her down the steps and she went obediently, like a good girl, back to her proud father.

Grace heard a shrill whistle, a rumbling and puffing. People cheered and waved after a train that was already far down the gleaming tracks. But in her mind Grace heard only three words repeated over and over: "My little friend."

If you come to Springfield, Ill., today you can't miss Abraham Lincoln's house, plain, white, two-storied, with broad eaves and a fence around it. They say it looks exactly as it did then, outside and inside. Loving care has preserved fixtures and furniture, draperies and knick-knacks. On the wall of one room hangs a piece of paper covered with childish scrawls: "Dear Sir—I am a little girl 11 years old."

Lincoln's carefully penned reply remained in the Bedell family until two years ago when it was sold at auction for \$20,000 by three of Grace's grandsons. The buyer, TV producer David Wolper, is a collector of Civil War memorabilia and a self-confessed "Lincoln fan," who prizes the letter, quite understandably, "from an emotional point of view."

Earl Turner, a Texan, Adds Provocative Views on Current Fiscal Problems

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, every thoughtful American is concerned about

Government spending, taxes, and fiscal problems and policies. In recent months the press has given wide circulation to various viewpoints on these matters of men in and out of government. During the last Congress spending occupied the center of the stage; taxes and spending will no doubt be a battleground of the current session.

I have recently had an opportunity to scan a book by Earl Turner, entitled "Stable Money." Mr. Turner is executive vice president of Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association of Austin, Tex. I find myself in disagreement with many of Mr. Turner's fiscal views but I find the book most stimulating and interesting. Economists and students of Federal budgets and trade and fiscal policy will, in my opinion, find "Stable Money" a provocative approach to the problems which confront us.

No Rise in the Gold Price

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, following the devaluation of the pound sterling and subsequent gold speculation, there has been renewed interest and discussion of the future role of gold in the international monetary system.

Recently Herbert Bratter, Washington correspondent of Banking, interviewed Dr. Paul Einzig and me on this subject. Dr. Einzig argued for an impressive rise in the gold price which would strengthen the position of gold as the keystone of the international monetary system. I contended that gold should remain at \$35 an ounce until such time as it can be demonetized, when its price as a commodity would fall sharply.

On December 12, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] joined me in reaffirming congressional determination to maintain the present gold price.

Yesterday, William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, asserted that an increase in the gold price is "neither necessary nor desirable as a solution to the problem of international payments imbalance or to the problem of assuring adequate growth in international reserves."

I include hereafter the interviews of Dr. Einzig and myself which were published in the Baltimore Sun on January 15 and February 5, 1968, respectively:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Jan. 15, 1968]

GOLD AND THE DOLLAR: ARE WE LOSING THE BATTLE?

(NOTE.—Paul Einzig holds the D.Sc. in economics and politics from the University of Paris and has published well over fifty books, mostly on international finance and money matters. One of the senior experts in the field, he has been since 1945 London correspondent of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of New York. Herbert M. Bratter is Washington correspondent of Banking, the

journal of the American Bankers Association and a frequent contributor to The Sun's editorial page. Mr. Bratter has prepared a series of questions on the current status of and the outlook for the dollar to which Dr. Einzig gives his own answers in the exchange below:

BRATTER. Dr. Einzig, from your ringside position, what are the chances that the pound sterling will hold its new par value of \$2.40 through 1968?

EINZIG. It depends on whether the British government is prepared to make really drastic cuts in public expenditure. (By public expenditure I mean not only government spending but also spending by the local authorities and by nationalized industries.) The main reason why the deflationary measures adopted by the Socialist government between 1964 and 1966 were unable to eliminate the balance of payments deficit and to restore confidence in sterling was that the measures were confined entirely to the private sector of the economy, while the orgy of over-spending continued unabated, indeed on an increasing scale, in the public sector. This meant that, although the deflationary measures adopted in July 1966, were indeed drastic, the inflated purchasing power they mopped up was replaced, and more than replaced by public over-spending.

But if, as I cannot help suspecting, the so-called cuts will only amount to a slowing-down of the increase in public spending, then I am convinced that as soon as the foreign exchange market comes to realize this, a sweeping attack on sterling will develop. In that case the Government will either devalue once more or it will adopt the system of floating exchange rates, and under it the pound will be allowed to depreciate.

BRATTER. What does the pound sterling matter to Americans? The pound and the dollar are not Siamese twins. If the pound should be devalued again this year, would it affect the United States?

EINZIG. It is true, technically that the pound and the dollar are not linked to each other. But the experience of November-December, 1967, when the devaluation of sterling was followed by a heavy flight from the dollar into gold, shows the extent to which the link does indeed exist in practice. If even a moderate devaluation of sterling produced such spectacular effect on the dollar, it is easy to imagine what the effect of a further and possibly more substantial devaluation would be. We must bear in mind that last year only a few currencies of secondary importance followed sterling's example, but in case of a second devaluation many other currencies, some of them of considerable importance, are likely to devalue.

Such a wave of devaluations would leave the dollar obviously overvalued and this would affect the competing capacity of American industries unfavorably. The result would be a widening of the trade deficit in spite of the very drastic measures announced by President Johnson on New Year's Day. The mere anticipation of such a development would be sufficient to inspire a sweeping wave of distrust in the dollar.

BRATTER. Washington has pegged the dollar price of gold, the so-called monetary price, at \$35 an ounce ever since 1934, although few Americans of today have ever seen a gold coin in circulation. Indirectly, the United States monetary price of gold is the world price, although in speculative markets non-monetary gold trades at higher prices. Wouldn't an increase in the official price mean inflation?

EINZIG. It would not automatically entail inflation either in the United States or in other countries. But since it would make it unnecessary for the United States Government and for other governments to defend their exchanges and their balances of payments by resisting inflation, there would be

more temptation to allow inflation to proceed and to disregard its effects on domestic prices.

But then the same effect would be produced through a substantial artificial increase in international liquid resources by the application of the project tentatively approved by the International Monetary Fund at its last meeting. If the amount of reserves is increased, whether by writing up the book value of gold reserves or by creating fictitious reserve units, inducement for governments to keep down the pace of inflation would weaken considerably.

BRATTER. You have long been known as an opponent of a higher price of gold in terms of dollars. Now suddenly you have reversed your position. Why?

EINZIG. Because the abandonment of the defense of sterling's old parity has opened the floodgates for irresistible pressure on the dollar. Each devaluation of an important currency, following on repeated solemn promises that it would be defended, undermines confidence in similar pledges by other countries. Even in the absence of a second devaluation of sterling, the continued defense of the dollar has become extremely difficult and would entail very drastic deflationary measures detrimental to production and to the standard of living.

Until the devaluation of sterling it was my very firm belief that such sacrifices would be well worth making for the sake of international stability. But the change brought about by that devaluation has compelled me reluctantly to come to the conclusion that, in trying to defend the dollar at \$35 the United States is fighting a losing battle. The choice is between devaluation now while the United States still possesses \$12 billion of gold or later after the greater part of that amount has been lost.

BRATTER. Since you now say the United States should raise the price, when and how and by how much do you recommend it do so?

EINZIG. It would be a mistake to raise it to an extent that would leave a widespread impression that this was only the first installment. The unsatisfactory result of a small devaluation of sterling has proved that undue moderation in this respect is a mistake.

Since there has been so much talk about the need for doubling the price of gold the public has come to think in terms of a price of \$70. If the United States must change the price it might as well make an impressive job of it instead of merely nibbling at the problem.

I am for an immediate swift action without any delay, because any delay would cost the United States further billions of dollars in losses of gold. It must be made by unilateral decision. Devaluation negotiated by a conference of international experts is impracticable because its deliberations are bound to leak out and there would be a landslide of withdrawals of gold before the new price comes to be applied.

BRATTER. From the standpoint of your recommendations, does it make any difference whether the price is raised by the Secretary of the Treasury informally through open market trading, under powers which he has, or by formal act of Congress changing the statutory gold content of the dollar which is the United States monetary unit?

EINZIG. As it would take time for Congress to pass a highly controversial act changing the price of gold, the resulting publicity that would inevitably precede the change would produce an even more disastrous effect than the leaks from an international conference debating the subject. By the time the act is passed there would be no gold left in Fort Knox. Informal action by the Secretary of the Treasury is the only practicable solution. Its effect on the actual dollar price of gold would surely be ratified by Congress subsequently.

BRATTER. If the United States follows your advice, what would be the effects on the United States and on other countries and their currencies?

EINZIG. At its devalued level the dollar would attract foreign money once more. There would be dehoarding of gold on a very large scale, as there was after 1934, and much of the gold thus released would find its way back to the United States. Its financial power and prestige which have been on the decline in recent years, would increase once more. Although for psychological reasons it would still be advisable to apply President Johnson's measures—the delay in measures to defend sterling at its devalued rate has jeopardized the success of the devaluation—I am convinced that the restrictions on the economy could be relaxed as soon as the extent of the favorable reaction becomes visible.

Needless to say, sterling and other currencies would have to follow the devaluation of the dollar. As I said above, that need not result in immediate inflation, but it would create the possibility of further inflation. This is the main reason why I was opposed until recently to an increase in the United States price of gold. But even an acceleration of the pace of the rise in world prices would be a smaller evil than the mounting pressure on the dollar and the atmosphere of uncertainty which would develop if a desperate attempt should be made to hold the present price. And the ultimate result would be the same, with the difference that when the United States is forced eventually to devalue it would find itself in a weak position similar to that of the United Kingdom today.

BRATTER. Would it not be detrimental to the prestige of the United States to abandon the resistance to pressure to raise the official price of gold?

EINZIG. Not if it is done now, while decision still rests with the Administration, as an act of deliberate policy, instead of its being forced to abandon the dollar parity as a result of irresistible pressure after the decline of the gold reserve to a level at which a devaluation becomes inevitable. The prestige of a currency, and of a country, depends not on its past record but on its present position and future prospects. In 1931 sterling and Britain came to command incomparably higher prestige after the abandonment of the old parities than during a period when sterling was hanging on precariously to its indefensible parities. In spite of their records for devaluations, the French franc and the Deutsche mark command more confidence today than the dollar.

In any case, while considerations of prestige cannot be disregarded altogether, they should take secondary place when vital interests are at stake. So long as the United States continues to remain on the defensive, its production and its capacity to play a decisive part in international finance and international politics is bound to suffer.

BRATTER. Would an increase in the price of gold not help the Soviet Union?

EINZIG. The extent to which a higher income from the Soviet Union's gold output would help is negligible compared with its benefits from a weakening of the United States through continued loss of gold and through defensive measures handicapping its production and its capacity to help other free nations.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 5, 1968]
GOLD AND THE DOLLAR: "WE SHOULD SCARE THE SPECULATORS"

(NOTE.—On this page January 15 Dr. Paul Einzig, an author and expert on foreign exchange, gave his views on the related questions of gold and the American dollar in answering questions put to him by Herbert Bratter, the Washington correspondent of Banking and a frequent contributor to The Sun. Dr. Einzig predicted that it will be

necessary to devalue the dollar sooner or later and recommended that the United States raise the price of gold now rather than be forced to do so after it has lost the greater part of the gold still in Fort Knox.

(Representative Henry S. Reuss (D., Wis.), a member of the House Banking Currency Committee and chairman of the Joint Economic Subcommittee on international exchange and payments, gives his views below on these subjects in answer to questions from Mr. Bratter:)

BRATTER. Dr. Einzig's first point was that a sweeping attack on sterling is likely to depress the pound substantially below its new parity of \$2.40, causing a wave of devaluation accompanied by distrust in the dollar. Do you agree?

REUSS. In the first place, I am not at all sure that a sweeping attack on sterling will develop. Britain's mid-January retrenchment on foreign commitments, plus its domestic austerity program, gives the pound a good chance to make the grade at the present \$2.40 parity.

But if the pound should be devalued again—and I don't believe it will be—I don't go along with Dr. Einzig's prediction that other important currencies—presumably Common Market currencies—will also be devalued. They would not deserve to be. The International Monetary Fund, if it wants to continue to command respect, should oppose it. I just don't believe that the free world monetary managers have so taken leave of their senses as to contemplate a series of competitive devaluations.

However, if there is another attack on the pound, it must be reckoned with that the dollar would also come under attack, as happened in November-December, 1967, when speculators against the pound got panicky about paper money generally and decided to get into gold. The gold pool lost about \$1 billion the last time. It now has many billions in its hands, and is determined to use it to flood out any speculators. And some sensible interim arrangements by monetary authorities can act as a further deterrent to speculation.

BRATTER. Einzig holds that in trying to defend the dollar on the basis of the \$35 price of gold established in 1934 we are fighting a losing battle. In a decade the United States gold stock has shrunk from almost \$23 billion to \$12 billion. Since we have been losing the balance of payments battle for a decade, should we reconsider our gold policy and double the price of gold?

REUSS. No, we should not double the price of gold. Though we have lost \$11 billion of gold in a decade, that was what our swollen gold supply was there for—to give us a breathing spell while the free world moved toward a better ordered international monetary system than the out-of-date gold exchange standard. The International Monetary Fund's Special Drawing Rights Agreement should be promptly ratified and activated. I believe that it will be, and that we can win the Perils-of-Pauline race to get a better system before our present inadequate system causes too much trouble.

The objections to doubling the price of gold have been extensively stated, and they are still valid:

1. To do so would break faith with the many foreign monetary authorities who have held dollars instead of demanding gold, in reliance on our commitment not to raise the price of gold.

2. If the dollar should become overvalued (and it is currently not overvalued, since traders and investors are delighted to hold it), merely raising the price of gold won't cure the overvaluation, since other countries would also raise the price of gold.

3. Doubling the price of gold would give windfalls to the two unattractive gold-producing countries, South Africa and the Soviet Union, and to the two gold-heavy coun-

tries, France and the United States. It would hurt countries, including Japan, Latin America, Norway, which used dollars rather than gold as their major reserve.

4. Doubling the price of gold would create such an increment in world reserves as to present a real inflationary problem, one that could only be warded off by very drastic domestic measures. By contrast, the increase in the new Special Drawing Rights ("paper gold") of the I.M.F. would be carefully calibrated so as to avoid inflation.

But why talk about the United States raising the price of gold? We aren't going to. Even if a panicky President or a trigger-happy Secretary of the Treasury decided to do it (and I am completely confident neither our President nor our Secretary of the Treasury has the slightest intention of trying to do it), only Congress has the legal power to raise the price of gold. This was made clear by my exchange with the Treasury which is included with the hearings of the House Banking and Currency Committee on the gold cover removal on January 23, 1968. And in a colloquy on the floor of the House on December 6, 1967, the House leaders joined with me in affirming our determination never to raise the price of gold—never to break faith with our creditors, and never to reward the speculators against the dollar.

BRATTER. Assuming that the Government decided to raise the price of gold, if it did so to an extent that it would not be interpreted as only a "first installment," Einzig says, foreign capital would again be attracted to the United States, much gold would be de-hoarded as in 1934, and United States financial power and prestige would be restored. Do you agree?

REUSS. I certainly do not agree that doubling the price of gold would enhance United States financial power and prestige. Just the opposite, we would stand exposed as an international four-flusher who enticed foreign monetary authorities to hold dollars instead of demanding gold, and then double-crossed them. While it is probably true, as Dr. Einzig says, that a doubling of the price of gold would result to some dishoarding from private hoards, who needs gold at such a time? Dishoarding would simply accentuate the inflationary problem that would come about through the initial doubling of the price of gold.

BRATTER. Dr. Einzig says that raising the gold price would not be automatically inflationary, yet even an acceleration in world prices would be less evil than a desperate attempt to hold the \$35 price, which would reduce the United States to a weak position like that of the United Kingdom today. What is your view of this?

REUSS. I don't see anything "desperate" in attempting to keep the monetary price of gold at \$35 an ounce from rising. As soon as Special Drawing Rights are activated—and the sooner the better—gold can be progressively devalued as a monetary reserve. Some nations will prefer to keep it as a reserve, and there is no reason not to humor their antiquarian whims.

But the time will come—I hope sooner rather than later—when all official dollar creditors of the United States will have had an opportunity to take all the gold they want, and we can then move toward disposing of the rest of our gold stock (less whatever we may need for cloak-and-dagger operations, and as a small industrial stockpile). To make sure we keep getting \$35 an ounce for what we sell, we should probably continue as occasional small purchasers of gold at \$35 an ounce so long as we have much of it left.

As a considerable portion of the world's \$45 billion of monetary gold leaves the system, it will depress the private market for gold well below \$35 an ounce—according to some observers to below \$10 an ounce.

This is something that speculators in gold ought to ponder. The United States Congress is never going to raise the price of gold above \$35 an ounce. And the likelihood that gold will be totally or partially dethroned within a few years makes it entirely possible that gold will sink drastically in market value.

Speculators in gold now figure they have a commodity which could go up in price, and can't go down. In fact, what they have is a commodity which can't go up in official price—Congress won't let it—and which may well go down.

In short, I disagree with Dr. Einzig. I don't think we should let the speculators scare us. We should scare the speculators.

Tribute to Miss Polly Bergen in Recognition of Her "Outstanding Woman Executive Award" by the Downtown Association of St. Louis and for Her Accomplishments in the Areas of Human Welfare

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

MR. REES. Mr. Speaker, the world of big business has been, by tradition, a man's world, so it gives me particular pleasure to call attention to an outstanding success achieved by a woman with the courage to enter the highly competitive arena.

I am referring to Miss Polly Bergen, one of Hollywood's most versatile stars and an outstanding actress of international renown in all areas of the entertainment world—motions pictures, television, and music recordings.

