

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 15477. A bill for the relief of Peter William Craine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15478. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederick Sia Lim and his wife Chua Huay Ching Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15479. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo Burgos-Camilo and Ramona Ventura de Burgos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15480. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Linford Escalante, Yvonne Marie Escalante, and Jacqueline Elizabeth Escalante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15481. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bhupendrakumar Manibhai Patel, M.B., B.S.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15482. A bill for the relief of Ricardo

V. Alberto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

245. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to a national petition day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Discontinuance of Union Pacific and Northern Pacific Passenger Trains—Joint Memorial of Idaho Legislature

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the second extraordinary session of the 39th Legislature of Idaho has adopted and forwarded to me a joint memorial to the U.S. Congress.

The memorial concerns petitions before the Interstate Commerce Commission by the Northern Pacific and Union Pacific Railroads to discontinue several passenger trains now serving Idaho.

I agree that the arguments for such discontinuance should be thoroughly examined, as is currently planned by the ICC, and ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the joint memorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[Legislature of the State of Idaho, second extraordinary session, 39th legislature]

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your Memorialists, the Legislature of the state of Idaho, in the Second Extraordinary Session of the Thirty-ninth Session thereof, respectfully represent that—

Whereas, there are now petitions before the Interstate Commerce Commission by railroads serving Idaho to discontinue the Northern Pacific "Mainstreeter" passenger train operating between Fargo, North Dakota and Seattle, Washington, through northern Idaho, the Union Pacific "Portland Rose" passenger train between Kansas City, Missouri and Portland, Oregon, through southern Idaho and the Union Pacific "Butte Special" passenger train between Salt Lake City, Utah and Butte, Montana, through eastern Idaho; and

Whereas, the passenger trains referred to are either the only passenger trains through the communities or the only passenger trains that serve certain communities on the routes; and

Whereas, the railway post office cars and mail storage cars have been removed from the passenger trains with a very evident deterioration in the mail service; and

Whereas, this discontinuance of mail contracts has resulted in an evident loss of revenue which has made necessary a serious cutback in passenger service on the above mentioned trains; and

Whereas, the Railway Express Agency has found it necessary to seek means of transportation other than passenger trains, re-

sulting in a serious disruption of service; and Whereas, mail service and public transportation service in general is becoming noticeably deteriorated; and

Whereas, the citizens of the state of Idaho and the Pacific Northwest are entitled to reliable, efficient, convenient and economical passenger, mail and express service:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Second Extraordinary Session of the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the state of Idaho, the Senate concurring therein, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed at the earliest possible date to conduct proper investigation of the need for rail passenger service, the need for coordination with other modes of transportation, and particularly, the return of an efficient mail and express service.

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the state of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the President and Vice-President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States, the Chairman and the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation of the United States.

Lithuanian Independence Day

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today is a day filled with biting irony. We mark today an anniversary of Lithuania's independence; yet we cannot do so wholly in the spirit of celebration and honor. We can celebrate that day 717 years ago upon which Mindaugas the Great unified the disparate Lithuanian principalities into a single strong kingdom; but we can hardly celebrate the many times in these intervening years which have seen that kingdom pawed and torn by foreign power. We can honor that day in 1918 which saw the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania; but it is not with honor that we note how many of the 50 years since have seen that Republic's territorial and political rights abridged by the Soviet Union. We can, and we certainly should, praise the great courage and nearly uncanny resilience which have characterized the Lithuanian people; but we must also—to truly honor them—denounce the brutal circumstances on which they are presently held.

In October of 1966, the Senate unani-

mously adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416. We in the 90th Congress should reaffirm that resolve. That resolution recognized that—

The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

We should again urge the President of the United States—

First, to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and

Second, to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

The issues here are large. They concern the principles and priorities around which we must seek to build an international law and an international peace. They are large, also, in terms of the response which both our history and our heritage require of us.

The processes under which the Soviet Union annihilated the political independence and the territorial integrity of these Baltic States were both deliberate and devious. In 1926, and again in 1932, the Baltic Republics had signed non-aggression pacts with the Soviet Union. They had, also, in the spring of 1939 concluded a similar pact with Nazi Germany. These proved to be of no avail.

The Soviets were secretly negotiating with Germany for special arrangements, or "guarantees," with regard to both Poland and the Baltic States. So the cudgels fell.

In 1939, the Soviet Union forced the Baltic States to permit Soviet military bases within their frontiers. Later that same year, the Russian State Security Service signed a secret instruction for the deportation of anti-Soviet elements to Siberia upon occupation of the Baltic States. Finally, in June of 1940, Molotov, then President of the Soviet Peoples Commissars, denounced the Baltic States for their aggressive intentions—a ludicrous charge—and issued an ultimatum. Within the terms of this ultimatum, the Soviet Army had occupied the Baltic States by June 17, 1940. This occupation continues today.

As a nation "under the law," and as a nation that has consistently held to its position that "all people have the right to determine the form of their national existence," the United States cannot condone this international crime, this

denial of such basic rights. As a member of the United Nations, whose charter specifically commits it to the search for international peace and national self-determination, we will never accept without protest the lingering injustice suffered by the people of Lithuania.

Indianapolis Group Makes Self-Help Work

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are times when it must seem that the term self-help has become a forbidden word in our language. Not for Mrs. Mattie Coney, of Indianapolis, however, who has organized, guided, and directed the Indianapolis Citizens Forum.