As a longtime resident of Beverly Hills, Calif., Miss Bergen, in addition to her multifaceted career, has still found the time to participate in various civic activities as well as in diversified areas of philanthropy.

We of the Beverly Hills-Los Angeles area of California are indeed proud that an important civic organization of a sister American city is paying a signal honor to our own Polly Bergen.

Each year the Downtown St. Louis Association of St. Louis, Mo., selects someone to be honored as the outstanding woman executive in the United States, the ultimate award offered to women in the business world.

This year's award went during this month of February to Miss Bergen, in recognition of her leadership with the "Oil of the Turtle" cosmetics company—a major American industrial organization that grew from an idea into a \$5-million business in less than 2 years.

It gives me great personal pleasure to salute Miss Bergen's energetic leadership and success. Although married to a prominent Hollywood executive, and the mother of two children, she had the initiative to go forward with this new business venture and prove, by her personal leadership, that her talents extend far beyond those of an actress in the world of show business.

In receiving the Outstanding Woman Executive Award, Miss Bergen joins a group of outstanding women who have won this coveted honor in past years, such as Lucille Ball, news executive Pauline Frederick, and Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN. The citation from the Downtown St. Louis Association is a well-deserved tribute to these exceptional women.

It is therefore fitting and proper for us as fellow Americans to join the St. Louis Downtown Association in paying tribute to Polly Bergen and commend her for her outstanding contributions in the world of business and also for her dedication to philanthropic endeavors aimed toward bettering the lives of her fellow man.

David Schoenbrun on Vietnam

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Members of both Houses were privileged last week to hear the articulate and cogent views of David Schoenbrun, known best to Americans as the former CBS chief in Paris and Washington. Mr. Schoenbrun can claim unique knowledge of Vietnamese and Indochinese affairs. He interviewed Ho Chi Minh several times, the first being in 1966. He was the only American on the scene at the crucial battle of Dienbienphu. He attended the Geneva Conference which followed in 1954. He has since traveled repeatedly to Vietnam, most recently as a private visitor to North Vietnam. He currently teaches at Columbia University the only course on the history of Vietnam offered in any college in this Nation.

During his series of meetings here last week, Mr. Schoenbrun spoke convincingly and authoritatively about the great mistake we are now making in Vietnam. I am pleased to report that his appearance was extremely well received, and that he will be returning to Washington within the next 2 weeks to continue his discussions with Members.

I insert in the RECORD one of Mr. Schoenbrun's excellent articles, titled "Vietnam: The Case for Extrication," in which first appeared in the February 6, 1967, issue of Christianity and Crisis, and has been circulated widely since then. The article follows:

VIETNAM: THE CASE FOR EXTRICATION

(By David Schoenbrun)¹

Most of the men who rule Saigon have, like the Bourbons, learned nothing and forgotten nothing. They seek to retain those privileges they have and to regain those they have lost.

¹ David Schoenbrun is perhaps best known for his reports from Paris on both radio and television for CBS News. A combat correspondent with the First French Army in World War II, he was decorated by the French Government with the Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre. This article is reprinted from the Columbia University Forum, Vol. IX, No. 4. Copyright 1966 by the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York.

In Vietnam only the Communists represent revolution and social change. The Communist Party is the one truly national organization that permeates both North and South Vietnam. It is the only group not dependent on foreign bayonets for survival. For its own strategic and political ends the United States is thus protecting a non-Communist Vietnamese social structure that cannot defend itself and that perhaps does not deserve to be defended.

Our responsibility for prolonging what is essentially a civil conflict may be one of the major reasons for the considerable amount of confusion, guilt and soul-searching among Americans over the Vietnam war. I simply cannot help worrying that, in the process of waging this war, we are corrupting ourselves. I wonder when I look at the bombed-out peasant hamlets, the orphans begging and stealing in the streets of Saigon, and the women and children with napalm burns lying on the hospital cots, whether the US or any nation has the right to inflict this suffering and degradation on another people for its own ends.

I agree with the paragraphs above although I did not write them. They are composed of sentences excerpted from a much remarked-upon article in *The New York Times Magazine* (Oct. 9, 1966) "Not a Dove, But No Longer a Hawk" by Neil Sheehan, who has been covering the Pentagon since returning from Vietnam last August.

Neil Sheehan is not a Nervous Nelly, not a Peacenik, not a Vietnik, not even anything so supposedly un-American as an intellectual. He is a professional reporter who once "believed in what my country was doing in Vietnam," but who, as of October 9, 1966, no longer believes. Along with many of his fellow citizens, he goes so far as to "wonder" whether his country "has the right to inflict this suffering and degradation on another people for its own ends." His is the cry of anguish of an honest man who has gone far toward the realization that his country is doing something very wrong. He has not yet gone that one vital step further to the only attitude that has both practical and moral importance: the willingness to right the wrong. His cry of anguish ends with a whimper: "Despite these misgivings I do not see how we can do anything but continue to prosecute the war"—and with a pious prayer: "I hope that we will not, in the name of some anti-Communist crusade, do this again."

A professional reporter myself, with long experience in Vietnam, particularly the larger region—Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos—once known as French Indochina, I read Sheehan's article with strong emotion: admiration for the sweep and depth of his reporting; respect for his distress and soul-searching; bemusement as to why he did not include more of these facts in his daily reports from Vietnam; finally, a hot flash of anger at his grotesque conclusion that we must continue to prosecute an evil war that cannot be won. How many readers, like myself, clutched at their sanity as an otherwise lucid writer concluded that there is no way out of a frightful mess other than to dig deeper into it?

A PERSONAL AND NATIONAL DILEMMA

If this were Neil Sheehan's personal dilemma it could easily be dismissed in light of his valuable documentation. But the greater value of Sheehan's article is that it so fully reflects a national dilemma, broad and deep across the country and, indeed, within the government itself. I have met and talked with many Neil Sheehans, in the White House, in the State Department, in the Congress and in lecture tours, symposia, teach-ins and other public and private discussions of the Vietnamese war. At the Bankers Association of Omaha, the Community Center of Oak Park, Ill., the World Affairs Councils of Buffalo, Philadelphia and Chicago, the Forum of Miami, the Merchants Club of Dallas; from

Garden City to Beverly Hills, from Minneapolis to New Orleans, in almost one hundred meetings with some hundred thousand people I have heard this same cry: it's a dirty war but we're stuck in it.

All of the evidence that I have seen, including analyses of the opinion polls, indicates that an overwhelming majority of Americans wants an end to the war. What clouds the issue is that the majority is divided into three groups: those who think the war can be ended by an all-out escalation, those who think it can only be ended by de-escalation leading to negotiation, and finally—perhaps the majority of the majority—those citizens neither hawk nor dove, who, as Sheehan correctly describes them, are confused, feel guilty, and let themselves be pulled into deeper waters by the powerful tides.

Of all the conflicting attitudes this war has stirred up perhaps the most extraordinary is one that every lecturer and teacher knows well; it astonished Senator Robert Kennedy on his recent trip to the Far West, when he was addressing the student body of a West Coast university. He told them that he was opposed to the student deferment system, which favors those who could afford to go to college. He was almost hooted off the platform. Startled at the outburst, Kennedy then asked the students whether they favored greater escalation, and they roared their approval. Such twisted thinking can be summed up: More War Without Us—or escalation without participation.

I have run into this attitude in every part of the country and not just among students. In Omaha, the executive vice president of a bank told me that he hoped we could hit hard enough to get it over before his son was drafted. Another man told me he had advised his son to study a special branch of science that would require four years of postgraduate study. "In the meantime let's bomb the hell out of them and get it over."

Get it over, get it over, is the cry heard across the nation. For some it is a cry of personal fear. For some it is a cry of moral anguish. For most, I am afraid, it is only a cry of anger—a howl of frustrated pride that has little to do with morality and everything to do with proving America's power and saving Uncle Sam's face. This attitude is most frequently expressed in the statement: Maybe we shouldn't have gotten into this, but since we have, we must see it through.

Perhaps the most prominent spokesman for this view is General Eisenhower, whose recent reversal of attitude reflects this widely held position. In October, 1966, Eisenhower said we must do everything necessary to wage the war successfully, and he refused to rule out even the possibility of using atomic weapons. Yet I heard General Eisenhower talk very differently two years ago.

I visited Eisenhower at his farm in Gettysburg, on August 25, 1964, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Paris. In the course of a talk lasting several hours the General reminisced about the French Indochinese War and the pressures he had put upon the French to conduct it differently. They could not rally the people to their side, he recalled, adding that no white, Western nation could win a colonial war in Asia. He then talked about our own dilemma in Vietnam and his decision to give economic aid to Ngo Dinh Diem to help them resist Communism. "That's the only way it can be done," Eisenhower told me. "We can only help them to help themselves." He thought then that we could not and should not try to do their fighting for them. Today he thinks differently and the reason is surely evident: our massive commitment to defeat Communism in Vietnam has in Eisenhower's view created a new situation.

Eisenhower has not contradicted himself. He now believes that the context has so changed that we need no longer concern ourselves with what changed it; perhaps we should never have gotten involved, but there

is no point in dwelling upon past history. Historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. apparently agrees. He began his article "A Middle Way Out of Vietnam" in *The New York Times Magazine* (Sept. 18, 1966) by stating: "Why we are in Vietnam today is a question of only historical interest. We are there, for better or for worse, and we must deal with the situation that exists. . . . Our stake in South Vietnam may have been self-created, but it has nonetheless become real."

THE VALUE OF LOOKING BACKWARD

Nothing could be more dangerous than this kind of thinking. The point in examining the past is not to cry over spilled milk or to indulge in useless blame-finding, but to find out what went wrong and why so that we might see more clearly, first, how to put it right and, second, how best to answer Sheehan's prayer that we don't do it again.

To illustrate the value of looking backward in the dispute, let us examine the question of the nature of the war, particularly the issue of aggression. The Johnson Administration talks constantly of North Vietnamese "aggression," sometimes simplifying it to "Communist aggression." Over and over at the Manila Conference, and in its final communiqué, aggression was the word used to describe the war. If we simply accept this charge without checking it against the historical record—that is, if we persuade ourselves that "now" is unrelated to "then"—it will be almost impossible, I believe, to find the way to peace. Hanoi will certainly not enter negotiations as the "aggressor."

Examination of the record would show a situation very different from today. (Is that why we are so often urged to forget it?) Certainly Hanoi is taking aggressive action now in sending regular soldiers to fight in South Vietnam. But Hanoi's view, which is accepted by most observers outside the U.S. is that the original provocation was committed by the South Vietnamese and by the U.S. in jointly refusing to carry out the provisions of the Geneva Accords. North Vietnam did not send troops south until after the American build-up.

Hanoi has been reacting to both the American intervention and the refusal of South Vietnam to hold free elections. It is also reacting to the usurpation of power by a military clique that is not representative of the Vietnamese people, and not even of the South Vietnamese, since Premier Ky and his principal aides are refugees from the North.

It does not invalidate these facts to argue that Ho Chi Minh does not represent the people either, or that what we are facing is some new kind of internal aggression. That is precisely what all the turmoil has been about. From the very start there has been a civil war among the Vietnamese, not a Korean-like aggression by the North against the South. And if this fundamental truth cannot be accepted, then any kind of an honorable settlement is beyond hope. You can't settle a fight if you do not know what it is all about.

I do not speak of history only from hindsight. I watched all of this happen. I was at the Battle of Dienbienphu; when I saw the Chinese mortars going into position on the crest of the hills above the valley, I knew I was watching the end of the era of Western dominance in Asia. I flew from Hanoi to Saigon to Geneva with Prince Buu Loc, then Prime Minister of South Vietnam. I covered the conference and interviewed the principal actors. They came to the conclusion that Western powers could no longer determine the flow of history in Asia; that the best that could be expected for the West was an independent, neutralist Vietnam, Communist but not a satellite of China.

I have come to believe that period deserves the closest study by American citizens, not because errors were made or evil done intentionally, but because the leaders of our coun-

try, Eisenhower and Kennedy in turn, either were not aware of the dynamics that would follow from their decisions or discounted the dangers too readily. If we turn our backs on the dynamic process that led us, without intent, into a war we know we should not be fighting, how will we avoid making the same mistakes in the future?

Our predicament began with the judgment of John Foster Dulles—a correct judgment—that Ho Chi Minh had become so popular a national hero that he would win free elections by a big margin (80 per cent, President Eisenhower estimated in his memoirs). Every informed observer concurred. It was not the judgment that was wrong, but the conclusion Dulles drew from it. Dulles decided that we must organize an Asian equivalent to NATO, support an anti-Communist leader in South Vietnam and stall off the free elections provided by the Geneva Accords. This led to Eisenhower's letter to Ngo Dinh Diem, our selection as anti-Communist champion, offering economic aid.

Eisenhower then believed that the South Vietnamese needed only our friendly help and guidance. This policy was based on America's brilliant success in Europe, where the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and NATO combined to provide the fruitful use of economic aid under a military shield against external aggression. The error, of course, was the assumption that a policy that had worked in industrialized, technologically advanced, white, Christian Europe could also work in rural, backward, yellow, non-Christian Asia.

We also failed to understand how the mechanism of our program of aid leads inexorably from butter to guns. We start with the simple proposition that Communism is evil and should be stopped from spreading. Therefore anti-Communists must be helped. When we give economic aid, we soon discover we must also provide technological help.

To persuade Congress and the people to give tax dollars the anti-Communists are described as fighters for freedom. When they fail to carry out our proposals for reforms, the fact is hidden because more aid must now be given to prevent their collapse. The investment in aid and technical advisors becomes so great that soldiers are sent to protect it. The soldiers are shot at, so they are authorized to shoot back. The Communists strike harder to prevent the American program from shoring up the adversary. More soldiers are sent and bases are built. Once our honor and power are committed, it becomes our war. And once it becomes our war, then we devise new rules. Thus an Eisenhower who once believed that only Asians should fight an Asian war can two years later approve an American commitment greater than the commitment of the South Vietnamese themselves.

FROM LUCIDITY TO ABSURDITY

How can we avoid the dynamics that lead from economic aid to all-out commitment? The mechanism that springs the trap is our unilateral programming. By giving aid directly, we directly involve our flag, prestige and power in the success of the recipient, and so become the servant of a Chiang Kailsh or a Marshal Ky—men who stand for the very opposite of the democratic cause we suppose we are defending. If instead we gave aid through international organizations—the World Bank and OECD are two of many—we might find a palliative for the ills of our foreign aid program. We could commit American dollars without committing the American flag.

Maybe then we would not find ourselves in situations that inevitably become polarized into the fatal alternatives: victory or defeat. This false dichotomy is what leads a Neil Sheehan from lucidity to absurdity. He and many other Americans see only a con-

tinuation of the war or a "precipitate retreat, degenerating into a rout." Or, as I have heard it said again and again across the nation, "we can't turn tail and run." Of course that isn't the answer; the trouble is, it isn't even the question. The real question is how to find a middle ground between victory and defeat. Is there, as Sheehan suggested, really nothing to do but make a bigger mess?

It is at this point that a huge dense cloud seems to descend upon even the clearest-thinking Americans. We cannot seem to perceive the shape of that middle ground. Mr. Schlesinger called on us to find it in his *Times* article, but he did not describe exactly where it might be found. He saw no reason for "our reluctance to follow the Laos model and declare neutralization, under international agreement, our long-run objective," but he only proposed de-escalation and put major emphasis on our need "to regain our cool." President Johnson too employed this in-cliche in his Princeton address when he urged his critics not to blow their cool.

But here I lose my own cool. It seems to me singularly inappropriate for anyone conducting a major war to accuse others of being overheated. Has President Johnson kept his cool in Vietnam in dropping more tons of dynamite on that tiny country than were dropped on Nazi Germany in World War II? Are doves really more hotheaded than hawks? Is there some intrinsic virtue in keeping cool before so tragic and cruel a war as this? Indeed isn't it about time to get hot about demanding an end of the war? It is said that Senators Wayne Morse and J. William Fulbright hurt themselves badly by losing their cool. Perhaps they did. But they have also done their country a great service, and were it not for men like them, we might still be awaiting responsible nationwide discussion of the Vietnamese and Chinese issues.

It is at this point that I feel only an intense anguish for the crisis of my profession and of my country. I know that Neil Sheehan is not the only reporter to suspect that he had been fooled, not the only correspondent to be torn between the realization that the war is corrupting us and a failure to see any honorable way out of it. I watch my colleagues agonizing about it, struggling to keep cool, but ending up by stepping away from the truth. They denounce the war but advocate that we continue to prosecute it. It is not that the press is cynical, but it seems paralyzed by the war, an avowed mistake, the correction of which appears so difficult and costly that it seems easier just to continue it.

Many fellow countrymen, like my colleagues, recognize the mess but cannot agree on how to clean it up. Some advocate greater peace efforts; others, the plurality, greater efforts to win. Both doves and hawks agree, however, on the desirability of ending the war swiftly. Hardly anyone has much stomach for Johnson's policy of a long, hard war.

IS IT TOO LATE TO REVERSE OUR ERROR?

It is at this point that someone inevitably asks: what can be done about it? I would suggest first of all that we stop using such loaded words as withdraw or retreat. Our problem is rather to extricate ourselves from a difficult position, not to fight our way out or to turn tail and run. To extricate ourselves would require a lot of truth-telling. Yet very few Americans even try to examine what others think is the truth.

We charge China with being aggressive and expansionist, but most of the world believes that we are the expansionist power. American soldiers, businessmen, and technicians are seen almost everywhere in the world. Hardly a single Chinese soldier is seen outside China, and few Chinese diplomats or technicians are seen anywhere. We believe we are not expansionist because we clearly do not covet territory, but we fail to see that others regard the extension of influence on a global scale as a new form of expansionism. They do not

believe that we are in Vietnam only to prevent a South Vietnamese Communist victory of a South Vietnamese military clique. They have long believed—and feel their suspicions confirmed by President Johnson's Asian tour—that the US, a Pacific power, now has a new objective: to extend its power from the Pacific to the continent of Asia.

I have never believed that America's vital interests were at stake in the Vietnamese civil war. I have never accepted the correlation between Munich and a settlement in Vietnam. Mao Tse-tung is not a Hitler, nor is Ho Chi Minh his servant. North Vietnam is not a powerful imperialist nation like Germany. If Ho is comparable to any European, he is the Tito of Asia. That is, a national Communist, at the head of a small state, trying to keep independent of an enormous Communist neighbor—in the case of Tito, Russia, in the case of Ho, China. If we can live with Tito to the tune of one billion dollars of aid, why is it so unthinkable to live in a world with Ho? Why do we fight for the South Vietnamese when we did not go to war for the Freedom Fighters of Hungary or for the East Germans? By what logic do we now offer more trade and closer relations with Russia and all of Eastern Europe but feel we must make war in Vietnam?

The crux of the matter is this: should not the Vietnamese have been permitted to determine their own fate in the first place? And is it now too late to reverse that error? Can we not return to the basic principle of the Geneva Accords: the creation of a military cease-fire and the beginnings of a negotiation among the Vietnamese themselves by themselves, between the NLF and Saigon in the South and also between South and North?

THE ANSWER: NEUTRALIZATION

It seems to me to be possible and certainly desirable for the US to change its role from belligerent to interested party, one among many who have an important stake in peace in Asia, Japan, India and Pakistan surely should be associated with efforts to end the war and encourage negotiations among the Vietnamese. The only way such negotiations could succeed and produce an enduring peace would be to quarantine Vietnam off from the world power competition, that is, to neutralize it.

By "neutralize" I mean something comparable in spirit and form to the neutralization of Austria. All foreign forces—Russian, American, French and British—were withdrawn from Austria. The Austrians drafted a constitution under which the country would not enter into a military alliance with any foreign power. This did not preclude many forms of cooperation between Austria and the West. Austria was neutralized but not neutral. This represented a real sacrifice on the part of the Russians for they were pulling out of a country they knew would henceforth be Western-oriented even in its neutralized state. They did not, of course, withdraw very far—just across the border to Hungary.

But we would not be very far off from Vietnam either, if we withdrew as a result of a treaty of neutralization. Our Navy and Air Force control the seas and air of Vietnam. And we have a firm base of operations in Thailand. There would be no great strategic danger of a phased withdrawal as a result of a negotiated treaty of neutralization. South Vietnam, without direct American military engagement, might not be able to maintain itself as a non-Communist state. The Communists might well be the dominant element of a coalition government. But which is the greater danger to America and the world: a nationalist-Communist Vietnam, neutralized by an Asian treaty, guaranteed by the great powers, or the current danger that Vietnam might become a world battlefield?

I feel strongly that it is possible to bring about a situation now where all foreign forces can be withdrawn, and Vietnam first,

neighboring countries later, brought under a general great-power agreement to guarantee the neutralization of Southeast Asia. Britain has already indicated it would approve. So has Russia. General de Gaulle proposed the neutralization of Southeast Asia as far back as 1964. Eventually, and the sooner the better, China would have to be brought into the great-power agreement. There can never be any stability in Asia without Chinese consent—certainly not now that China has become a nuclear missile power. There would still be great problems. Neutralization would not solve any of the internal problems of the states in Southeast Asia, but it would solve the external problem, which is becoming the gravest problem in the world.

Neutralization is not a blueprint. No detailed plan would be of any real value today in any case. What is more immediately important than a plan is a change of attitudes and of objectives. If it becomes more important to Americans to end the anguish of this war than to continue it, there will be no problem finding a plan. Plans are, after all, only ways of carrying out what one wants to do. If we want to end the war, to keep Southeast Asia from becoming a world battleground, to neutralize it for everyone's safety, then the detailed plan will easily be found.

Neither a plan nor a prayer would be meaningful except in the service of a new policy.

Homeownership: A Congressional and Republican Initiative To Meet Certain Aspects of the Urban Housing Problem

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress has had a spotty record for developing programs originated by the study and efforts of its own membership. All too often this Congress has given priority to legislative leadership coming from the Executive of our Government. However, one of the few conspicuous examples of healthy congressional resurgence is in the area of low-income urban housing.

Beginning at once in the first days of the 90th Congress in January 1967, Senator CHARLES PERCY, of Illinois, took the floor of the Senate to unveil a new plan for low-income homeownership. By April 20, 1967, all 36 Republican Senators followed him in introducing the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. At the same time, led by my able colleague, Representative BILL WIDNALL, of New Jersey, over 100 Republican Congressmen sponsored the bill in this body. Surprisingly, this was the first major piece of urban housing legislation introduced in a Congress, all of whose membership campaigned for election in the wake of the urban riots of 1966 and a further crisis in 1967.

The National Home Ownership Foundation Act placed new emphasis on four major principles. First, that there should be, whenever possible, homeownership, as this provides a basic and healthy self-confidence and pride in people. It makes them savers and investors. This is translated into improved upkeep and further improvement of their homes. Second, that there should be a continued emphasis, rather than a deemphasis as is

so often the case, in Government programs on the involvement of the private sector and the utilization of the private enterprise system to meet social problems. Third, that there should be more coordination of the various programs designed to help low-income groups. The NHOFF in supplementing homeowner assistance can concomitantly provide guidance in job training and employment. Fourth, that individual self-help and participation in community projects is primary and that governmental programs are ancillary. They should support, and not supplant, efforts undertaken by the individual and local private groups.

The administration, speaking through Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver, issued a negatively critical statement the day after the introduction of the bill which notably offered no additional proposals on behalf of the administration. The legislation subsequently submitted by the administration in the area of housing was the old programs warmed over, extension of public welfare programs, model cities, and rent subsidies.

Fortunately the Congress, most notably the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, forged far ahead of the Executive in the area of low-income housing needs. The extensive hearings of that subcommittee in July of 1967 resulted in a bill (S. 2700) containing many major provisions of the original National Home Ownership Foundation Act. Specific provisions of S. 2700 traceable to the congressional NHOFF initiative are, interest payment subsidies to lower the cost of homeownership for low-income families, broad assistance to neighborhood organizations, expanding opportunity for "sweat equity"; namely, allowing the homeowner to contribute his labor as down payment on his home, reimbursing lenders for the unusual expenses in initiating mortgages for low-income families, and the establishment of a federally chartered National Home Ownership Foundation.

Significant differences can be found in S. 2700 from the original Percy-Widnall proposal, but the homeownership initiative has taken hold and the dialog in the concept is growing. Noting the administration's default, the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee, in our statement on the President's economic message, unanimously agreed that "more is demanded than mere lip service to the concept that our private institutions and State and local governments must be given new incentives and mobilized to play a key role in meeting our public problems." In direct response to "our cities, seething with discontent and the possibility of civil strife" we then urged the adoption of the National Homeownership Foundation Act.

In the July 1967 hearings before the Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Secretary Weaver gave mild endorsement to the homeownership concept. Because of this switch of positions, certain expectations were raised that the Johnson administration may soon present to Congress a housing message emphasizing homeownership. I certainly hope it does.

"The Vulnerable Russians"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent episode of Hanoi's attacks in South Vietnam bears all the hallmarks of carefully calculated psychopolitical warfare. In essence, the broad campaign against the cities of South Vietnam was far more psychological and political in objective than military. This is an important lesson for us to learn both in the present and for the future.

The new book on "The Vulnerable Russians" shows the background of this type of warfare in the case of the Soviet Russian totalitarians and, through them and their specialized schools in this warfare, the cases of all other Communist functionaries, including Ho Chi Minh. Authored by Dr. Lev D. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book is simply written, revealing in numerous ways, and consistently documented. With broad perspective, it shows the foolhardiness of viewing Vietnam, Korea, or any other part of the Red empire in divorce from the power center; namely, Moscow itself.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work.

The excerpts follow:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

—JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Imperialist Russia exerts every effort to discredit the annual Captive Nations Week observances held in this country. In the United Nations, through its various propaganda media, by diplomatic pressure toward accommodation for its empire, and even in the form of alleged letters from once-free officials in the captive nations, colonialist Moscow strives to achieve this objective. A year does not pass without a heavy barrage of invective against the observance, for, indeed, every observance has served to reinforce the Captive specter over Moscow.

Circles within and outside the United States, which strive to appease Moscow, over-emphasize the political consequences of foreign aid and propagate falsehoods and exaggerations about substantial changes in the Soviet Russian Empire, have been contributing heavily to this dangerous tendency. Fortunately, there have been many other determining events to offset this tendency toward false coexistence.

The Izvestia interview and Stevenson in the U.N.

For instance, there was no reason for the President to assert, "Now we recognize that today the Soviet Union does not intend to permit reunification, and that as long as the Soviet Union has that policy Germany will not be reunified." As one of our leading columnists put it, "This unnecessary concession will dash the hopes of the German people and indicate to the world that the United States accepts indefinitely Communist domination not only of East Germany, but of

Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and of the other captive nations of Europe and Asia." * * *

Worse still are the concepts and conceptions revealed by Kennedy in regard to our chief adversary. These aspects have been completely overlooked by otherwise critical observers and analysts. There can be no doubt about Moscow capitalizing on them. First, the President could have displayed a more valid understanding of the Soviet Union when, with reference to World War II, he said: "I will say that the United States also suffered, though not so heavily as the Soviet Union, quite obviously." We can well imagine Adzhubei's reaction to the more valid answer: "... though not so heavily as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Georgia, and Russia." As a matter of fact, the non-Russian nations in the USSR suffered far more in the war than did the Russian.

Further assertions by the President that the "Soviet Union is a strong military power"—and that "no one is ever going to invade the Soviet Union again. There is no military power that can do that"—not only furnished a propaganda bonanza to the totalitarian Moscow regime but also betrayed a serious unfamiliarity with the military history of the Russian Empire and with what essentially constitutes "military power" in any empire. These, too, were plainly gratuitous and detrimental statements which can only give comfort and encouragement to the enemy and depress the hopes of the captive nations, especially those in the Soviet Union.

In sharp contrast to Kennedy's conception of the Soviet Union, Stevenson's memorandum on Soviet Russian colonialism described Moscow's empire as being barbaric and as enslaving nations in the Soviet Union as well outside it. To be sure, the President in his brilliant UN address raised this signal: "Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe." But, judging by the *Izvestia* interview—not to mention other examples—his measure of fullness failed to approach the conception disclosed by Ambassador Stevenson. This example of comparative strides in the development of a captive nations awareness, consciousness, and even an ideology is seen over and over again.

Why Captive Nations Week?

The annual Captive Nations Week observances in this country represent marked strides in the cultivation of captive nations consciousness and ideology. In connection with examples similar to that given above we may well ask ourselves, "Why do we need a Captive Nations Week?" From time to time many people have asked, "What is the significance of this Week?"—"What do you hope to accomplish by it?" Complete answers to these questions require a number of preconceptions and perspectives such as appear in the immediately succeeding chapters.

Considering the first requisite on the nature of our own nation, one cannot but recall President Kennedy's remarks concerning our revolution: "We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution." If you will re-read the clauses of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, you will be impressed by its initial emphasis on the revolutionary symbol of American independence. This symbol cannot be anything but a living and dynamic one, signifying strong motivation to action itself. And such concrete action does not mean passive living "by example" or a mere model.

Many who give purpose and direction to the Captive Nations ideology are living evidences of the history of Sino-Soviet Russian aggression. As Calvin Coolidge once said,

"Whether one traces his Americanism back three centuries to the Mayflower or three years to the steerage is not half so important as whether his Americanism of today is real and genuine." Whether many of these citizens are products of the Hungarian Revolution, the free voices of a conquered Poland, the escapees of a Russian-genocided Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia, past fighters of a Ukrainian or White Reuthenian underground, or past victims of tyranny and oppression in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Germany, Yugoslavia, or in the Caucasus and Asia and now Cuba—or indeed, freedom-loving Russians who have found a haven here—their Americanism is no less than that of those born and reared here. Together we share a common conviction about the nature and independence of our nation.

We have not even begun to tap the enormous potential of non-Russian nationalism within the Soviet Union. The insecurity of Moscow's imperio-colonialist domination over the captive non-Russian nations, from the Danube to the Pacific, would be permanently sealed and intensified once we seriously begin to direct the paraphrased words of President Kennedy to the peoples of the two dozen-plus captive nations: "Fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man." Regrettably, in relation to the captive nations in the aggregate these words have yet to be expressed with implementative intent.

Lest we forget, above everything else Moscow craves to have its captive world undisturbed and neglected by the Free World. This is much of the motive behind its unremitting efforts toward negotiations. But it should be obvious that we must never allow this imperio-colonialist power to consolidate its far-flung empire. Moscow's haunting insecurity about the captive nations is our great weapon in the Cold War, not to speak of a hot war. Nor must we ever forget that the field of the Cold War is also Eastern Europe and captive Asia, not just the Free World. More, it is a war not only between the imperialist centers of Moscow and Peking and the Free World, but also between the captive peoples and the colonialist puppets and satraps imposed on them. Thus, terms such as "Communist nations," "Communist peoples" are pure nonsense.

As in Poland, Hungary and elsewhere, there is a serious colonial problem within the Soviet Union—in fact, more so by far. Khrushchev showed his concern about this when he attacked those "who say the Soviet Union's Asian Republics are colonies." If this problem were emphasized more and more in the forum of world opinion and attention, the proper characterization of Russian Moscow as the last major and more powerful imperialist power in the world would be devastating to its propaganda and cold war efforts. The Kremlin well understands this and rants endlessly. However, too many in this country still remain puzzled and bewildered by all this. We have muffed our opportunities on this score before, and we do so now.

Our opportunity will be seized once we actively recognize a number of basic truths. The first is that the issues of colonialism and imperialism in Moscow's empire are prime targets for our national concern and effort. The second is the fact that the Soviet Union, which pretends to be an equal of the United States, is an empire in itself, holding in bondage the captive nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossackie, North Caucasia, and Idel-Ural.

There is no agency in government or private life that continually and persistently studies and investigates all of the captive nations. We have desperately needed such a body. Both in the 1961 and 1962 observances, as well as in subsequent years, calls for a Special Committee and the passage of the Freedom Commission Bill were vigorously voiced. We shall surely continue to lose the Cold War until we decide to develop a cold war strategy and apparatus. The Red totalitarians have theirs.

* * * What we failed to do at the beginning of the 1950's with regard to the European captive nations, we must do now with regard to Cuba. The fact of a new captive nation existing at our doorstep should awaken us to the need of forming units of Free Cuba, prepared for guerrilla warfare and the process of liberating Cuba. The National Captive Nations Committee, which from Washington guides the nation-wide observances, was severely criticized when it first designated Cuba a captive nation. A year later in his October address on Cuba, President Kennedy himself used the term.

* * * In the meantime we virtually leave the enemy's vulnerable areas untouched, e.g., Turkistan and the Caucasus. There are over thirty million Moslems in the USSR who deserve our closest attention and whose significance for the entire Islamic world is immense.

Captive Nations Week action has also been directed at the restoration and extension of the Champion of Liberty Stamp series. Over the years the goodwill impact of these stamps had been well demonstrated. The decision of our postal authorities to downgrade the series is mystifying and even irrational, especially when many fighters for freedom among the captive nations should be appropriately honored.

The nature and the meaning of the Week, then, are manifested in these and other ideas, projects, proposals, and actions. There is no question that in time most of them will be realized. They stand in the best interests of our nation, for the survival of freedom, and for the avoidance of a cataclysmic hot global war. From decades of experience and evidence colonialist Moscow knows best that it cannot trust its own armed forces. This was shown in World War I, World War II, and in Hungary in 1956. The momentous conflict of our day will not be resolved by military arms but, instead, by non-military means, primarily in the field of psychopolitical propaganda.

The 50th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Don Cossacks

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, we will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Don Cossacks. Unfortunately, the Cossacks are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is prohibited by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day for the Don Cossacks, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

The February 16 declaration of independence by the Don Cossacks was fol-

lowed by a similar proclamation by the Kuban Cossacks on May 5, 1918, but these valiant people were subjugated by the Red armies. The Cossacks still maintain, however, a defiant attitude toward Communist attempts to absorb them into the Soviet Union because of their strong tradition of self-government and nationalism.

In addition to commemorating national days such as this, Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. Therefore, I reiterate my plea for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations and also for lengthier and more effective broadcasts to the brave Cossacks by the Voice of America.

The Arnheiter Case: A Plea for Review

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a recent column by James Kilpatrick entitled "The Arnheiter Case Won't Die." This column appeared in the February 14 edition of Newsday as well as other papers throughout the country.

The careers of two naval officers are involved in the Arnheiter-Alexander cases and the relationship between the Department of the Navy's actions with respect to these two men is at best vague.

Congressman JOSEPH RESNICK of New York, our distinguished colleague, has introduced a House resolution proposing the formation of a select committee to conduct an investigation of this case. The syndicated columnist James Kilpatrick also states a convincing case for a thorough review of this matter by the Congress.

I place in the RECORD at this point the text of Mr. Kilpatrick's column for the information of my colleagues:

THE ARNHEITER CASE WON'T DIE
(By James Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy has begun to return fire in the Arnheiter case, and a good thing, too—for it suggests that the top brass who have closed ranks in this sad affair are feeling pressures that may yet produce the full public airing that is urgently needed.