The following article by Russell Kirk in the February 8, 1968, Indianapolis Star describes the work of the citizens forum:

INDIANAPOLIS GROUP MAKES SELF-HELP WORK

Congress has made rat-control a function of the national government—but presumably the rats don't know it. Rodents will continue to thrive, regardless of Federal appropriations, until people in the heart of our cities cease to scatter garbage about.

Similarly, criminals and fanatics and the reckless and the violent will do as they please, regardless of talk in Washington—until local people take action in their own communities. There is no Federal Pled Piper—and besides, the people of Hamelin paid a terrible price for letting someone else provide their rat-control.

So it is heartening that in some of our city centers intelligent people are beginning to act at the local level, without government direction or subsidy of any sort. One of the better examples is the Citizens Forum, in Indianapolis.

The prime mover and president of this voluntary organization is the energetic and humorous Mrs. Mattie Rice Coney, who has taken an extended leave of absence from her school-teaching to clean up, and restore order to, the heart of Indianapolis. You can read about her work in an interesting new book by M. Stanton Evans and Margaret Moore, "The Law Breakers: America's Number One Domestic Problem" (Arlington House).

Mr. and Mrs. Elmo Coney (for now her husband has joined her in this work, full time) have a simple office and a modest budget defrayed by an Indianapolis foundation, the Lilly Endowment. They take no governmental money. Recently I visited them, and I found them wondrously cheerful and hopeful, even though they are performing a labor of Hercules in trying to cleanse the Augean stables of urban decay and disintegration.

The Coneys begin by brightening the corner where they are. They have formed volunteer organizations, block by block—colored residents and white residents—to clean up a vast area of Indianapolis. Thousands of tons of disused refrigerators, old cars and miscellaneous junk have been carted away from city back yards, in cooperation with the municipal authorities. Once a neighborhood begins to look better, people begin to think better of themselves.

"There's no one so culturally deprived that he can't wash his own face," says Mrs. Coney. Elmo Coney, who also has the gift of sensible and witty talk, emphasizes the need for per-

sonal relationships in a neighborhood—knowing one's neighbors' names, for instance. "If you know a man's name, he won't wish to rob you, or won't dare."

Here are the practical slogans and recommendations which the Coneys post on buses, in shop windows and every place they can find:

"No loitering on street corners.

"No beer drinking in public.

"Put cans and bottles in containers.

"Don't be a loudmouth.

"Wrap garbage—put in covered can.

"Minimum noise in neighborhood.

"Front and side yard for beauty.

"Keep business to self on buses."

And more to the same general effect. Simple remedies? Yes—and effective: more effective than any amount of compulsion or bribery could be.

Remarks of M. G. O'Neil, President of the General Tire & Rubber Co., at Sacred Heart College

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Sacred Heart College, Belmont, N.C., is a very fine institution of higher education for young ladies. It has been operated by the Sisters of Mercy for the past 78 years as an academy and junior college. Recently the college entered the ranks of the senior colleges and will grant degrees commencing in 1970.

On the evening of February 15, 1968, Sacred Heart College entertained community leaders at a very splendid dinner on its Belmont campus. The principal speaker for the occasion was Mr. M. G. O'Neil, president, the General Tire & Rubber Co. Mr. O'Neil's remarks were very impressive as he dealt with the importance of the education of young women.

As one who has observed the excellent educational program of Sacred Heart College over a period of many years, I can attest to the contribution of the institution in providing the type of education for young ladies which will equip them to meet the challenges outlined by Mr. O'Neil.

There is no more dedicated staff at any college than one will find at Sacred Heart College, nor has any institution rendered greater service to a community than we have had in our community from the college. Mr. O'Neil's address is made a part of the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS TO SACRED HEART COLLEGE BY M. G. O'NEIL, PRESIDENT, THE GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER CO., BELMONT, N.C., FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Two years ago, I had the pleasure of being in Charlotte to speak at the United Appeal dinner.

It is pleasant to renew tonight the acquaintances I made then, and to meet more of you.

You represent an important part of the leadership segment of this area. You are largely responsible for the great progress that has been made by this region in recent years. Progress which is just beginning.

I know how effectively the advantages of this area can be put forth because our company is a new corporate citizen of Charlotte.

Obviously we share with you great faith in the present advantages and the future potential of the Piedmont Crescent.

Within the past three months, we formally opened here the fifth tire manufacturing facility in General Tire's domestic network.

This plant is, we believe, the most modern tire plant in the world. Currently, it is producing 7,000 passenger tires a day. Soon, production will be stepped up to 8,000—plus a daily output of 500 truck tires. The potential is 20,000 tires of all types per day.

I mention these facts not as a "commercial" for General Tire, but as the basis for some observations I think are appropriate.

Someone has said that the decision to locate a major plant in any city has "a terrible permanence."

This is true. You can't pick up and move a multimillion-dollar manufacturing plant after a few years.

If all the economic factors have been checked out properly, a company can't very easily make a mistake in its short-term expectations.

But the long-range future is the important thing . . . and is another matter.

Not how big—but how well will the community grow? Will its educational facilities, for instance, keep pace with its economic and population growth?

A community is most attractive to industry when it is attractive to highly motivated people as a place to live, to work, raise their children and educate them.