For those who just came in: Lt. Cmdr. Marcus Aurelius Arnheiter, 42, is the gung-ho naval officer who took command of the USS Vance, an aging destroyer-picket ship, in December of 1965. It was his first command, after a brilliant performance as executive officer of the USS Ingersoll. It was also his last command. Ninety-nine days later, when his ship arrived at Subic from combat patrol off Vietnam, Arnheiter was summarily removed from command. He has since been beached in San Francisco, and passed over for promotion. His career has been utterly destroyed.

Now, it may seem strange, at a time when so much is going on, for a columnist to return to the Arnheiter case. But if a gross injustice has been done to even one career officer—and a great many responsible persons are convinced that Arnheiter is a pathetic victim of cumulative blunders—the

story of this one man ought not to be buried in topical news.

Until this past week, the Navy has preserved a stony silence on the Arnheiter case. Secretary Paul Ignatius was suggesting, deadpan, that there was no direct relationship between the Arnheiter case and the abrupt "resignation" of Arnheiter's articulate defender, Captain Richard G. Alexander, as prospective skipper of the battleship New Jersey. For two months, the official line was that since Arnheiter had filed certain legal proceedings in California, the Navy could say nothing.

Now the Navy is insisting publicly that Arnheiter had his day in court, that the verdict against him was impressively reviewed, and that his "derelictions" abundantly justified the decision to deny him further command assignments. Without questioning the sincerity of these gentlemen, it has to be said that many an outside critic, after searching review of the case, will flatly disagree.

If Arnheiter were as completely in the wrong as the Navy now contends—if the case were all that black against him—it is bewildering that so many respected voices should have been raised in his behalf. Vice Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, now retired after 51 years in the Navy, reviewed the entire Arnheiter file and gave the young officer complete support. Rear Adm. Dan Gallery has angrily described Arnheiter's ordeal as "the old story of bigshot professionals covering up each other's mistakes." Vice Adm. Lorenzo Sabin concurs. Even more significant, perhaps, is the eloquent testimony of enlisted men who served on the Vance under Arnheiter. They knew what Arnheiter sought to achieve.

And what was this? The evidence is convincing that Arnheiter inherited a sloppy ship, infested with cockroaches, suffering from miserable morale and lax discipline. He had one month before going on the line. In this month, he sought by admittedly Draconian measures to build a taut warship out of an easy-going pleasure yacht.

Hearsay charges against him were circulated behind his back. He lost his command before he could say one word in his own defense. The Navy never lifted a finger against the junior officers who fomented disloyalty. In the light of the Navy's own regulations, it is incredible that an officer's career could have been so ruthlessly destroyed on such flimsy evidence of such trifling allegations. Why did it happen?

So far as the Navy is concerned, Arnheiter is dead. His only hope for vindication lies in a congressional investigation, or in constant pressure by the press. He is one man, gravely wronged. So was Dreyfus.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot pass judgment on the Department of the Navy's actions in this matter, but I do believe the facts in this case should be aired and reviewed.

A New Secretary General for the OAS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recent election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is a significant event. It has broken a 3-month deadlock over the election of a new Secretary General. The final solution was a compromise that took the efforts and influence of all OAS members equally and heralds a more effective working arrangement between the

United States and the Latin American members. It brought Galo Plaza Lasso, an exceptionally well-qualified man, to take a position of authority and responsibility. Mr. Plaza is noted with high praise in editorial comments of both the New York Times and the Washington Post as a statesman of strength and sensitivity, and an administrator equal to the opportunities and the responsibilities of the Organization.

The OAS is fortunate indeed to have a man of his quality as its new Secretary General both because of his personal ability, and because it marks the OAS for a stronger future and the opportunity to deal creatively and effectively with some of the problems before it.

The editorial comments follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

THE OAS COMES OF AGE

The Organization of American States has worked itself out of a leadership crisis in a way that opens exciting possibilities for a more active, more significant, future. In breaking a three-month stalemate over the election of a new Secretary General, the O.A.S. Council opted simultaneously for several objectives.

It clearly reflected the long-held desire of a majority of the 22 active member governments for an expanded O.A.S. role in promoting hemispheric cooperation and solidarity. It did so by electing Ecuador's talented Galo Plaza Lasso, a man uniquely qualified to administer those greater O.A.S. responsibilities and to make the most of them.

In the process, the council also served notice on recalcitrant Governments—the United States included—to get on with ratification of the amendments adopted a year ago by the American Foreign Ministers. These spell out an important part of that enlarged O.A.S. activity and responsibility.

Mr. Plaza, the ablest President in Ecuador's history and a seasoned United Nations mediator, survived handicaps and humiliations to win the O.A.S. post. He had been tagged—unfairly—as the United States candidate, and he also had to contend with the hopes of small Central American and Caribbean countries that they would elect one of their own.

None of this should handicap or inhibit Mr. Plaza when he takes office in May. At 62, he is a ruggedly independent but sensitive statesman who sought the job only when convinced that most member nations wanted a "strong, dynamic, creative" organization with an executive to match. He understands the United States well, but a more unlikely errand boy for the Johnson Administration would be hard to conceive.

The Central American group has been satisfied by the designation of Salvador's able Miguel Rafael Urquiza as Assistant Secretary General. For giving up that number two post, the United States will be asked to name a new Assistant Secretary-General for Administration with a view to tightening up the whole O.A.S. operation and thus guarding against the financial irregularities that added to the Organization's crisis last November.

As things have turned out, Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was off base last week in accusing the United States of "inept diplomacy" in its support of Mr. Plaza. Instead, the quiet pressure-free diplomacy of Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz paid off in a way that seemed impossible two months ago.

The result was that the O.A.S. Ambassadors themselves worked out the compromise solution that now seems to please most of them and that opens new vistas for the Organization. For once, as one observer put it, the United States played throughout the

role of "partner of the enterprise rather than boss of the enterprise."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1968]

OPPORTUNITY AT THE OAS

The election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is as important for the way it was done as for what it does. With enough effort of the right sort by all the members of the inter-American system, it may well turn out to be the best thing that's happened to the OAS and to political life in this hemisphere since the principle of multilateralism was first introduced.

What it does is place at the head of the OAS a man of stature and energy who has been President of his own country, Ambassador to this country and an effective United Nations trouble-shooter in Cyprus, the Congo and Lebanon. It is not too much to say that he is very probably the best man for the job—and therefore, by past practice, the last man likely to get it. He got it the hard way, on the sixth ballot, after three months of political and diplomatic tugging and hauling in as honest a demonstration of the democratic processes at work as the hemisphere system has ever seen.

What was different about the way it was done this time was the way the United States played its hand. The traditional approach (still very much accepted by some State Department professionals) has been for the United States Government to pretend publicly to have no preferences, while twisting arms unmercifully behind the scenes on behalf of a captive candidate. This time, thanks largely to the refreshing influence of an able amateur, Ambassador to the OAS Sol Linowitz, who is anything but a traditionalist, the United States made no big secret of its admiration for Galo Plaza, but employed persuasion rather than the familiar power play. The Latin American members of the OAS were given time and opportunity to exercise their own influence, individually and collectively, on the result. That it was a sensible result is no mark against the other leading candidates, Eduardo Ritter-Aislan of Panama, and former Foreign Minister Falcon Briceño of Argentina. Rather it is a mark of increased maturity for the system as a whole.

A strong Secretary General means a stronger inter-American system, and a brighter opportunity for all of the members to grapple together, to greater effect, with the momentous political and economic problems of the hemisphere. Above all, a stronger OAS opens opportunities for the Latin Americans, if they have the wit and the will, to work in their own interests and in the interests of the hemisphere as a whole on a more equal footing with the United States.

Restrictive Travel Tax Threatens To Hurt Positive Efforts To Cut Travel Deficit

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one part of the administration's program for reducing the deficit on international travel by \$500 million in 1968 is an intensification of efforts to attract more European tourists to the United States.

The Industry-Government Travel Task Force, headed by former Ambassador Robert M. McKinney, is expected to make its recommendations to the President within a few days. Increased European

travel to the United States is almost universally recognized as the only long-term solution to the travel deficit consistent with the United States' traditions and liberal objectives.

But we must also rely upon the positive approach to correcting the travel deficit in the short run. We may well doom our efforts to increase European tourism to the United States if we harness them to a travel tax on Americans aimed at reducing the dollar earnings of Europeans by \$250 to \$300 million.

In a January 31, 1968, letter to Ambassador McKinney, Hugo Mayr, general manager for North America of Swissair, describes the steps already taken by Swissair to promote European tourism to the United States. He expresses the willingness of Swissair to continue to cooperate in stimulating travel to the United States and recommends increased promotional activities by the U.S. Travel Service as well as measures to reduce travel costs within the United States.

He observes, however, that such measures "must be free to work in a prevailing atmosphere of international good will. For, if the approach of the U.S. Government should be a combination of constructive measures linked with a restrictive policy for travel to Europe, it would be strictly self-defeating. One can hardly expect that European nations would be receptive toward traveling to a country which, through restrictive legislation upon its own citizens, is depriving the friendly European countries of the income vital to their own national economy."

I include the text of Mr. Mayr's informative letter:

SWISSAIR,

New York, N.Y., January 31, 1968.

Mr. ROBERT M. MCKINNEY,
Chairman, Industry Government, Special Task Force on Travel, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: At the outset let it be known that Swissair and Switzerland are thoroughly cognizant of the tremendous gravity of the United States' balance of payments deficit and the drastic consequences which may be expected should it continue to increase. The President's proposals do indeed contain a sting for a company such as ours, but we feel—as we did in the past—that we have an inherent responsibility toward doing our part to maintain world confidence in the stability of the dollar at all costs.

In 1965, when the travel industry first came under scrutiny as a possible source of improvement to the gold drain crisis, we took immediate and positive steps to counteract the apparent disparity in tourist spending by Americans in Europe as opposed to European tourist expenditure in this country. Although we had been effective marketers of travel to the U.S. for many years already, we called an emergency meeting of our top sales, advertising, and marketing executives from Europe in New York which resulted in the creation of our highly successful "Visit U.S.A." Department, with branches both in our Zurich headquarters and New York. In addition, we established a separate advertising budget of a quarter of a million dollars strictly for "Visit U.S.A." advertising programs. This amount, which represents a third of our entire advertising expenditure in Europe, is exactly the amount spent by the United States Travel Service for all advertising in Europe. The inequity of a situation wherein an airline company of our modest size invests the same amount to promote travel to the U.S. as does the arm of

a government which annually earns close to two billion dollars in tourist receipts is immediately obvious. Nevertheless, as a direct result of our revitalized efforts we have succeeded in bringing the ratio between the percentage of our European passengers to the U.S. and our American passengers to Europe into much closer proportion.

Ten years ago, 70% of our traffic on the North Atlantic consisted of Americans traveling to Europe. Today Swissair passengers originating in this country represent only 54% of our total traffic on this route. And the trend toward a continued closing of this gap is definitely indicated. In the year just passed, Swissair carried some 70,000 European visitors to these shores. It is also interesting to note that of our total passenger increase on the North Atlantic in 1967, two thirds originated in Switzerland. Thus, it can be plainly seen that Swiss traffic to the United States is growing at twice the rate of U.S. traffic to Switzerland.

To appreciate this in proper perspective, one must realize that such dramatic development is done in a marketing area of approximately ten million population; for our potential marketing area in Europe consists primarily of Switzerland, southern Germany and northern Italy. This is in sharp contrast to a potential market here of some two hundred million. Furthermore, we are proud to say that on a per capita of population basis Switzerland generates the second largest number of citizen visitors to the United States of any nation in this world.

On the other side of the ledger, let us take a look at what the United States is doing in a positive way toward the development of new visitors from abroad. Five years ago, it founded the United States Travel Service. It is rather difficult to determine exactly how much of the subsequent increase in European visitors to the United States is directly attributable to their efforts, but it is certainly no coincidence that since its inception traffic from Europe has been growing at the rate of 20% annually as compared with an average growth of 9% annually in the ten years previous. Despite such apparent success, the Administration has consistently tightened the purse strings on this new agency, and its present budget is a mere three million dollars. Switzerland itself spends nearly as much in promoting abroad a nation one-seventeenth the size of Texas. It is quite clear to us that this inequitable situation should be rectified. If the United States feels that a solution must be found to eliminate the "real" deficit in the balance of tourist payments between Europe and the U.S. of \$380 million as demonstrated in the excellent study released by the American Express Company, we feel they should limit themselves to strictly positive methods, such as expanding the efforts of the USTS. At the same time, the Government in cooperation with the domestic travel industry must take some realistic and constructive steps toward making a visit to this country both attractive and economically feasible to the middle class European. Special hotel rates, reduced rate packages, further airline reductions domestically must all be met by an improvement in facilities for assisting the foreign language traveler in a mono-lingual country.

We at Swissair are quite willing to consider directional fares at a future date—but we certainly do not feel that the airline industry should pick up the complete tab. We would like first to see evidence that others are contributing their rightful share of the burden. And if such steps are subsequently taken by all the responsible parties, they must be free to work in a prevailing atmosphere of international goodwill. For, if the approach of the U.S. government should be a combination of constructive measures linked with a restrictive policy for travel to Europe, it would be strictly self-defeating. One can hardly expect that European nations

would be receptive toward traveling to a country which through restrictive legislation upon its own citizens is depriving the friendly European countries of the income vital to their own national economy. So it is that we can only hope that the United States will reject the restrictive measures proposed and surge forward with positive steps to attract Europeans to this great land.

In the meantime, Swissair intends to continue the reinforcement of its own marketing strategies. In addition to our normal advertising expenditures for "Visit U.S.A.", another move this year will be to send over a group of some 200 European travel agents for an indoctrination on the potential of this country as a tourist destination. We shall continue our long-standing policy of purchasing U.S.-manufactured aircraft exclusively, and paying for them with fully-convertible Swiss Francs backed one hundred and forty per cent by gold. In 1968, we shall spend some 63 million dollars to do business in this country.

Even with a healthy growth rate, we shall realize a mere 30 million dollars in traffic revenues. In other words, we shall continue to assume a considerable portion of responsibility in closing the travel gap. With the conviction that measures which we consider unwise will not be taken, we shall move ahead in the true spirit of free enterprise and democratic ideals in fervent hopes that solutions to your nation's financial crises will be successfully found elsewhere.

Sincerely yours,

HUGO K. MAYR,
General Manager for North America.

The Public Conscience

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk in recent months about the deep danger in which this Nation finds itself—at home as well as abroad. We are being told on every side that a democratic society cannot correct the social injustices which we have inherited from earlier periods when the concept of human equality and dignity were less fully accepted as a part of the meaning of this country. Some—not many, but some—who believe strongly in the concept of equality tell us that our system cannot achieve it, and that we must turn violently to some other system of government and economics. Some—not many, but some—tell us that we cannot have both freedom and equality and that to preserve freedom for those who enjoy it now, we must give up trying to find justice for those who have been denied both freedom and justice.

I am convinced that both extremes are wrong. Those who despair of democracy's ability to serve the ends of justice are as wrong, but no more wrong, than those who think the justice would cost too much and that the comfortable majority can continue to ignore the plight of those who do not share in the Nation's affluence.

There is excellent reason for this conviction of mine, Mr. Speaker. The President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, and later in his manpower message to the Congress, pledged the prestige and power of his office to a

massive program to find employment for the hard-core unemployed. And the labor movement and a substantial segment of the business community have responded alike to the demands of our grave internal crisis. The Urban Coalition, which will soon have the benefit of the superb leadership of John Gardner, now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has continued to speak for enlightened labor and enlightened business in trying to find ways to bring to reality the magnificent potential of our system of government and our system of economics for the benefit of every American.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, and of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, speaks, I believe, for both groups in a recent editorial which appeared in the January-February edition of Agenda, the magazine of the IUD. In the same magazine, an article by Henry Ford, president of Ford Motors, speaks to the same subject. I include both these articles at this point in the RECORD:

A RENEWED CALL TO THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE

(By Walter P. Reuther)

Throughout history, man has built great cities and seen them destroyed—sometimes by natural catastrophe, more often by his own hand.

Rome was burned, and so was Chicago.

Forces deep within the earth destroyed Pompeii and San Francisco.

The most urgent problem facing the United States as we begin 1968 is to find ways to prevent forces deep within the minds and hearts of men from erupting in a frenzy of rage and frustration that will result in the destruction of our great cities.

Everyone who was shocked by the riots of 1967 knows that our cities can be destroyed. Buildings can be leveled, physical facilities can be blown up and vital services can be disrupted. But there can be an even greater destruction of the tolerance and mutual dependence which make it possible for great masses of people to live together in harmony in a small space.

This potential damage to the human spirit is far more frightening than the destruction of property. Property would be replaced despite the tremendous cost because the city is indispensable to modern civilization. But large-scale rioting, looting, burning and killing, with its attendant overtones of racial and class warfare, would tear asunder the fabric of our free society and set social progress back several generations.

Every concerned American knows that this could happen.

As one American, I believe it likely to happen unless there is a massive, determined and effective attack on the root causes of unrest and violence.

Much is being done; much more, in fact, than most people seem to realize. It's being done by many Americans of different philosophy, occupation, political belief, color and religious conviction. They are working side by side in a great emergency effort to bring jobs, decent housing, better education and just plain hope to the poor and discouraged.

More is being done than ever before, but only because so little was done before. What we're doing is not enough, and it falls far short of what can and must be done. We need to raise our sights as a people and a nation. We need a deeper sense of national commitment, a greater sense of national urgency and a more realistic and responsible allocation of our national resources.

But while recognizing that we can and must do more, nobody, including the President and the Congress, should underestimate the significance of the social and economic

forces that have joined together to find solutions.

These combined forces are best represented in the Urban Coalition—an ad hoc committee of leaders of business, labor, civil rights, religion and city government. The Coalition was formed at an emergency convocation in Washington last August, following the riots in Detroit, Newark and other cities. Men who in their ordinary occupations were considered on different sides sat side by side in common dedication and purpose.

At that time the United Automobile Workers were in the middle of tough contract negotiations with the Ford Motor Company. Everyone in the room knew of the tense situation that prevailed between the two organizations. Yet Henry Ford and I both addressed the group, and each of us tried to convey our conviction that the people in that room must join together in an urgent effort to save the cities.

I opened my own remarks by saying: "Henry Ford and I are on opposite sides of the negotiating table right now, but on this issue we are on the same side of the table."

The business community must make a positive and meaningful response to its own obligations within the Coalition. Several major corporations have already drastically revised their hiring practices and many are actively recruiting workers in the ghettos who had previously been considered unemployable. The speech given by Henry Ford before the Urban League in December, which is reprinted in this issue of *AGENDA*, rings with a sense of concern and responsibility which not long ago few people would have expected from a leading businessman.

Other segments of the Coalition, including labor, civil rights, religion and city government, are also working hard to meet the problem.

More and more local communities are facing up to their own responsibilities. To date, local urban coalitions have been formed, or are in the process of being organized, in 27 cities in every part of the country. Others have displayed an active interest in getting their own programs going.

But in final analysis we can begin to meet the problem adequately only if private and local efforts are accompanied by a bold and massive effort by the federal government.

The public sector is lagging far behind, and the blame rests squarely with the United States Congress. The first session of the present Congress did little toward providing effective solutions to the urban crisis. Essential bills were either not enacted at all or were so mutilated and circumscribed as to be of little help.

The second session of Congress, meeting in this election year, must move promptly and positively on a wide range of social and economic proposals to provide real help and hope to the poor of our cities.

Congress must act now—forcefully—or we may all live to remember their failure and regret the dire consequences.

THE HARDEST NATIONAL TASK

(By Henry Ford II)

(NOTE.—At a conference of the National Urban League in New York City last November 17, the chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Company presented a thoughtful address about a national problem of major proportions, excerpts of which are presented here.)

All of us are united by our deep concern over three intertwined problems—the decline of our great cities, the persistence of poverty in the midst of plenty and the explosion of racial unrest and discord.

It is good to be reminded that the bewildering tangle of problems we face is reducible, in large part, to one problem, which can have only one answer.

That single problem is the absence of opportunity for millions of Americans.

And that single answer is the creation of opportunity for every American.

It is already clear that the summer of 1967 will prove to be a turning point in the history of our nation's long and halting quest for equal opportunity. After the holocaust which swept Detroit and Newark and other cities last summer, things can never again be the same. Whether they change for the better, or for the worse, remains to be determined.

Whether our nation harvests the crop of opportunity or the crop of fear and hatred depends, in the first instance, on our willingness to see things as they really are. Then, on the basis of the facts, we will need to work out a drastic reordering of our national priorities.

The achievement of genuinely equal opportunity is, in fact, the most urgent task our nation faces. It must be placed first on the national agenda, and it must be given the massive commitment of material resources and human effort it requires.

The truth is usually more complicated than it seems, and the truth about equal opportunity is no exception.

Privileged Americans believe, by and large, that substantial progress has been made against poverty, racial discrimination and urban blight. They are right, and they are understandably bewildered when they see progress greeted by impatience, anger and violence. By many measures—including income, occupation, education and political representation—progress toward equal opportunity for Negroes has been hastened markedly in recent years.

Dispossessed Americans believe, however, that equal opportunity is still a distant dream. They, too, are right and they are understandably angry and impatient to close the gap. All the measures which show that the gap is narrowing also show that it is still very wide. And the narrower the gap becomes, the more outrageous it seems that it should exist at all.

In some ways, moreover, the gap has not been narrowed. Many Americans—white as well as black and rural as well as urban—have been left behind by progress. The gains of the great majority only make the burden of poverty all the heavier for those whose lives have not improved.

Within both the white community and the Negro community there are now fundamental disagreements over priorities. The reason why these splits have occurred, it seems to me, is the failure to see that the coin has two sides.

Poor Negroes are encouraged by extremists to believe that orderly progress within the structure of American life has not happened and can never happen. When this message is believed, the only alternatives that seem open are insurrection or withdrawal from white society and the establishment of a separate Negro nation within a nation. But these, of course, are not real alternatives. Insurrection can lead only to anarchy and repression. Withdrawal can lead only to continued poverty and denial of equal opportunity.

White people, too, are deceived by extremists who refuse to see the other side of the coin, who encourage them to believe that Negro unrest is the product of agitators, that equal opportunity has been achieved and, indeed, that Negroes are rapidly becoming a privileged class. When this message is believed, violence again may seem to be the appropriate response. At the very best, the fruit of such misconceptions is indifference and tokenism.

We are caught in the crossfire between these two extremes. The common ground we seek to defend is not moderation, but what Whitney Young calls "responsible militancy." Our goal is not moderate progress, but the fastest possible progress toward genuinely equal opportunity.

To achieve that goal, we must, of course, earn the confidence and support of the people

we are trying to help. We must listen—really listen—to their grievances and aspirations. We must help them find ways to transform destructive and random protest into constructive and practical action. We must help them discover a sense of influence over decisions that affect their lives. We must try to give them the outside assistance they need without robbing them of the will to do for themselves what no one else can do for them.

One other thing we must not do, however, is suspend our own judgment and good sense.

We must not let the poor be persuaded that their problems can be solved without the support of people and organizations that have money and experience in the ways of politics and power. We must not surrender, out of some misplaced sense of guilt, to the voices of fantasy and hatred that are now being raised in the name of black power. If we do, we are guilty of the worst form of condescension. Even worse, we are guilty of standing by while the chance for real progress slips out of reach.

I believe that victory can be won. We have already come so far that the remaining problems are of manageable proportions. It is entirely possible to eliminate all but the most stubborn vestiges of poverty in less than a generation, if only we can summon the will and the wisdom to make the necessary effort.

We are not making the necessary effort now. The new alliance between municipal governments, business, labor, community agencies and the poor themselves—which is manifested in the Urban Coalition, the New Detroit Committee and similar organizations in other cities—is a very hopeful sign.

But, while much more is being done at the local level, many in Congress are unwilling to escalate the struggle against poverty at the national level.

Quite apart from the cost of the war in Vietnam, there are many signs that our national priorities are in disorder.

Consider the direct effect of public policies on the incomes of poor people.

About half of the people who are below the poverty line, as defined by the federal government, receive no payments of any kind from any level of government. But almost all of them pay taxes which have been estimated to total about \$6 billion per year.

When the net effect of public policies is to reduce the incomes of at least half of our poorest citizens, something is wrong with our priorities.

I cannot attempt to explore that whole vast area of priorities for equal opportunity, but I would like to discuss briefly the question of priorities as they relate to employment opportunity. I choose this one aspect both because I believe it is the most important, and because it is the one I know most about.

I have no doubt that the first priority for equal opportunity should be the maintenance of a high level of economic growth and demand for labor.

Almost as important as the need for jobs is the need for equal access to existing jobs and promotion opportunities. It goes without saying that where employment discrimination exists, whether by unions or employers, it must be stamped out, by law if necessary.

Employers are just beginning to learn, however, that equal employment opportunity requires more than the elimination of deliberate racial discrimination. Opportunity is not equal when people who would make good employees are not hired because they do not know of openings, because they lack the self-confidence to apply, or because formal hiring criteria screen out potentially good employees as well as potentially poor ones.

I believe that employers must take aggressive steps to overcome such barriers.

It is not enough to provide technically equal employment opportunities. Management should be willing to go directly into the

city, to seek out the unemployed, to make sure that hiring standards are not unnecessarily or unrealistically restrictive, and to lend a helping hand in adjusting to the work and the work place. . . .

A third priority in the search for equal employment opportunity is a vast improvement in the education and pre-employment training of those who now receive the poorest preparation for work.

The nation's schools have failed to meet the needs of deprived children of all races. The evidence is overwhelming that poor children fall farther and farther behind the longer they stay in school. This appears to be true even of those who have had the benefit of efforts to compensate for their handicaps by enriching their school experience.

School integration is important but it is not the main issue. Providing a little more money to do a little better what the schools are now doing will not be enough. It seems clear that we need radical departures, new educational approaches, to reach children who are hardly touched by present methods. Meanwhile, we shall also have to expand and improve our efforts to provide basic literacy and work skills for teenagers and adults whose earlier education did not take. . . .

The war on poverty and racial discord and urban blight cannot, of course, be won by businessmen alone.

But it will not be won unless businessmen take their place in the struggle along with national, state and local officials and legislators, union officers, civil rights groups, religious leaders and other powerful community forces. It will not be won unless business leaders take a personal stand and exert their personal influences in their communities, among their friends, and above all, in their own companies.

"Active 20-30 Week" Designated by California Legislature

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress that the week of February 12 through 18, 1968, has been designated as "Active 20-30 Week" by the international board of directors of this great service club.

This organization is made up of young business and professional men between the ages of 20 to 39 years of age who are interested in citizenship, fellowship, and community betterment.

The 20-30 International was founded in Sacramento, Calif., in the district of Congressman JOHN MOSS and myself in 1922, and merged in 1960 with the Active International, which was formed in Aberdeen, Wash., to become the Active 20-30 Club International. It now has a membership in excess of 7,000 members, represented by 13 countries throughout the world.

They serve their community and country well with such standing committees as the 20-30 International Rheumatic Fever Foundation and their outstanding foreign exchange student program. Their work in Scouting and traffic safety are well recognized in the communities which they serve.

I am pleased as a Member of Congress and former member and past president of the Vallejo, Calif., 20-30 Club to include under unanimous consent, the resolution of the California Legislature which has the full support of my colleague JOHN MOSS and myself.

I have additionally been privileged over past years to have on my Washington staff 20-30 Club Past Presidents Lee Wilber and Owen Chaffee. They epitomize to the highest degree the 20-30 motto that "youth to be served, must serve."

The resolution follows:

[Assembly, California Legislature, 1967
Regular Session]

H. RES. 81

Resolution relative to Active 20-30
International Week

Whereas, Active 20-30 International is a young men's service organization devoted to helping children disadvantaged from either medical or economic circumstances; and

Whereas, The objectives of Active 20-30 are to develop young men, by precept and example, into a more intelligent, aggressive and serviceable citizenship, and to create in them a desire to participate actively in civic and welfare work in the community; and

Whereas, Active 20-30 International was formed in 1960 by the merger of Active International, founded in Aberdeen, Washington, and 20-30 International, founded in Sacramento, California; and

Whereas, Active 20-30 International has over 200 member clubs throughout North and South America, having main offices in Sacramento, California, and in Mexico City, Mexico, and

Whereas, Its motto is "A man never stands so tall as when he kneels to help a child"; and its emblem is an hourglass, symbolizing the passing of time and the urgency of the cause, enclosed within a buzzsaw, symbolizing the vigor and enthusiasm of youth and its power to cut away the shrouds of despair; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members urge Governor Ronald Reagan to name the week of February 20-26, 1967, as Active 20-30 Week; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Governor Reagan and to Active 20-30 International.

House Resolution No. 81 read and adopted unanimously February 20, 1967.

JESSE M. UNRUH,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Attest:

JAMES D. DRISCOLL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Dean Rusk's Pesthouse

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the latest installment in the continuing story of the Otto Otepka case is one that should leave any fairminded citizen fuming. Some of us here in Congress have indeed been fuming over this case, and this reaction includes both Democrats and Republicans. As an illustration of the interest which this case has generated, there appears on page 1888 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Febru-

ary 1 a listing of items which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or press releases dealing wholly or in part with the Otepka case, dating back to September 1963.

The items—overwhelmingly in favor of Otepka's position—number over 100.

Those following the case know that not only was Otepka the victim of State's vendetta but subordinates who supported him got the "Siberian" treatment. Two such supporters who are being quarantined are Harry Hite and Edwin Burkhardt who worked under Otepka in former times, and who are still with the State Department. Hite and Burkhardt were assigned to a new department entitled "Bureau of Inter-American Affairs." They, along with the others assigned to this department were told that the function of this body was so highly classified that its purpose could not be divulged—even to them.

It turned out that this undertaking was indeed highly secret. So secret in fact that since October 1966, they have received no work assignments and Hite could not get to see his superior for over a year. Their requests for assignments went unanswered.

But State's flagrant deception is a secret no longer.

On Tuesday of this week the veteran reporter and columnist for the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, told of his visit to State Department Annex No. 1, an eight-story building condemned and awaiting demolition, standing next to the plush State Department complex on 23d Street, where State's two "lepers" are housed. State's supersecret operation was declassified at last.

The pesthouse probably rocked when in the front door walked at various times Senator JOHN WILLIAMS; Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER; that bane of bureaucracies, Congressman H. R. GROSS; Clark Mollenhoff, the Pulitzer Prize winning reporter of the Cowles Publications; the AP, the UPI, representatives of local newspapers and TV; and heaven only knows who else.

Today, Willard Edwards came out with his second column on the case of the dump on 23d Street, along with an article on later developments. Also, in less than 48 hours after the cleansing zephyrs of publicity had wafted through Annex 1, State apologized to Hite and Burkhardt, somehow found new assignments to offer them, and promised new quarters.

This, then, is the latest episode in the continuing story of the Otto Otepka case. With the help of Congress, the press, and, most of all, the American people, this chronicle is going to have a just and equitable conclusion. When more people learn of the courageous stand of Harry Hite, Ed Burkhardt, and Otto Otepka, the heat will become unbearable in State's kitchen. In the meantime, I would request of the State Department that if they have other un-American and totalitarian isolation wards in operation, please, please do not—as in the case of Annex No. 1—fly the American flag over the building!

Here are the three excellent accounts by Willard Edwards which fumigated

with a breath of fresh air another of State's deep, dark, and dismal machinations:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Two condemned men report daily to a condemned building, otherwise deserted and infested with vermin, in the heart of a sprawling complex of federal structures, luxury hotels, and apartment houses in the nation's capital.

To the thousands who pass in and out of the portals of the glittering new 48-million-dollar state department headquarters across the street, the cavernous and crumbling eight-story structure of World War I vintage is merely an eye-sore, marked for destruction.

It is obviously unfit for human habitation. Rats scamper thru its dark corridors and offices strewn with rubbish. Condemned years ago and scheduled for demolition, it still carries over its main entrance a sign reading, "State Department Annex one."

Only the few in the know have given it another title in whispers—"Dean Rusk's pesthouse." For, incredibly, two state department officers are daily confined here in an isolation almost as complete as if they had been shut away from the world as victims of a plague in the middle ages.

All other government employees were transferred long ago and one small group on the fifth floor is preparing to leave.

TWO TARGETS OF WRATH SIT IN IDLENESS

The remainder of the old building has been given over to bugs and rodents with one exception. On the first floor, huddled into a small office, two targets of the secretary of state's wrath sit in enforced idleness each day.

There, since November, 1965, these two veteran security officers, with unblemished records, have been reporting. They have nothing to do. All their appeals to superiors, written and verbal, seeking some knowledge of their future fate, have been met with grim silence.

They have become, in the language of Orwell's "1984," nonpersons.

A visitor to the building enters a gloomy and seemingly deserted building. Dirt and desolation prevail in offices, long stripped of all furniture. Empty whiskey bottles litter the floor. The silence is broken only by the rustle of fleeing roaches and the patter of tiny claws.

In the shadows at the end of a long corridor, one door was shut. Opened, it disclosed two men sitting at desks. They looked up in surprise. From the time they report in the morning until they leave at the end of the day, no caller disturbs their solitude. When they go out for lunch, other state department employees dare not give them even a friendly nod.

Harry M. Hite, 42, and Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, were happy to talk about their plight, to discuss the reasons for a quarantine which has become increasingly severe over a four-year period. They were calm, not too resentful, even capable of displaying a wry humor over their predicament. Neither revealed the slightest hint of willingness to surrender to what they regard as oppressive intimidation.

What is the crime for which they are suffering?

Hite put it simply:

"We have been sentenced without trial, our careers put in jeopardy, isolated, and confined to this rat-infested prison, and ostracized for telling the truth and supporting Otto Otepka."

LAST OF 6 OTEPKA ASSOCIATES

They are the last of six associates of Otepka, former chief of evaluations in the

state department's office of security. All were punished when they came to his defense when he was dismissed in November, 1963, for testifying truthfully about lax security in the department. Two surrendered, accepting employment overseas. Two others won appeals, then promptly resigned and sought nongovernment employment. Otepka, meanwhile, is still waging a legal battle for vindication altho Rusk, after a 4-year delay, revoked his dismissal and substituted a reprimand and demotion.

Hite, with 20 years of government service, and Burkhardt, 26 years, decided to stick it out. They are civil service career men.

"The department was never able to charge us with any wrongdoing or deficiency in performance," Hite noted. "It is attempting, instead, to break our spirit, forcing us to resign."

"It is hard to fight an invisible foe. We keep sending a flow of memoranda to our superiors, pleading for assignment. They act as if we had disappeared from the earth."

"We are not going to break down. This is a question of right and wrong, of honesty and dishonesty. One of these days, the building may be torn down over our heads but we're not going to submit to the dictum that government employees must cover up for their bosses when summoned to testify before a qualified committee of Congress." Additional aspects of this bizarre case will be examined in a following column.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 15, 1968]

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The unsung heroine of today's drama, in which two state department officers were suddenly rescued from a state department "Siberia," is Mrs. Janet Hite, a sweet-faced young mother, wife of one of the two condemned men.