Let me quote just two sentences from a report by Thomas A. Vanderslice, of the General Electric Company, which was a part of a national symposium published last month to mark the 25th anniversary of the Committee for Economic Development:

"When a company contemplates moving into a community," Mr. Vanderslice wrote, "quite often the decisive factor is not taxes, not the labor supply, and not the nearness to markets. What really makes the difference is the quality of the schools."

Whether or not you believe this overstates the case for quality education, it is an authoritative opinion.

It expresses the view of many ambitious young parents who, in our mobile society today can choose to live and work where they feel their children will have good educational facilities available.

For reasons like this, the expansion plans of the administration of Sacred Heart College are of much greater community significance than they might have seemed to have been just a few years ago.

After 78 years as an academy and junior college, Sacred Heart College will grant its first Baccalaureate degrees in 1970—fully accredited by both the North Carolina State Board of Education and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

By that time, student enrollment is expected to reach 600. It will be the only Catholic women's college between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Florida, and it will open, of course, to students of all faiths.

This new four-year college is a needed cultural asset for this growing area. It is a tangible step toward assuring that your educational facilities here will keep pace with your economic development.

For undertaking to meet this need, I congratulate the administrators of the College, the Sisters of Mercy of North Carolina, who next year will celebrate the 100th anniversary of their educational work in the state.

The Charlotte area is blessed with four fine colleges. All of them deserve wholehearted community support. They will be vitally needed as this area grows. We at General will encourage our people to pursue higher education at the college of their choice here, and help finance them through our Tuition Refund Program.

Industry has found that it is no longer sound to contribute only to educational institutions which graduate engineers, scientists and business administration majors.

Our support of these universities which graduate industry's future leaders is necessary and will continue.

But one of the characteristics of a free society is that all worthwhile human effort is recognized as inter-related.

The economic, political and social aspects of our lives are so interwoven that the good influence of a well-educated woman is just as important in the community as the skill or technical knowledge of her husband.

I understand that most of the graduates of Sacred Heart College will go into the teaching field. There, they will have positions of community leadership immediately—wherever they teach. Their work will directly affect the future because they will be training the minds of the future generations.

We know that the highly publicized protesters, malcontents and down-graders of our way of life, who are in the teaching field, are a small minority. But the publicity they get—and its influence on the uninformed—makes all the more necessary teachers dedicated to sound ideals and to the principles of our free society.

The free enterprise system needs intelligent interpretation by those in the teaching field. It deserves this support, as well, from the college graduates who are going into government service.

A strong and growing economy is the basis of the strength of our government. The country cannot be strong militarily, provide the social service programs of the government, or furnish government aid to education, in a nation of 200-million people, without an adequate, healthy economy.

It is the economy which provides the taxes for all the billions of dollars of government expenditures.

Ironically, business and industry do not get credit for this. Instead, our economic well-being is generally thought of as an automatic by-product of our form of government.

The importance of a strong economy has become masked by its own success. A disturbing number of bright college graduates want careers in fields they think are more "socially meaningful" than business and industry.

What is more socially meaningful than providing millions of jobs? And paying—to mention just one tax bill of industry last year—more than \$30 billion in federal corporate taxes alone?

What kind of career do many college graduates want, in order to make "meaningful" contributions to society?

Do they want to work for a company and help pay half the social security bill for hundreds—maybe thousands—of their fellowmen?

Do they want to help provide their company's pension for its retired employees?

Do they want to make a substantial contribution to education with a gift to their own college? (A gift which many companies will match.)

Or do they want to help build a new wing on the local hospital?

Do they want to help support the health and social service agencies in their community? The business they can work for does these things through contributions to United Fund campaigns and to other local agencies.

Without taxes and voluntary contributions of business, none of these things would be possible. So, what is the reaction of a growing number of our smartest college graduates?

A high percentage want to go into government service, join the Peace Corps, or do various kinds of social work. Now, I'm not belittling any of these. But I am mystified. It proves there is something terribly wrong with the image that is being projected of the social importance of business.

If enough of our educated young people

come to feel that going into business will not let them fulfill their ambitions to do something worthwhile for their fellowmen, then all of us—not only business and industry—are in trouble. Industry must have a growing number of talented, educated young people to meet the exploding needs of a growing population, and to work with the complicated techniques of the new technologies.

Last year, for the first time in many years, a trend seems to have started toward a better attitude about business among college people. A national survey reported just last week that now a majority of men students, and a growing number of women, say they are primarily interested in business careers after college.

The trend is most evident among young women. This is undoubtedly because the opportunities for women in business have broadened so much in recent years.

There has been a lot of publicity about the many positions of high responsibility now being held by women.

The New York Stock Exchange admitted its first woman member in history, just last month. Our own company elected a woman to its finance committee for the first time. At least two leading New York department stores have women chief executives.

Many young women graduates are going into sophisticated computer fields—a vast, challenging area that did not exist a few years ago.

There are many more new opportunities for educated women in today's business world, as well as in the educational field where as teachers of tomorrow's citizens they have always been indispensable.

A school like Sacred Heart College graduates "Women of Influence"—in the best sense of that phrase.

With great influence on the home, on the community, on the nation and—most important of all, whether as a mother or teacher—on the future generations of American children.