Her husband, Harry M. Hite, 42, and his partner, Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, had virtually given up hope that they would ever be relieved from their exile. They regarded themselves as forgotten men, doomed to isolation until they succumbed to state department pressures and resigned.

Mrs. Hite decided last week to do something about it. She called on her congressman and visited other Capitol hill offices but found little interest in her story. Then, someone suggested she call this reporter who, like many others, was disinclined at first to believe that government employees could be subjected to such treatment as she described.

A visit to the "isolation ward," as Sen. John J. Williams [R., Del.] described it, and an interview with the two men confirmed the shocking reality of her report. Today, less than 48 hours after first publication of the two officers' plight, congressional indignation had forced the state department to apologize and offer them new assignments and a transfer to livable offices.

HAPPY, BEWILDERED BY SUDDEN EVENTS

Hite and Burkhardt confessed themselves both happy and bewildered by the rapidity of events which ended their dark isolation of 16 months. They remained skeptical of the state department's future attitude when today's indignation on Capitol hill has died down.

They were gratified, however, at the prospect of something to do even tho they will not be allowed to resume the profession of security officer for which they trained long years. This is ultra-sensitive work—evaluating the loyalty and trustworthiness of government employees—which is vital to government security.

The years of enforced idleness have taken their toll, they confessed. The inactivity forced upon them often became an almost unbearable agony. They were deprived for

four years of the right to work at a meaningful task. For eight hours each day, they sat staring at each other, reading newspapers, listening to a radio, or writing memos to their superiors in futile pleas for employment. These petitions, until today, were never even acknowledged.

"We could take everything—the ostracism, the turning away of heads of fellow employees, the incarceration in a rat-infested building—but the strain of idleness was beginning to wear on us," said Hite.

HAVE COMBINED SERVICE OF 46 YEARS

"We came to realize that this was the probable purpose of the treatment—to break us down mentally until we started shouting at each other. It didn't work but we don't know whether it might not have, eventually."

The two men have a combined government service of 46 years. Hite is a grade 13 civil service employee, annual salary \$15,307. Burkhardt is a grade 12, salary \$12,989. Conscientious to a fault, they were disturbed by the realization that they had collected in four years a total of about \$113,000 in salaries for which they performed no useful services. This dissipation of taxpayers' money did not bother the responsible officials—until today.

"We know that every government worker was watching the eventual outcome of our treatment," Hite remarked. "We hope that today's developments will help encourage those who still believe that a federal worker has the right to give honest testimony before a congressional committee, without subsequent harassment."

"Sometimes, during the last four years, we found it hard to believe that all this was happening in the United States. I guess it can't as long as Congress and the press are around to expose what is going on."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 15, 1968]

OUTBURSTS IN CONGRESS SPUR ACTION— OFFERED APOLOGY, NEW JOBS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The state department, responding to outbursts of indignation in Congress, today ended the exile of two veteran security officers who have been confined in forced idleness to a condemned, rat-infested building since November, 1965.

Apologies to the two men, Harry M. Hite, 42, and Edwin A. Burkhardt, 44, were tendered by Robert T. Hannemeyer, chief of functional personnel. He said he was speaking for Idar Rimstad, deputy undersecretary for administration.

PROMISED TO RETURN

Rimstad was "totally unaware" of the conditions imposed on Hite and Burkhardt and deeply regretted them, Hannemeyer said. "You will never have to go back to your present offices," Hite and Burkhardt were told.

New assignments in new offices were offered the two officers, who had been sending a flow of memoranda in quest of employment for nearly two years. Hite, who has a law degree, was offered a post with the director of the office of personnel. Burkhardt also was offered a job in the personnel office. They will receive the same salaries.

TWO LIVE IN DESPAIR

Until yesterday, Hite and Burkhardt lived in despair that their confinement would ever be relieved. Their plight was disclosed that day by the Chicago Tribune, and the report stirred a reaction in Congress which culminated today in these developments:

1. A telegram to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from Chairman James O. Eastland [D., Miss.] of the Senate judiciary committee and its subcommittee on internal security, urging Rusk to personally investigate the "working conditions" of the two men and demanding "an immediate explanation and remedial treatment."

2. A Senate floor speech by John J. Wil-

Hams [R., Del.] the Senate's celebrated investigator, giving the state department 72 hours to restore the rights of the two men and rescue them from "the state department's isolation ward." If no action was taken in that period, he pledged, he would seek action, thru a Senate resolution, to fire the superior responsible for "an incredible outrage."

3. The issuance of a special report by the Senate internal security subcommittee declaring that Hite, a veteran of 20 years in government service, and Burkhardt, with 26 years of service, had been subjected to a "Chinese-torture type of system."

4. Announcement by Rep. H. R. Gross [R., Ia.] that, when the House met tomorrow he would seek action on a resolution similar to that proposed by Williams in the Senate. "Heads should roll," he said, "and the first man to go should be Secretary Rusk himself."

MOVES WITH SPEED

Within three hours, the state department had moved with unprecedented speed. Rusk was reported to have instructed Rlmstad to quell the congressional disturbance.

Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber Jr., in charge of congressional relations, paid a visit to Hite and Burkhardt, looked around, exclaimed, "What an awful place!" and fled.

Growing panic in the state department, as it received reports of thunderous oratory in Congress, was climaxed when a television crew showed up to take scenes of the rubbish-filled interior of the old building, known as state department Annex No. 1, which adjoins the new 48 million dollar state department building.

OLD JOBS ABOLISHED

In midafternoon, the two men received a summons to report to Hannemeyer for "new assignments." Both said they would take the offers under advisement. Their former jobs as security officers, they were told, had been abolished and were not available to them.

Williams and Gross disclosed that they had made personal inspections of the condemned building from which all state department employees except Hite and Burkhardt had long ago been transferred. The building has been condemned and is scheduled to be torn down.

They described their wanderings thru the eight-story structure, its deserted rooms filled with rubbish and gutted of furnishings, in a search for the only two permanent tenants remaining.

NO WORK ASSIGNED

"I was shocked and dismayed," Williams told the Senate, "to find that the state department is operating a special isolation ward or cooler for employees whose only crime is telling the truth to a Senate committee."

"I invite the entire Senate and the Washington press to visit this junk-filled, deserted building. After a long search, I found these two men hidden in a corner office. They have had no work assignments since October, 1966, and their repeated requests for work have been ignored."

"These two men are being isolated and penalized solely because they testified truthfully in the Otepka case. Three other employees testified falsely and were rewarded. They were taken care of. But these two men sit twiddling their thumbs in an old abandoned warehouse because they told the truth."

SUPPORT HIS DEFENSE

Hite and Burkhardt were associates of Otto F. Otepka, former chief of evaluations in the department's office of security. They supported his defense against charges of conduct unbecoming a state department officer.

Otepka was discharged in November, 1963, allegedly for supplying confidential documents to the Senate internal security subcommittee but actually, Williams noted, for testifying candidly about the protection of

security risks in the department. Four years later, in December, 1967, after Otepka had waged a costly legal battle, Rusk revoked the dismissal, substituting a severe reprimand and demotion involving a \$5,479 salary cut. Otepka has appealed this decision to the Civil Service commission.

REPORT IN CASE

"No one who has not seen the utterly appalling conditions which surrounded Hite and Burkhardt could possibly believe that they were ordered by officials of the United States government," Gross said. "There are absolutely no excuses for this unspeakable disgrace."

A special report on the treatment given Hite and Burkhardt by the state department was issued by the Senate internal security subcommittee. It gave this summary:

"The department of state at the highest level has pursued a vendetta for five years against Otepka. Much has been said about the relentless persecution of Otepka by the state department."

BLAST AT SYSTEM

"But the drive against his associates continues to be equally relentless in an effort to cow them into submission and, if at all possible, obtain their resignations and removal as professional security officers."

"Now, the new information brought out shows the Chinese-torture type of system introduced against these men by the state department."

"Contrived efforts by these officials to force despair on Hite and Burkhardt thru solitary confinement and lack of authentic assignments by which they could utilize their skills have failed."

"The state department, stooping again to a new tactic designed to achieve its ends and thwart the intent of the Senate internal security subcommittee, has placed these men in quarters which cannot even be compared to a hovel. Whisky bottles litter the floor. Bait for rats is cast in every corner of their office."

"There is no security guard even tho the project to which Hite and Burkhardt were assigned on paper was justified by the state department as being top-secret and extremely sensitive in nature. Windows do not have locks. Cardboard covers panes of glass to keep out the cold. Restroom conditions are filthy."

"OUTRAGED AT PENALTY"

"With all this, these two career civil service employees remain the last two individuals on their floor of a building which is scheduled to be demolished within a very short time."

"Will this be the way to get rid of them—by razing the building with these two men still inside? Members of the subcommittee are not only concerned but outraged at the cruel and inhuman punishment being meted out against these two men because they dared to testify truthfully before it."

"We shall not permit the state department's lack of decency nor stand for its subtle personnel assassination."

Better Information-Handling Methods for Congress

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a column by Marquis Childs in the February 14 issue of the Washington Post points up the increasing seriousness of the credibility gap between the administration and the people.

The story is related of a Senator X—and this could be any Senator, of course—who visits Vietnam and is told by American officials there that "the war is being won. It is not stalemated."

Then the Senator has dinner with five or six reporters. He gets exactly the opposite picture. The war cannot be won. It is stalemated.

The Senator is, to say the least, torn by these conflicting views.

The Senator's dilemma is further compounded if, within his committee, and within Congress as a whole, he is served up a diet consisting primarily of views and opinions which may or may not be based on adequate knowledge of the facts. And this is true in any subject matter area, not just of the war in Vietnam.

Of course, Congress is the traditional and necessary and proper forum for the expression of disparate views within the society. But Members of Congress must also have objective information and a presentation of the facts to help them render decisions on matters of public policy.

It should be remembered that the first step taken by our early Congress in the direction of intelligent information handling was to create committees charged with the responsibility of gathering and studying facts which would subsequently be reported to the full Congress. Second, and simultaneous with the creation of committees, was the establishment of the Library of Congress to serve as a repository of the collected wisdom of our society. With the advent of the 20th century, the Legislative Reference Service was established within the Library to distill, process, and organize relevant information necessary to the Congressman for decisionmaking on an ever-expanding scale, both quantitatively and in the complexity of the issues.

Now, in the second half of the 20th century, we are often faced with a problem of too much information in unusable form. It is true that Members of Congress still fall at times to get all of the information they need on a particular subject, but the problem in general is that we are suffering from a "processing" gap. One no longer talks about information coming into the Library of Congress in numbers of books, reports, and so forth; material is wheeled in daily in moving van-type vehicles. Incredibly, the processing of this information is still done almost entirely by hand, by old-fashioned paper and pencil methods which for some years have been considered obsolete not only in business and industry and in our higher institutions of learning, but indeed by officials in the executive branch of the Government.

In the second issue of "Law and Computer Technology," published by the World Peace Through Law Center, Robert L. Chartrand, Information Sciences Specialist for the Legislative Reference Service, comments on the urgency of the congressional information-handling problem, some of the new techniques and their applications to specific areas of data handling, and the beginning steps that are being taken to remedy the situation. This is a concise, factual, well-written article, and its significance should command a wide readership. In

particular, I hope all Members of Congress will read this article with care and concern.

The article follows:

COMPUTER-ORIENTED INFORMATION FOR THE U.S. CONGRESS

(By Robert L. Chartrand*)

The Congressional milieu of the 1960 decade is vastly different from that of the earlier years of the 20th century. Scientific and technological advances in such areas as space exploration, nuclear energy development, and automatic data processing (ADP) have left their imprint throughout the Nation. The responsibilities of governing a populace that is continually increasing in size and complexity, and which has a high degree of mobility, have caused those who govern to consider carefully their role. In addition to ensuring national security, the Federal leadership must strive to achieve a continued rise in the standard of living for all citizens.

The elected members of the United States Congress derive their support from all sectors of society—business, commerce, the academic world, and unaffiliated individual citizens—and their decisions must reflect the needs and the desires of these groups. The contemporary Congressman, unlike his predecessor of even forty years ago, must be knowledgeable about a great many subjects. As Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, an eminent authority on the role of the Congress, notes: In a given session of Congress there are forty or fifty major issues . . . which are a reflection of a specialized, but interlocked technical age where social and economic and political structure is intricate, sensitive, dynamic, and at the same time scarcely understood even by the wisest and the best informed of men.¹

The sheer volume of legislation introduced into the two chambers of the Congress is a reflection of the magnitude of governing a large nation. In the 89th Congress (1965-1966), a total of 26,566 public and private bills and resolutions were introduced, and eventually 4,016 legislative measures were passed.² This work load is in contrast to the First Congress which produced 118 bills and resolutions.³

The Senator or Representative of today is faced with the requirement to identify, locate, acquire, select, assimilate, and apply that information which is relevant to a given problem. Since the number of topics for which information must be obtained is large, and the resources of a Congressional office are limited, recent attention has been given to finding new ways and means of handling the information which is a *sine qua non* for effective decision-making. Not only is the spectrum of Congressional information needs virtually infinite, but the emphases change constantly. The awareness of the Congressional members of this problem was reflected eloquently in a recent survey of general categories of problems encountered by a House member: 78% cited "complexity of decision-making; lack of information" as a key concern.⁴

All too often there comes the realization that the basic problem may be one of too little information, but too much. Professor Kenneth Janda, a perceptive student of the Congressional information dilemma, comments that: "Congress still needs much information it does not get . . . Congress' problem is one of obtaining relevant information. What Congress really requires is a procedure for acquiring the information it needs and a method for processing that information in order to learn what it wants to know."⁵

At the present time, the Congressional member or committee desiring to obtain a certain type of information will turn to traditional sources such as the Legislative Refer-

ence Service (LRS) of the Library of Congress, various Executive Branch elements, or to the private domain (e.g., universities, lobbyist organizations). Although these groups often provide an excellent quality of support, the Congressmen who are most concerned about combatting the effects of the "information explosion" in their day-to-day functioning now are attempting to establish new, tangible capabilities for information handling.

Among the possible antidotes identified to help overcome the Congressional information malaise is that of employing automatic data processing equipment and programs. Vice President Humphrey, in the forefront of those urging that relief for the harassed Congressmen and their staffs might be found in the power, flexibility, and massive storage capability of the electronic computer, has urged that:

"The legislative branch should, itself, take the lead. Few groups of men and women in the world need more, better or more varied information than 535 elected Representatives and Senators. Congress' committees and subcommittees and Members need push-button, preferably display-type access, to specialized 'banks' of information. Each major 'bank' should serve the interested committee—Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Foreign Relations, Interior—and so on, down the alphabetic line."⁶

Legislation now pending before the 90th Congress (H.R. 21, et al.) provides for the establishment of an automatic data processing facility to render support to the Congress. Representative Robert McClory of Illinois, the sponsor of the first bill calling for an ADP facility, has pointed out that the Legislative Branch "must use every possible mechanism to insure that Congress executes its traditional responsibilities."⁷ He and a bipartisan group of supporters in the House of Representatives have stressed the importance of using the great capacity of the electronic computer and modern program evaluation techniques as an aid to Congressional budgetary review. Other priority applications cited included the handling of digests of bills being considered by Congressional committees, their associated legislative histories, and the establishment and maintenance of selected data on Federal programs in machine-readable form.

A similar provision for an ADP facility was introduced by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and included in the Senate version (S. 355) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, now pending before the House Committee on Rules.⁸ The placement of the computer facility within the non-partisan Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress would allow optimum utilization of its complementary capabilities both by the Congressional user and the LRS research specialist.

It has been shown that the demands upon the Congressman and his staff are legion, and that oftentimes reliance must be placed upon outside groups. In addition to simply acquiring key information, there may be a need for detailed reports to be prepared, intensive analyses to be undertaken, and statistical compilations to be produced. Maximum objectivity is a recurring criterion for the preparation of these various background "think pieces" for the Congress. Also, there may be the need for a confidential analysis of a problem. In this respect, the role of the Legislative Reference Service is of singular value to the Congress. Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa, in the volume *We Propose: A Modern Congress*, stresses the value of the LRS support:

"Members of Congress receive from the Legislative Reference Service that rarest of all Washington products: the disinterested point of view, the undistorted fact, the impartial and non-partisan analysis and evaluation of controversial public policy issues."⁹

The Legislative Reference Service, which commenced serving the United States Congress in 1914, is the only group external to the Congress *per se* dedicated exclusively to providing research, information, and related services to that body. A group of subject specialists and support personnel with access to an impressive repository of highly varied information comprises LRS. In testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, the forms of assistance provided by LRS to the Congress were enumerated:

"It is a place that Members can turn to for . . . preparation of background reports on public and legislative issues; for pro and con analyses of bills; for studies of alternative proposals for solutions of national problems; for legal opinions; for surveys of court decisions; for spot factual information; for newspaper searches; for assistance in preparing draft statements or speeches; for translations; for legislative histories; for the preparation of charts, graphs, and maps; for bibliographies; for tabulations of statistics; for consultations with subject specialists; for assistance in answering constituent inquiries; and so forth."¹⁰

The number of requests initiated by Congressional members, staff personnel (both personal and committee), and from constituents via the Congressional offices has continued to increase, with foreseeable pressures on the LRS staff. In 1946 an LRS staff of 131¹¹ received 19,732 inquiries;¹² by 1966 with a staff of less than twice the size (228)¹³ 117,062¹⁴ inquiries—member, committee, constituent—were sent to LRS. The average number of inquiries during fiscal year 1965 was 343 per Senator and 136 per Representative.¹⁵

The potential value of utilizing ADP within the Legislative Reference Service in fulfillment of many of the Congressional requests for information has been recognized in many quarters. The lessons learned by numerous agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal government substantiate the claim that:

"No single technological advance in recent years has contributed more to effectiveness and efficiency in Government operations than the development of electronic data processing equipment."¹⁶

The primary objective of all Congressional staff information handling efforts, and supporting activity by such groups as LRS, is to provide the Congressman with selective information and analyses in order to render knowledgeable decisions. In discussing this omni-important consideration, Professor James A. Robinson of Ohio State University reinforces the innate essentiality of correct information to the legislator by pointing out that "as problems proliferate, the amount of information increases."¹⁷ A concomitant effort needs to be made to retain a sharp perspective of the function and role of that data and interpretive material which is provided the Congressman. It must be remembered that: "Information systems are *not* . . . devices for grinding out policy decisions, and they are not designed to replace human judgment. Rather, they are intended to provide the human decision-maker—here, the Congressmen—with knowledge for making informed choices."¹⁸

A brief review of the areas in which computer-oriented information might benefit the Congress is in order at this juncture. In some instances, the information provided may be focused on the need of the Congress as a whole, or an individual chamber. In other cases, the committees (or subcommittees) or the individual members may be the chief beneficiaries.

Centralized information concerning the status of pending legislation and the schedule of committee activities is recognized as an area where ADP could be of significant value. Not only could daily printouts, specially formatted, be generated for each of

Footnotes at end of article.

these two functions, but special (*ad hoc*) requests could be handled in a more expeditious way. The computerization of selected bill information could be integrated with the preparation of the Digest of General Public Bills and Resolutions by the Legislative Reference Services.

With nearly 140 committees and subcommittees active in the 90th Congress, the need for an up-to-date schedule of executive sessions, public hearings, lists of witnesses to appear, and other key information is undeniable. Histories of committee action for years past, and files of priority subject matter information for committee use, also could be maintained in computerized form.

Often mentioned as an area where the electronic computer has proven to be a valuable tool is the indexing, storage, and retrieval of various types of legal information. While it is true that most Senators have Legislative Assistants and many House members have staff personnel serving in a similar capacity, the members often must go outside his own resources for assistance in obtaining analyses-in-depth, advisory opinions, digests or citations, surveys of state laws and court decisions, or the full text of some requisite documentation. With the advent of ADP, a new dimension has been added to legal research and related decision-making. Significant pioneer work in creating and maintaining useful legal information repositories has been performed by a number of university, government, and foundation groups. Perhaps the work of greatest magnitude has been conducted at the University of Pittsburgh Health Law Center under the leadership of Professor John Harty. The full-text holdings, available upon request to such outside groups as the U.S. Congress, include the complete codes of several states, the United States Supreme Court decisions from 1950, the Internal Revenue Code and Regulations, and other legislative, court, and ordinance material.¹⁹

Another important source of legal information in ADP form is Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics),²⁰ under the aegis of the Department of Defense. This system features "keyword-in-context" access to: the complete United States Code (updated to the 1965 supplement), the Comptroller General's Decisions complete to the last published volume (and the unpublished decisions from 1955 to the present), the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, international law agreements of interest to the Department of Defense, and other assorted items.

Finally, several Executive Branch agencies—the Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Department of the Treasury, etc.—have established limited holdings of legal information on magnetic tape. Other information of a legal nature is stored in ADP form at various American universities, by a few states, and some private commercial organizations now are commencing to provide systems design and data processing services in the legal area.

Outside of the legal information area, Congress has yet other needs. An automated index to Congressional documents has been identified as a useful tool. Current information on issues up for vote and readily accessible post-vote information represent other possible applications for ADP systems. Lobbyist activity information and key data on Federal contract awards also have been considered for placement in a computerized file. The applications of ADP in the Congressional environment are many, and have been examined in a study prepared for the Congress entitled "Automatic Data Processing for the Congress."²¹ Figure 1 sets forth a summary listing of projected applications of ADP in support of the Congress.

Enhanced Congressional access to information that is complete, accurate, timely, and relevant has become in many ways a problem of information management. These questions must be asked:

What specific elements of information are needed to make what judgments? Where are these elements located? How are they to be retrieved? And how should they be presented in order to be meaningful?²²

The United States Congress, then, has demonstrated a willingness to examine the ways in which modern tools and techniques can assist its legislative and housekeeping activities. Action is being taken to determine how systems technology (including ADP) can aid the Congressman as he functions in his three major roles:

1. As a legislator, responsible for scrutinizing, debating, and making decisions regarding issues of national and international scope;
2. As a representative of his district (or State), with prime concern for its welfare, growth, and relationship to other governmental elements, and the legislative responsibilities involved; and
3. As an ombudsman of sorts, looked to by each individual constituent as a point of reference for assistance in any one of a thousand forms.²³

In the years to come, as the Federal Congress fulfills its responsibilities to the citizenry of the nation and to the world, those who govern must do so with increasing wisdom and insight. The products of man's ingenuity and industry must be utilized to the fullest. President John F. Kennedy expressed his view of the impact of science and technology on contemporary civilization in these words:

The expanding wonders of science . . . have captured man's imagination, challenged the powers of his mind, and given him the tools for rapid progress.²⁴

The ability to govern a nation such as the United States necessarily will be contingent upon the efficacious marshalling and allocation of all resources, both human and technological. By this action, the continuing development of the nation and its contributory role on the international scene will be assured.

REGISTRY FOR SOFTWARE NAMES

To tackle the problem of duplication among software names and acronyms, the Special Interest Group on Programming Languages (SIGPLAN) of the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) in the United States has established a Registry Subcommittee which will maintain, for the international computing community, a registry for the names of computer programming languages and major publicly reported software packages, where inadvertent duplication of names could cause confusion in the computing literature.

The registry is planned to contain the following for each entry:

- (a) Name or acronym of the programming language or software package;
- (b) Derivation of the name or acronym;
- (c) Indication as to whether the name is legally protected, e.g., as a trademark;
- (d) Brief one- or two-sentence distinguishing description;
- (e) List of computers for which availability is current or planned;
- (f) Conditions of availability, e.g., free or leased;
- (g) Bibliographic references to authoritative documentation;
- (h) Names and addresses of responsible contacts;
- (i) Date of initial registration and latest revision, validation, or cancellation;
- (j) Miscellaneous or additional information or comments.

The services to be provided by the Software Registry include:

- (a) Register submitted names and acro-

nyms. Duplicates will be registered, but submitters will be informed of previous registrations and their legal status and advised to cancel their entry and make some other choice.

(b) Answer queries regarding registered names and acronyms.

(c) Annually solicit and regularly accept revisions to existing entries.

(d) Annually publish the complete register.

FOOTNOTES

* Information Sciences Specialist, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. Prior to joining the Library of Congress, Mr. Chartrand spent six years with private corporations concerned with the development of information technology. His most recent assignment was with Planning Research Corporation as Manager of Applications Development. With the Federal Systems Division of the IBM Corporation he fulfilled technical and managerial positions, performing systems analysis in such areas as legal information retrieval and graphic data indexing and retrieval. As a Member of the Technical Staff for the Ramo-Woolridge Division of TRW, Inc., he helped develop large scale information handling systems for the Department of Defense. For several years before entering industry, he served as an intelligence analyst for the Central Intelligence Agency and with the United States Navy at continental and overseas posts. He has lectured widely on information technology before professional, government, and industrial groups; has conducted special seminars at several universities; and is the author of several studies for the United States Congress on the subject of information systems and the role of automatic data processing. His academic work includes a Master of Arts Degree in history and government from the University of Missouri, with additional graduate work at Louisiana State University. (The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Legislative Reference Service nor the Library of Congress.)

¹ Ernest S. Griffith, *Congress, Its Contemporary Role* (New York: New York University Press, 1961), p. 72.

² 112 Cong. Rec. D 1045 (daily ed. Nov. 21, 1966).

³ George B. Calloway, *History of the House of Representatives* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1961), Appendix G, p. 303.

⁴ Kenneth Janda, "Information Systems for Congress," *Congress: The First Branch of Government* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966), Table 1, p. 42.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 426.

⁶ Address by Senator Humphrey, "The Computer Revolution," Eastern Spring Computer Conference. Remarks in the Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 7, p. 9075.

⁷ Remarks in the House by Representative Robert McClory on "An Automatic Data Processing Facility to Support the Congress," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 20, p. 27824.

⁸ Remarks in the Senate by Senator Hugh Scott during the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 3, p. 3732.

⁹ Fred Schwengel, "Information Handling: 'for a vast future also,'" *We propose: A Modern Congress*, ed. Mary McInnis (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 307.

¹⁰ U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Organization of Congress, Part 7. Hearings before the Joint Committee (89th Cong., 1st Sess., August 2, 1965). Washington U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965. p. 1111. [Testimony of Dr. Hugh L. Elsbree.]

¹¹ U.S. Congress, House. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967 (89th Cong., 2nd Sess., May 9, 1966). Washington, U.S. Govt. Print.

Off., 1966, p. 232. [Testimony of Lester S. Jayson.]

¹² U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, Organization of Congress, *Op. cit.*, p. 1176.

¹³ U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967, *Op. cit.*, Table 3, p. 226.

¹⁴ Statistics provided by Basil T. Owens, Administrative Officer, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, May 1967.

¹⁵ U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967, *Op. cit.*, p. 235. [Testimony of Lester S. Jayson.]

¹⁶ Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Report to the President on the Management of Automatic Data Processing in the Federal Government, Washington, February, 1965, p. 1.

¹⁷ James A. Robinson, "Decision Making in Congress," *Congress: The First Branch of Government* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966), p. 265.

¹⁸ Janda, *Op. cit.*, p. 435.

¹⁹ Law school research projects reported, *M.U.L.L.*, September, 1965, p. 122.

²⁰ Status information provided by Grant Reynolds, Office of the Air Force General Counsel, June 1967.

²¹ Robert L. Chartrand, "Automatic Data Processing for the Congress," in extension of remarks of Representative Robert McClory, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 2, p. 1801.

²² Charles R. Doehert, "Availability of Information for Congressional Operations," *Congress: The First Branch of Government* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966), p. 172-173.

²³ Address by Robert L. Chartrand, "The Potential of Systems Technology for the Federal Congress," Systems Management Research and Study Forum, Temple University, June 20, 1967, p. 32.

²⁴ Address by President John F. Kennedy, Reception for Latin American Diplomats, Washington, D.C., March 13, 1961.

Two 21-Year-Old Maryland Enlisted Men Killed in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Jonathan E. Sykes and Sp4c. Jack A. Beard, two young men from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

SOLDIER, MARINE DIE IN VIETNAM WAR—J. E. SYKES, J. A. BEARD DEATHS REPORTED

Two 21-year-old Maryland enlisted men have been killed in the Vietnam fighting, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

A marine from Baltimore, Cpl. Jonathan E. Sykes, was shot dead while patrolling in Quang Nam province February 6; and a soldier from Boonsboro, Spec. 4 Jack A. Beard, died of battle wounds while with the 25th Division.

Corporal Sykes was a native of Philadelphia who grew up in Baltimore and later went to high school in Trenton, N.J.

ENLISTED AFTER PROM

His mother, Mrs. Dorothy Sykes, of 3708 Winterbourne road, said he enlisted "right after his senior prom."

Corporal Sykes was home for a 30-day furlough last summer when he told a reporter he had volunteered to return to Vietnam for an extra five-months tour to help "stop the spread of communism," because, he said, "I have a commitment to my country."

He had already completed the regular twelve-month tour and could have remained on an American marine base until his discharge which was set for this month.

On January 12, his mother said, his seabag arrived home. Then she learned that he had volunteered to serve yet another three months in Vietnam.

"He was a good marine, that little hard-head," his mother said. "He made me think it was a picnic. He was not the complaining type. He said he had learned to like the people over there. I never thought that anything could happen to my child when he had an attitude like that."

Corporal Sykes is survived by his mother, his father, Robert Sykes, of Trenton; and a sister, Miss Judonna Sykes.

Specialist Beard was a native of Hagerstown and a graduate of Boonsboro High School.

He enlisted in February, 1967, and went to Vietnam in July.

Survivors include his parents, Jack M. Beard, of Boonsboro, and Mrs. Geneva Beard, of Hagerstown; his wife, Mrs. Judith Beard, of Boonsboro; two sisters, a half-brother and a half-sister.

Vets of Dienbienphu Appraise Khesanh

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Wednesday edition of the Washington Post an article taken from the London Sunday Times by Edward Mortimer that discusses the comparison between Dienbienphu and Khesanh, as viewed by three veterans of the French-Indochina conflict. These three individuals were officers in the French Army and fought at Dienbienphu, and I believe their views are of special significance as we look at the situation in Khesanh. I include them herewith:

VETS OF DIENBIENPHU APPRAISE KHE-SANH

(By Edward Mortimer)

PARIS.—Is Khesanh a second Dienbienphu? This question about the Marine stronghold was put to three French officers who tried to counter the 1954 siege that led to their country's withdrawal from Indochina.

General Clement Blanc, Chief of Staff of the French army at the time and now head of the National Association for Retired Officers, replied: "No, the present situation is not comparable to the situation then because the enemy has had more than ten years to build up his strength. Probably in 1953 or 1954 there was a possible solution, but now you are faced with a real national front. We never had to cope with attacks on Saigon and Hue, not even on Hanoi."

"The situation which the Americans face now is much worse—a general insurrection, which is the fourth and last stage of revolutionary warfare. They lack a position of strength from which to negotiate. Even so, they must negotiate. There is no other solution."

"Tactically the American position at Khesanh is much stronger than ours was at Dienbienphu, which was 300 kilometers [about 186 miles] from the nearest air base. Arguably it was a mistake to try and hold Dienbienphu at all. We should have fallen

back on Luang Prabang [in Laos, still associated with France at that time]. But there is no reason why the Americans should be defeated at Khesanh and, in any case, Khesanh is not the determining factor. What's important is the phenomenon of revolutionary warfare."

SEES U.S. ADVANTAGE

Retired Gen. Rene Cogny, who was commander of all land forces in North Vietnam, said: "The comparison between Khesanh and Dienbienphu is a tendentious one thought up by the press and the radio. The fall of Langvel [the U.S. Special Forces camp five miles west of Khesanh, overrun Feb. 7] cannot be compared in importance with the fall of the first two outposts of Dienbienphu. If the Americans had thought it was important, would it have been defended by only 30 regulars and 400 auxiliaries?"

"At Dienbienphu the enemy cut the lines of communication very early. Nothing like that has happened at Khesanh. The Americans still have the means to bring in new supplies and personnel and the chance to maneuver. At Dienbienphu we had no reserves to bring up and we were condemned to immobility. I don't deny that the situation in Khesanh is serious, but I don't think the camp is really in danger. The Americans still have both the means and the will to win the battle."

"Strategically, the Vietminh [members of the organization that preceded the Vietcong] have got the initiative at the moment by launching a counter-offensive simultaneously at Khesanh and throughout the country, but General [William C.] Westmoreland [the U.S. commander in Vietnam] has every chance of regaining the initiative on both these fronts."

AIDE DE CAMP'S VIEWS

The third French officer questioned was Maj. Jean Pouget, who was only a captain in his thirties at the time of Dienbienphu. But he was aide de camp to Gen. Henri Navarre, the Commander-in-Chief for Indochina, and consequently attended all the meetings at which strategy was worked out.

Later Pouget was parachuted into Dienbienphu itself and was taken prisoner when it surrendered. After his release, he served as a paratrooper in Algeria then left the army to devote himself to writing. As well as being the model for the hero of Jean Larteguy's best-selling novel about Indochina, "The Centurions," Pouget has done extensive research on the documents of the period and written a book of his own, entitled "We Were at Dienbienphu."

"Of course, there are superficial similarities," he said. "For example, both Dienbienphu and Khesanh are in hollows. But it's absurd to say we were beaten at Dienbienphu because it was a hollow. People talk as if the Vietminh were attacking us from above, but in fact they were always attacking us from below because we held the surrounding peaks. When the last peak was taken we were finished."

"But in relation to the war that [Vo Nguyen] Giap [then the Vietminh's commanding general, now Defense Minister of North Vietnam] was fighting, Khesanh belongs to a similar phase—that of the general counter-offensive. It wasn't the defeat at Dienbienphu that provoked the collapse of the French army: We had lost the war from the moment we agreed to negotiate."

"It's the same with the Americans. [President] Johnson may not actually be negotiating now, but he's agreed in principle to stop bombing and the American people are thinking in terms of negotiation. That is the psychological moment when Giap chooses to launch his general counter-offensive—so that the Americans will think, 'If we're going to negotiate, we'd better get on with it.'"

"In 1954 he held back his attack on Dienbienphu until he was sure negotiations were going to start. The attack started the day

after [British Foreign Secretary Anthony] Eden announced in Berlin that the West and the Russians would meet the Chinese in Geneva. I remember, because we'd been dropped on Muong Sai [in Laos] and we were completely surrounded and outnumbered.

"Then during the night the enemy suddenly disappeared and moved up to attack Dienbienphu. We probably owe it to Mr. Eden that we got out of Muong Sai safe and sound.

GIAP'S POSITION

"Today Giap has the initiative and the situation has to be judged in relation to his intentions. To take Khesanh he would have to use 40,000 men and lose half of them. But if he does that and the psychological effect is to make the Americans give up quickly, he will have won.