To a very large extent, in the hands of Christian educated women lie the hopes, and the fulfillment of the best plans of you leaders of the Piedmont Crescent.

Federal Highway Trust Funds

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this distinguished body to the peculiar problems of highway construction in Minnesota. Because of our cold and snow-filled Minnesota winters, highway construction is feasible only 6 to 7 months of the year.

In order to get the needed work done in this period of time, long-range plans must be made. Because the employment is on a part-time basis, construction companies must know well in advance what contracts they will be awarded so that workers can be hired.

Because of the short work year, Minnesota traditionally finds itself in somewhat of a bind. The work must be done in the summertime and that is when our State is host to millions of tourists using our highways to drive to our more than 10,000 sparkling lakes.

Any general delay in Federal funding of aids to State highway programs is bad, but in Minnesota, because of the short construction season, they are doubly bad.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD a letter which I recently received from the Governor of Minnesota, Harold LeVander, dealing with the problems arising from the holdback of Federal highway trust funds:

The time has come when we must take a firm stand on the matter of highway programs in our nation. Since 1965, the Federal government has taken liberties with the Highway Trust Fund that have disrupted highway building in every state. Delays in quarterly payments were enough to upset the balance of our long-range programs, and the further aggravation of the cutback of November 1966 created unnecessary turmoil.

Now we are faced with an even more serious disruption of our plans by the unjustified, menacing cutting away of \$600 million from the Highway Trust Fund allotments in 1968. This budget degradation would be bad enough, were it not for the fact that these funds are dedicated and collected only from road users. They should not be susceptible to the whims of the Administration.

The balance of the Highway Trust Fund at the end of fiscal 1967 was \$725 million. An expected apportionment for the current fiscal year was reduced from \$4.8 billion to \$4.4 billion, and allotments are running far behind. As chief executive of a vigorous, progressive state, I must protest this manipulation of dedicated funds.

National economics may dictate tight money controls and restricted spending, but these adjustments must not be allowed to affect the flow of dedicated, self-supporting trust funds. Payments to the states should be based entirely upon the availability of these funds.

In Minnesota, the effects of the Administration's fiscal policies for highway programs has had a telling effect. Not only has the Minnesota Highway Department had its planning crippled by the regressive actions, but the effects have been felt in each of the 87 county highway departments through the funds which are reapportioned for use on Federal aid secondary highways.

On October 1, 1965, the Federal government was a full three months and \$24 million behind schedule in releasing our Federal aid funds. As a result of the Administration's cutback of November 1966, the deficit has now reached \$43.5 million and we are confronted with another cutback which could swell the deficit to approximately \$51.5 million by the end of this fiscal year.

Of the \$111 million apportioned to Minnesota at the beginning of fiscal 1968, we have so far received \$40 million. We can look forward to just one more allotment before the end of the year, which was expected to amount to approximately \$25.5 million. Now this, too, has been reduced, and we are now faced with the possibility of going into fiscal 1969 a full six months behind our anticipated programs.

As one of Minnesota's representatives in Congress, you are in a position to protect the sanctity of the Highway Trust Fund. It is in the best interests of your state and your nation that the revenues collected from road users be promptly put to their intended purpose. To insure this nation's burgeoning highway system for the safety and continued economic progress that the future requires, we must be confident of a consistent flow of highway funds to the limit of the availability of these funds.

The cost of highway construction is increasing. It is a fallacy to contend that delaying any of these programs will save money. In many cases, bonding programs are being used to speed up needed highway construction on the premise that the cost of interest is nearly parallel to the rising costs of construction. In addition, a much more urgent savings may be measured in terms of deaths, personal injuries and property damage caused by highway accidents.

There can be no doubt that this nation's highway programs are among the most important public programs ever undertaken by this or any other nation. It is more significant, however, that the funds for these programs are collected from those who use the highways, with the pledge that they will be used for that purpose.

For this reason, I am asking you, as a representative of the State of Minnesota, to urge action that will halt the manipulation of the Highway Trust Fund. Work for legislation, if necessary, to prevent further delays and reductions in the allocation of funds for highway programs. Stay the hand of the President and his Administration from diminishing the flow of this dedicated revenue. Keep the Highway Trust Fund inviolate by insuring the disbursement of funds as soon as they are available.

Sincerely,

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.

Comparisons of President Lyndon B. Johnson and President Abraham Lincoln in Conduct of Presidency in Face of Public Dissent

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Senators a most thoughtful letter, written by Patrick Riddleberger, professor of history at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Ill., to the editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Professor Riddleberger analyzes comparisons that have been attempted between President Johnson and President Lincoln in the matter of the conduct of their high office in the face of public dissent. The letter helps to bring the historical record into sharper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JOHNSON AND LINCOLN: PRESIDENT'S ANALOGY WITH CIVIL WAR QUESTIONED BY A HISTORIAN

In the current crisis which the United States faces in Vietnam, it is very tempting to resort to historical analogy. The complexity and the deep tragedy of our involvement in that unhappy land make it altogether understandable that we would search for explanations, or rationalizations, or perhaps illumination, in this way. The historical analogy, especially when it might convince us that we are not departing from American traditions, is one avenue to the satisfaction of these proclivities. It is, however, a precarious one and should be resorted to with wisdom and caution.

In fact, our Vietnam involvement is so unique that it defies analogy, in any one to one relationship, with our past experience, and undoubtedly too many of us have been unable to resist the temptation to engage in it.

Regrettably, the President has increasingly resorted to it, as our presence in Vietnam becomes more untenable. His efforts to draw an analogy between himself and the Civil War President on the occasion of Lincoln's birthday is only the most flagrant ex-

ample. His speech on this, and some other occasions, verges on demagoguery.

Up to a point, the analogy President Johnson draws between himself and Lincoln is valid, just as it is valid to draw them between himself and other Presidents. Lincoln and Johnson both faced grave crises, and both faced strenuous opposition. At this point the analogy ends. Both the nature of the crises faced by these men and their methods of dealing with them defy any simple analogy.

Only those who are grossly uninformed, misinformed or sentimental could accept a comparison between Lincoln's preservation of the American Union with an American involvement on the mainland of Asia eight thousand miles away. But the very poignancy of this war—the insensate loss of life among military and civilians and the wanton destruction—are inducements to react to a sentimental appeal, especially when the most legendary figure in our history is brought into the equation.

The differences between Lincoln and Johnson are so far reaching that it would be impossible to deal with them adequately in the space allotted here, but let me suggest a few of them.

Lincoln's analysis of the state of the Union during the secession crisis, which he presented in his first inaugural address, was steeped in the history of the growing sectionalism and the constitutional development in the United States during the preceding half-century. There was little or no dissent by responsible persons in the North to this presentation of the case, and after the war many responsible Southerners came to accept it.

In fact, the most difficult opposition Lincoln had to face came from those Radicals within his own party who wanted him to pursue the war with more vigor. There was disagreement on some points, but with the Emancipation Proclamation, which was decided on by the summer of 1862, they were in substantial agreement. But the current opposition to Johnson's policies comes from responsible leaders in both parties, including the chairman and several members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, from the clergy, from business, and from the academic community.

To be sure, there were dark days for the North from 1861 to 1865, but the North was not divided as the nation is today. If Americans must discover past experiences to justify our involvement in Vietnam, this one simply will not do. Lincoln kept around him, in Cabinet posts, men who were spokesmen of the Radical opposition. Although he was patient with generals who did not achieve immediate victory, in due time failure led to replacement. Lincoln was never beguiled by promises or by fatuous optimism on the part of his generals. Moreover, Lincoln never deviated from the principle that the ultimate authority rested with the civilian President. There was no erosion of the political administration, even during the bleakest and most heartrending setbacks. Can the same be said of the Johnson Administration?

The most profound difference between the two men is to be found in their view of the world, their sense of tragedy and their sense of history. Lincoln could never have asserted, as has Johnson, that he was not going to be the first American President to lose a war. Rather, he said to the departing South, and to the nation, "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen . . . is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assuage you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend' it." Lincoln understood all the nuances of the situation confronting him and handled them with the delicacy of a virtuoso.

Despite his limited political experience and

humble origins, Lincoln had enough self-confidence to be able to see the limitations of his power and to understand that he could not control all the forces of history. Hence he had that capacity for growth which all our great Presidents have had, and without which they are inevitably relegated to mediocrity.

Perhaps it is too early to make an assessment but these seem to be the very qualities that President Johnson lacks. This is not to accuse him of a lack of sincerity, or even a kind of courage, but it is hardly unfair to suggest that he suffers from a sort of obtuseness which compounds his difficulties.

The sort of demagoguery which the President resorts to in the misuse of history can be also found in his refusal to distinguish clearly between opposition to his policy and attitudes toward the fighting men in Vietnam. Time and again, in awarding Congressional Medals of Honor, the President uses the occasion to make speeches about policy and to impugn the motives of his critics. Those of us who oppose the current Vietnam policy are as much concerned about the American soldier as the most hawkish members of the Administration; in fact, we are so concerned that we want the impossible situation into which he has been thrown changed at the earliest feasible time.

Any sensitive member of the academic community is faced with the question of just what his role should be in times such as these. In fact, the academic community is divided on this question, and in the final analysis each member must decide for himself how active he should be and in what ways he can act. It does seem to this writer to be very proper, perhaps even imperative, that when information in an area in which he has some professional competency is being misused and distorted, he should move from the classroom to the public forum. It is in this spirit and on this premise that this letter is written.

PATRICK W. RIDDLEBERGER,
Professor of History, Southern Illinois
University,
EDWARDSVILLE.

Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call my colleagues' attention to an editorial that appeared in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, February 15, 1968. The editorial comments on Washington, D.C., Councilman and Vice Chairman Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy's choice to be a member of the board of convenors of the Black United Front, of which Stokely Carmichael is chairman.

The Black United Front, a new Negro civil rights coalition, announced February 15, 1968, that it backs the aims of the Reverend Martin Luther King's April job demonstration in the Nation's Capital. In regard to the so-called April "tent-in," Reverend King is quoted as saying "if there is no response, then we might go to disruptive protest" to achieve our demands. Just what Reverend King means by "disruptive protest" has not been spelled out but it is not outside the realm of reasonable men to presume that "disruptive protest" means that the orderly functioning of our Government and Nation's Capital will be disrupted.

When Reverend Fauntroy accepted his appointment by President Johnson as Vice Chairman of the Washington, D.C., City Council, he also accepted the responsibility to run the city efficiently and with due regard to the needs of all the people—not only the private citizens but the Federal Government itself.