"What he wants is to control the population of South Vietnam. American opinion is concentrated on Khesanh, while political commissars are speaking in the public squares of every small village and even Saigon itself, and they have a whole party apparatus behind them devised by Lenin and Mao Tse-tung.

"Giap isn't a classical general like Westmoreland or Navarre. He's a genuine Marxist. He'd have got very bad marks at Sandhurst, or West Point, or the Ecole de Guerre.

"Giap has often explained his strategy. He told Paris Match in 1955: 'I don't understand why you criticize your soldiers. Dienbienphu was perhaps the most dangerous thing for us they could have done. They forgot nothing except the most important thing: That for a Marxist, strategy is above all politics.'"

Progress Noted in First Lady's Beautification Campaign

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, Philip Meyer reports in the Sunday Oregonian that the First Lady's beautification campaigning is succeeding—despite its grumbling cynics.

A cross-country trip confirms his observation. Today there are more green, open areas and fewer billboards and eyesores—particularly near our newest highways. Many of our cities have developed aggressive local beautification programs.

What began as Mrs. Johnson's personal commitment to beautify our Nation's Capital has been transformed by her into a national commitment to remove the barriers to beauty from our midst.

Mrs. Johnson has not only mobilized all levels of government into the battle. In a nation fed up with ugliness, thousands of citizens have heeded the First Lady's call to beautify our country from the grassroots up. Thousands of letters pour into the White House monthly testifying to America's pledge to restore its ancient beauty.

Much remains to be done to remake the face of America. Generations of neglect and scorn are not erased overnight. But the commitment has been written by Congress and already—as Mr. Meyer notes—"the country is indeed more beautiful in spots." Mrs. Johnson

has appropriately summed up our progress to date:

The ugliness trend has been reversed. People are getting on the beauty bandwagon.

We must maintain the high enthusiasm of the First Lady if we are to finally succeed. I am confident that we will.

With unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the article by Philip Meyer in the Sunday Oregonian:

LADY BIRD'S BEAUTIFICATION CAMPAIGN SUCCEEDING DESPITE SNICKERS

(By Philip Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's campaign to beautify America is three years old next month, and the country is indeed more beautiful in spots—but you have to know where to look.

Despite grumbles and a few snickers, the First Lady has succeeded in getting a lot of people to talk about beauty, and some of the talk has led to visible results. Examples:

A cross-country auto trip will take you past more green, open space and fewer billboards than did the same trip three years ago.

This eye-pleasing effect is due to the increased interstate highway mileage and the suppression of billboards by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

If you happen to pass through San Pablo, Calif., you will find that a pleasant, tree-shaded plaza has replaced the junky collection of signs, poles, and wires at the town's main intersection.

A peek out of the right office windows here in Washington reveals flowers, shrubs and pleasing arrays of park benches on patches of government ground that used to be bare.

And you can't visit Boston, Philadelphia, Rochester, or other cities which have been aggressive about getting the federal beautification grants without admitting that they are pretty in places.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has spent more than \$115,000,000 in the last two years on city beautification and open space grants. Another \$90,000,000 was appropriated for highway beauty two years ago, but Congress went home last month without renewing that appropriation. This omission may be corrected in the new session.

"It's working. I don't think there's any question about it," says Mrs. Henry Fowler, wife of the Treasury secretary, and head of a traveling squad of cabinet wives and other prominent Washington women who make speeches around the country to spread the beauty gospel.

A truck driver in Mystic, Conn., agrees. He wrote:

"DEAR MRS. JOHNSON: I would like to express my appreciation for what you have done to make the highways more pleasant to drive on . . . If you should ever find time, you should take a ride on I-95 (Interstate 95) east out of New London . . . this stretch of highway would show what you have done for us truck drivers."

Mrs. Johnson does not claim the credit for this new national concern. The country was already getting fed up with ugliness. "I just got on a moving train," she says, according to her staff director, Elizabeth Carpenter.

CAMPAIGN OUTLINED

Her campaign began in February, 1965, when Mrs. Johnson appointed a group of prominent Washingtonians to an informal committee for a more beautiful capital. It quickly got things going to set an example for the rest of the country.

In the last three years, more than \$2,000,000 has come from private donors to beautify the nation's capital. Federal and municipal funds have provided another \$15,000,000 to landscape and improve parks, playgrounds and streets here.

Mrs. Johnson's concern began very early to spread beyond the capital. In the spring of 1965, she opened a White House conference on natural beauty and called for a grass roots battle against ugliness.

"It is one problem which every man and woman and child can attack and contribute to defeating," Mrs. Johnson said.

Since then, Mrs. Johnson's office in the east wing of the White House has served as a kind of clearing house for exchange of ideas among citizens with beautification problems.

"One of the most thrilling things is to see how much people are doing on their own," says Miss Wilson, who opens the letters arriving at the rate of more than a thousand a month. "It amazes me to see how much can get done without public funds."

Occasionally, Mrs. Johnson has used her position to get direct government action. Her staff director, Elizabeth Carpenter, likes to tell the story of the Dayton (Ohio) baker who wrote to the First Lady about three junked aircraft that marred his daily view as he drove past Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

"I showed the letter to her," Mrs. Carpenter recalls. "It so happened that Defense Sec. (Robert S.) McNamara was coming to dinner that night, so she kept it and gave it to him. Listen, that man is faster than sound. The next night, he called to say the airplanes had been pulled away from the highway and screened from the road. You never saw a citizen's complaint acted on so quickly."

Most of the mail, however, produces somewhat less dramatic action. Correspondents receive a pamphlet titled "Ideas for Beauty-minded People." Sample ideas: "Place planters filled with shrubs and flowers in front of your store or office. Your customers will appreciate their cheer." And, "If you have a surplus of plants, pass them along to friends and neighbors."

EXAMPLES SHOWN

By the few objective measures that are available, the country as a whole is not much more beautiful than it was three years ago. Indeed, Mrs. Johnson may have succeeded merely in slowing the trend toward ugliness.

The Highway Beautification Act, labeled "Lady Bird's Bill" by the President, is supposed to make roadides prettier by removing billboards, screening junkyards and planting greenery. But so far, less than 4 percent of the 17,000 affected junkyards have been touched.

Highways completed since the act are noticeably free of billboards, but this may not last. Congress was never too happy with the bill and the loopholes in it may soon be widened.

Mrs. Johnson is the first President's wife to get directly involved in public policy since Eleanor Roosevelt. Bess Truman, Mamie Eisenhower and Jackie Kennedy kept out of such matters, and Lady Bird is exposed to criticism and ridicule from time to time.

RIDICULE HURLED

Republican Rep. Bob Dole, now a candidate for the U.S. Senate from Kansas, offered an amendment when the Highway Beautification Act was passed, that drew a few chuckles. His amendment would have struck out all references to the secretary of commerce, who administers the act, and substituted the words "Lady Bird."

Said Dole: "When one chooses to step down from the pedestal of the dutiful, preoccupied wife of the President . . . and to wade into the turbulent stream of public controversy, one must expect to at least get her feet wet."

There have been other Republican complaints. "While we are spending money in Vietnam to defoliate," said Robert Michel of Illinois, "we are spending money at home to prove Lady Bird has a green thumb."

There also has been some grass roots grumbling. When the Cape Cod town of Truro, Mass., was awarded a landscape beautification grant, local editors called it in-

sulting. They said their area was pretty enough before.

STAND SUPPORTED

Instead of the \$72,000 worth of "all sorts of nonresident pines and junipers, off lowering shrubs and such, many who live in and love Truro might actually prefer the pitch pine, wild rose and cranberry cover that is there already," said the weekly Cape Coder.

Even friends of the program worry about whether the little federal money that is available is going to the right place. Most of the cities getting beautification grants already had a lot going for them with local officials pushing vigorously for programs of their own.

Philadelphia, for example, with the largest single federal grant, \$1,000,000 is spending another \$19,000,000 of its own on beautification.

Other cities, like Washington, have historic spots, natural scenery, or other redeeming features to make the effort seem worthwhile. San Pablo, Calif., is cited as the rare case of a city that started from a base of near-total ugliness.

"You're never going to get the country completely cleaned up," admits Mrs. Carpenter, the First Lady's enthusiastic spokesman. "But you can make people more aware of ugliness. You can make citizens conscious of the need to save their strip of trees along the river or the park down town. I think the ugliness trend has been reversed. People are getting on the beauty bandwagon."

Joint Resolution Regarding Afro-American History Week

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1968

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce today a joint resolution regarding a matter of importance to the 25 million Afro-Americans in the United States.

For 42 years, Afro-Americans have observed the week including February 14, Frederick Douglass' birthday, as a special time to commemorate the contribution of the black man to civilization. Several States have made proclamations relating to Afro-American History Week. However, the Federal Government has never officially recognized this week by special proclamation as it does for so many other commemorative days, weeks, and months.

The 55 Congressmen who have joined me in introducing this joint resolution feel as I do that it is time that Congress corrected this oversight. The 42d observance of this week by Afro-Americans was chosen as the time to introduce this resolution to give special emphasis to the omission.

We look forward to Congress passing this resolution in time for next year's celebration.

The text of the joint resolution introduced today is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1087

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as "Afro-American History Week"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America

in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested annually to issue a proclamation designating the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as "Afro-American History Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I am honored that this joint resolution is being cosponsored by so many of my colleagues. As part of my remarks, I would like to have the full list of sponsors printed in the RECORD. I am hopeful that other Members will join with us:

FIFTY-SIX SPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE WEEK INCLUDING FEBRUARY 14 AS AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY WEEK

CALIFORNIA

George E. Brown, Jr., Phillip Burton, Don Edwards, Augustus F. Hawkins, Thomas M. Rees, Lionel Van Deerlin, Charles E. Wiggins.

COLORADO

Byron G. Rogers.

CONNECTICUT

Thomas J. Meskill, William L. St. Onge.

DELAWARE

William V. Roth, Jr.

FLORIDA

Claude Pepper.

HAWAII

Spark M. Matsunaga.

ILLINOIS

Frank Annunzio, William L. Dawson, Thomas F. Rallsback, Robert McClory.

INDIANA

John Brademas, Andrew Jacobs, Jr.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harold D. Donohue.

MICHIGAN

John Conyers, Jr., Charles C. Diggs, Jr.

MINNESOTA

Donald M. Fraser, Clark MacGregor.

MISSOURI

Thomas B. Curtis, William L. Hungate.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

Henry Helstoski, Joseph G. Minish, Peter W. Rodino, Jr.

NEW YORK

Joseph P. Addabbo, Jonathan B. Bingham, Daniel E. Button, Barber B. Conable, Jr., John G. Dow, Seymour Halpern, Theodore R. Kupferman, Richard D. McCarthy, Joseph Y. Resnick, Howard W. Robison, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James H. Scheuer, Herbert Tenzer.

OHIO

Thomas L. Ashley, Clarence J. Brown, Jr.

PENNSYLVANIA

William S. Moorhead, Robert N. C. Nix, Richard S. Schweiker, Joseph P. Vigorito.

TENNESSEE

Richard H. Fulton.

TEXAS

Bob Eckhardt, James C. Wright, Jr.

WASHINGTON

Thomas M. Pelly.

WISCONSIN

Robert W. Kastenmeier, Henry S. Reuss.

Since the date for establishing Afro-American History Week is the day which Frederick Douglass chose to celebrate as his birthday, I would like to insert in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a brief biography of Douglass

whose courage, conviction, and outspokenness have made him a legend and an inspiration for all black people. Frederick Douglass escaped from slavery as a young man and fought throughout his life for the still unachieved goal of social and economic equality for all Americans. His speeches have the same force and relevance today as they did during the 19th century.

The following biographical sketch is taken from "Great Negroes: Past and Present," by Russell L. Adams:

FREDERICK A. DOUGLASS (1817-95): GOLDEN TROMBONE OF ABOLITION

The first day of 1863 was bitter and cold. The 3,000 abolitionists and free Negroes gathered in Tremont Temple, Boston were excited and waited impatiently for news from Washington D.C. Among those in the hall were Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Wells Brown and Frederick A. Douglass, people whose lives had been dedicated to bringing about this moment. The crowd had gathered early and passed the time with oratory and singing. Douglass, the greatest orator of them all, had spoken and now he, too, was waiting with the rest. Into the hall burst a man shouting, "It is coming, it's on the wires, the Telegram is coming in!" The Telegram was news of the Emancipation Proclamation, now taking effect. The crowd quickly translated the Telegram into song:

"Sound loud the timbrel o'er Egypt's dark sea
Jehovah has triumphed: His people are free!"

Four million black men and women would soon be free. Not all of them and not all at the same time but, inevitably, all one day would be free.

For Frederick A. Douglass, already a free man, this night was the high point of his life. From Tremont Temple, Douglass could look back on a life which had begun in slavery and obscurity. Rising like some bronze Phoenix, Douglass for years had been the golden trombone of abolition, ever pressing for the freedom of his fellow Negroes. No one knows just how this ex-slave, ship caulker, wood cutter, coal handler and odd job man, almost overnight, became the spokesman of his race. Born in 1817 on Maryland's hard scrabble, Eastern shore, Frederick Augustus Bailey as a child often had to fight with dogs over bones in order to get enough food. His rebellious spirit kept him in trouble with his master and once he was whipped each week for six months in an effort to break his indomitable spirit. Exasperated, his master sold him when he was ten years old. When Frederick Augustus Bailey was 21, he escaped and went to New Bedford, Massachusetts, the city of Paul Cuffe. Here he finally learned to read and write and to know that there were many others who felt slavery to be wrong.

In 1841, now a married man, Frederick August Bailey changed his name to Douglass and began to attend meetings of the various anti-slavery societies, telling of his experiences as a slave. The Massachusetts Anti-slavery Society engaged him as lecturer and expected him to tell simply what had happened to him and leave the broader issues to others, such as William Lloyd Garrison and the society general agent, William Collins. But like Garrison, Douglass determined that he would be heard. "It did not entirely satisfy me to narrate wrongs. I felt like denouncing them." From this point forward, Douglass traveled all over New England and much of the North. His travels were not without hardship and danger, for he was still a fugitive slave. Nor was the North itself completely sympathetic with his cause. In Pendleton, Indiana for example, he was beaten unconscious and left for dead by a white mob. Undaunted Douglass continued to denounce the evils of slavery.

It was perhaps in the crucible of the anti-slavery lecture circuit that the real education of Douglass was earned. So great was Douglass' skill as an orator his fame soon overshadowed that of other able Negro spokesmen such as Charles L. Remond, Henry Highland Garnett and even caused tension between himself and some of his white colleagues. Three things contributed to his success as a spokesman: the inherent justice of his cause in a North growing increasingly doubtful of the wisdom of slavery, the vigor of his oratory and the drama of his person. A powerfully-built, strong-featured mulatto with a huge leonine head, Douglass' bearing was nobility itself. James Russell Lowell said that "the very look of Douglass was an irresistible logic against the oppression of his race."

In 1845 against the advice of his friends, Douglass decided to write an account of his life, fully aware of the possibility that this would mark him as the "Bailey, run-

away slave of Thomas Auld." When his *Narrative of the Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* appeared in this same year, Douglass went to England and continued to speak out against slavery. English friends raised money to secure his formal freedom from his old master and two years later Douglass returned to America to start a newspaper, first called *The North Star*, and later *Frederick Douglass' Paper*. In his own words, Douglass managed "to keep my anti-slavery banner steadily flying during all the [slavery] conflict from the autumn of 1847 till the Union of the states was assured and Emancipation was a fact accomplished."

Shifting slowly from the spoken to the printed word, Douglass now moved even closer to direct action. In 1848 he joined the short-lived Liberty Party. During the early winter of 1850, he met with John Brown before his raid on Harper's Ferry and cautioned the latter, declaring that "from insurrection nothing can be expected but

imprisonment and death." Douglass' prediction came true and Douglass himself had to live in Canada for a while.

When the impending crisis finally erupted in outright war, Frederick Douglass urged Lincoln to free the slaves and arm Negroes. He also recruited Negroes for the Union armies, among them his own sons.

When the Union emerged victorious, Douglass turned his attention to the status of the freedmen, urging education as a way out. Many of these ideas were read by Booker T. Washington and embodied in Tuskegee Institute. Douglass was also quite interested in universal suffrage, women's rights, and world peace. He held a variety of offices with the U.S. government, including that of Recorder of Deeds, Washington, D.C. and Minister to Haiti.

Frederick Augustus Douglass lived until 1895 and saw the pendulum of history swing from slavery toward the beginning of freedom.

SENATE—Friday, February 16, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Let us run with patience the race that is set before us. Hebrews 12: 1.

O God, Lord of men and of nations, to Thee we turn for peace and strength. Let this time, wisely set apart by this body to acknowledge Thee, be a time of fresh fellowship with Thee and a new experience of Thy presence and love. Come close to us and especially to the Members of this important group of dedicated men, and beyond the power of any human words spoken in prayer, meet our needs.

Here today we pray that Thou will quicken the minds and challenge the courage and illumine the spirit of those who have the responsibility of making decisions that ultimately determine our destiny as a nation.

In this place we are aware of our history, remembering great men and inspired decisions of the past and present. We also feel conscious of another presence that has been here throughout our history and we feel is here now, even Thy presence. For this we are thankful and we renew our loyalty to Thee in this hour.

Be with those brave men who represent us in the fields of battle as well as those who represent us here. Hasten the day when wars shall cease to the ends of the world. Thank Thee for Thy help, O Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1968, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated

to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 14, 1968, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 491. An act to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 1542. An act 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.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD AT CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CHURCH ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be allowed to proceed for 1 hour at the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go

into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk read the nomination of Harold L. Oppenheimer to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN AIR FORCE, ARMY, AND MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, and the Marine Corps.