However, by becoming a member of the board of convenors of the Black United Front, Reverend Fauntroy is attempting to wear two hats. On one side, he is pledged to work for the best interests of the Nation's Capital in his position as Vice Chairman of the City Council. On the other side, he has deliberately joined a group which pledges "disruptive protest" if their demands are not met. It is apparent that Reverend Fauntroy has placed himself in a contradictory position and a position which the city and the Government cannot tolerate. It is imperative that Reverend Fauntroy decide, and decide now, as to which organization he wishes to pledge his loyalty. If Reverend Fauntroy desires to be an active and leading member of a group which pledges "disruptive protest" against the very city that he represents as Vice Chairman of its City Council, then he should immediately resign his City Council position.

The editorial follows:

There were more than a few raised eyebrows around town last month when the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy attended a secret strategy conference at which, it was reported, formation of a "United Black Front" to include both civil rights moderates and militants was approved. Stokely Carmichael was among the militants who attended.

Certainly, the Rev. Fauntroy had every reason to attend the meeting. After all, he is Washington representative of Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

What caused the raised eyebrows was the fact that the Rev. Fauntroy is also vice chairman of the new D.C. City Council.

At the time, not too much was said about the Rev. Fauntroy's attendance at the meeting. However, now that some of the "organizers" for Dr. King's April "tent in" here have arrived in town, we are pressed to consider the prospects for the Federal City and especially, to consider the Rev. Fauntroy's equivocal position.

Dr. King has said: "We will stay until we get a response" to demands upon Congress for "full employment" and a guaranteed income for those unable to work. He said that all this would be the "absolute minimum goal" for the April campaign. "If there is no response, then we might go to disruptive protest."

The operative word here is "disruptive." What does it imply?

Washingtonians, whether involved directly with the Federal government or not, must presume that "disruptive" means what it says—that the physical functioning of the city will be interfered with.

Dr. King indicates that his battle is with the Federal government, not the District government. We submit, however, that such a distinction cannot be drawn if "disruptive protest" becomes an actuality.

This, of course, is exactly where the Rev. Fauntroy's dual roles become involved.

The D.C. government—its mayor, deputy mayor and City Council—are charged by President Johnson, who appointed them, with responsibility for running the city efficiently and with due regard for the needs of all who live here—the private citizens them-

selves and the Federal government which functions here.

How, then, can a member of that city government—the vice chairman of its City Council, in fact—fulfill two antithetical roles, namely, as an important city official on the one hand and as the official representative of a possibly "disruptive" force on the other?

One might reply that it would be time enough for the Rev. Fauntroy to determine where his primary loyalty lies when, and if, the threatened disruption takes place. We do not agree. We believe that the Rev. Fauntroy should make his decision long before the die is cast—and take action on that decision to make his position clear now.

We make bold to suggest that in so doing the Rev. Fauntroy would also ease the manifold and increasing problems of the city's eminently able mayor, who has troubles enough as it is.

P.S.: Yesterday's official revelation that the Rev. Fauntroy is a member of the Board of Convenors of the Black United Front, of which Mr. Carmichael is chairman, simply reinforces our opinions expressed above.

Post Office Department Honors Texans

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Saturday, February 17, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien announced that 81 citations including \$3,000 in cost awards would be presented at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the following day, February 18, in recognition of outstanding service to the mails during the emergency caused by Hurricane Beulah.

Assistant Postmaster General Richard J. Murphy, Chief of Personnel, made the presentation in the east ballroom of the Robert Driscoll Hotel.

Awards went to 22 postal employees as individuals, to employee complements of 50 post offices, and to nine private citizens. All were cited for their outstanding contributions to the postal service last September after the hurricane, floods, and tornadoes that devastated a large portion of southern Texas.

The ceremony was hosted by Dallas Regional Director B. M. Myers and Corpus Christi Postmaster Otis S. Bowers.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the remarks of Assistant Postmaster General Richard J. Murphy, delivered in Corpus Christi in presentation of the citations and awards, together with the names of all those receiving citations and awards, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL RICHARD J. MURPHY, BUREAU OF PERSONNEL, FEBRUARY 18, 1968, AT ROBERT DRISCOLL HOTEL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

It is a particular pleasure for me to be with you in Corpus Christi; I take great pride in the presentation of these awards.

Nowhere is dedication to the postal service so dramatically illustrated as in times of crisis. The hurricane that ravaged southern Texas last September caused millions of dollars worth of damage, destroyed homes and

other property, disrupted postal service and for an uncertain time rendered thousands homeless.

It is no small tribute to note that the postal service was restored even before many hurricane victims, including postal employees had a chance to assess their losses and to tend to their own needs.

Such devotion, I might say, is no less than that with which postal employees in Texas and everywhere throughout the United States fulfill their responsibilities to the postal service and the American public.

That kind of devotion is not unusual; it only shows more brightly against the background of a crisis like Hurricane Beulah.

We saw the same kind of inspiration and determination among postal employees in Fairbanks, Alaska, just a month before Hurricane Beulah ravaged the Gulf Coast. In Alaska, it was a flood, but the disaster evoked the same kind of response from postal employees. The same dedication motivated postal employees in Anchorage after the Good Friday earthquake in 1964 and in New Orleans and Miami after the hurricane of 1965 and again in Florida after the 1966 hurricane.

The awards we present here today are most highly earned. But they could never tell the whole story. There was so much bravery during that storm, so many instances of self-sacrifice and heroism that we could never recount them all.

Beyond that, there is the courage of those who helped to rebuild and the contribution of others who were not involved at all but who sent food, supplies and funds to the disaster victims. It was the most generous kind of compassion.

That is why the presentation of these awards in the wake of Hurricane Beulah can be symbolic only, representative of the will and dedication of many individuals.

It is not too much to say that the postal service itself is a monument to all those who helped sustain it during that desperate crisis last September. And I am speaking of everyone, not postal employees alone.

Typical of the pitch-in-and-help attitude that prevailed in the aftermath of the hurricane was the contribution of Mr. Warren Whitley and Mr. Franklin Pagel, owners of Refugio-Calhoun Industries of Tivoli, Texas. At a time when the highway into Tivoli and Austwell was closed and the area was isolated by flood water, Mr. Whitley and Mr. Pagel agreed to use their crop-dusting plane to fly mail in to the towns. They landed and took off on the closed portion of highway 35 at either end of the trip.

They hauled all classes of mail, including parcel post, along with other supplies which they were carrying in to residents of the stricken area. Mr. Whitley and Mr. Pagel transported more than 600 pounds of mail, all at a very nominal cost, and I think we are very properly recognizing their contribution to the mail service here today.

Another example of the generosity and compassion we are honoring is in the action of Mr. Robert Kinsel, of Three Rivers, who took the postmaster into his own home, when hers was ruined, and then donated the use of his garage as an emergency post office.

For the postmaster, Miss Vaughn Price, too much cannot be said. She and her clerk, Charles E. Nichols, barely escaped from the flood with only the clothing they were wearing. Soon afterwards, Miss Price moved back into her post office again, but she had to live in temporary quarters for many weeks because of the extensive damage to her home.

Mr. Nichols demonstrated the highest kind of bravery and dedication to the safekeeping of the mails. He waded through deep water to reach a flooded post office and move several bags of mail to high shelves, away from the water. He then had to wade back through water which was still rising dangerously in order to reach high ground.

It was truly the act of a courageous man.

I'd like to give you another example of that kind of devotion. Mr. James Bradford, the postmaster from up at Pettus, refused to evacuate his post office, even as the waters rose steadily, until he had made certain that all mail was stored in a high place and that all equipment was protected.

Then, and only then, did Postmaster Bradford leave the post office, and he had to wade through knee deep water to do it. Instead of thinking of his own needs and comfort, Postmaster Bradford drove his automobile to high ground overlooking the post office and stayed in his car all night to make certain that there would be no looting.

That night, the water in the post office rose to five and a half feet. Just two days later, Postmaster Bradford was open for business. Here, again, is another outstanding example of dedication to the postal service.

The Rio Grande Valley took severe punishment from the hurricane itself. Beulah destroyed the post office at Port Isabel and caused heavy damage in Brownsville, which was the largest city struck by the hurricane.

The post office in Brownsville served as a shelter for evacuees; about 450 persons waited out that wild night in the sturdy old post office building. Postmaster Runyon has been proud to say—as have Postal Inspectors Lee Schmidt and R. L. McCoy who spent the night at the post office—that the unselfish, untiring efforts of three custodial employees were absolutely indispensable and upheld the finest traditions of the postal service.

Chester Edlund, Alfredo Pompa and Marciano Flores remained on duty continuously for almost two and a half days. During the storm, they went out into the wind and rain to assist old persons inside and to help mothers carrying babies and personal belongings.

During the crisis period, Mr. Edlund, Mr. Pompa and Mr. Flores were everywhere. They passed out water and food to the evacuees, set up lanterns when the lights failed and provided portable sanitary facilities.

As soon as the storm abated, these three men plowed right into the gigantic task of cleaning up the building and making it fit for the post office and the other agencies that occupy it.

The performance of Mr. Edlund, Mr. Pompa and Mr. Flores deserve the highest kind of admiration and praise, and I am proud to be making awards to them here today.

I would like also to mention the heroism and courage of two of our postal inspectors who rode herd on the situation in southern Texas during the hurricane and in the critical hours immediately afterward.

C. Lee Schmidt and R. L. McCoy deliberately placed themselves in the path of the oncoming storm. They took cots and lanterns and some cold food and canned water and settled down at the Brownsville post office. The full fury of the storm struck Brownsville; winds were up to 150 miles per hour. The storm battered the city for 13 hours.

The federal building itself became a shelter for evacuees and about 450 persons took refuge in the building, sharing the ordeal with the inspectors and with Mr. Pompa, Mr. Edlund and Mr. Flores whom I mentioned earlier.

After the storm had passed, the inspectors split up; one drove east and the other west to survey the damage done by the storm and to see what could be saved and what was necessary to get the mails moving again. Between them, they visited virtually all post offices in the path of the hurricane and brought order again to the chaos caused by the storm.

In Harlingen, the home of Postmaster Robert E. Gilbert had been severely damaged by flood water, and Inspector Schmidt took the postmaster into his own home and gave him shelter.

I am proud to say that the work of Inspectors Schmidt and McCoy earned them both a special citation and the \$250 superior accomplishment award.

There are more stories like these—that of Mrs. Cassie Mae Harwood, clerk at Sweet Home, for example, who thought to seize postal valuables and dash outside minutes before a tornado destroyed her post office. There is the work of Mr. Harley Swanson, a postal mechanic, and Mr. Deward DeMoss, superintending engineer at Harlingen, and Clerk Jack Holland at Mercedes. And I'd like to mention also the exemplary performances of our postal service officers—Jennings Pitre, Napoleon Ballard, James Lusby, Joe Bruning and Blanks Dudley.

Each of the post offices whose employees we honor here today represents achievement of a similar nature; the same kind of courage and dedication is apparent throughout.

It is, as I said earlier, no more than the customary devotion with which postal employees safeguard the mails in the course of their everyday duties. I have always been impressed that our thousands of employees take their responsibilities so seriously; to them, the mails truly are a sacred trust.

In times of crisis, our people have responded magnificently, as they did here in Texas during the emergency caused by Hurricane Beulah. I take great pleasure in presenting these awards in official recognition of the spirit and determination and outright heroism that sustained the mails during a major natural disaster.

Special Citation and \$250 Superior Accomplishment Award "for special services performed and commendable devotion to duty, without regard for personal welfare, during the emergency period created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. Chester V. Edlund, Engineman, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Alfredo Pompa, Mechanic Helper, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Marciano D. Flores, Jr., Janitor, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Jennings L. Pitre, Postal Service Officer, Dallas, Texas

Mr. Napoleon B. Ballard, Postal Service Officer, Houston, Texas

Mr. James V. Lusby, Postal Service Officer, Lake Charles, Louisiana

Miss Vaughn Price, Postmaster, Three Rivers, Texas

Mr. James O. Bradford, Postmaster, Pettus, Texas

Mr. Charles E. Nichols, Clerk, Three Rivers, Texas

Mr. Joe B. Bruning, Postal Service Officer, Corpus Christi, Texas

Special Citation and \$100 Superior Accomplishment Award "for special services performed and commendable devotion to duty, without regard for personal welfare, during the emergency period created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. Jack C. Holland, Clerk, Mercedes, Texas

Mrs. Cassie Mae Harwood, Clerk, Sweet Home, Texas

Mr. Harley Swanson, Postal Mechanic, Harlingen, Texas

Mr. Deward I. DeMoss, Superintendent Engineer, Harlingen, Texas

Mr. Blanks L. Dudley, Postal Service Officer, McAllen, Texas

Special Citation "for special services performed and commendable devotion to duty, without regard for personal welfare, during the emergency period created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. W. J. Treptow, Assistant Postmaster, Yoakum, Texas

Mr. O. P. Austin, Assistant Superintendent of Mails, Victoria, Texas

Mr. Ira Prindle, Assistant Postmaster, Palacios, Texas

Mr. R. E. M. Gilbert, Postmaster, Harlingen, Texas

Mr. Robert A. Runyon, Postmaster, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. D. H. Bowling, Assistant Postmaster, Brownsville, Texas

Mr. Ralph M. McHam, Postal Service Officer, Austin, Texas

Special Citation to the employees of the Falfurrias, Tex., Post Office "for exceptional devotion to duty and willing cooperation in the restoration of mail service following Hurricane Beulah in September 1967. This dedication to the public need, without regard to personal convenience or welfare, is in the highest tradition of the Federal Service."

Special Citations to the following nonpostal personnel "as an expression of appreciation for outstanding assistance to the Postal Service during the emergency conditions created by Hurricane Beulah in September 1967:"

Mr. Thomas L. H. Jennings, Contractor, South Padre Island Rural Branch, Port Isabel, Texas

Mrs. Helen E. Renfrow, Contractor, Port Mansfield Rural Branch, Port Mansfield, Texas

Mr. Eddie Robinson, Contractor, Crystal Beach Rural Branch, Port Bolivar, Texas

Mr. Warren Whatley, Refugio-Calhoun Industries, Inc., Tivoli, Texas

Mr. Franklin Pagel, Refugio-Calhoun Industries, Inc., Tivoli, Texas

Mr. Robert Kinsel, Three Rivers, Texas

Mr. J. W. Turcotte, Sarita, Texas

Mr. Joe E. Ward, Falfurrias, Texas

Mr. Owen McKinney, Falfurrias, Texas

Special Citations to the Employees of the following facilities "for their commendable response to the unusually adverse conditions and threat to the Postal Service posed by Hurricane Beulah which struck in September 1967:"

Rockport, Fulton, Olmito, Los Fresnos, Port Aransas, Port Isabel, Brownsville, San Perlita, La Feria, McAllen, Los Ebanos, Grulla, Elsa, La Blanca, Encino, Francitas, Long Mott, Bloomington, Vanderbilt, LaSalle, Point Comfort, Seadrift, McFaddin, Placedo, Fronton.

Sarita, Aransas Pass, Armstrong, Orange Grove, Sandia, Pettus, Three Rivers, Tivoli, Austwell, Sweet Home, Port Bolivar, Gilchrist, Kemah, Sabine Pass, Port O'Connor, Port Lavaca, La Ward, Lolita, Kingsville, Ingleside, Riviera, South Padre Island, Port Mansfield, and El Sauz.

Piedmont Airlines' 20th Anniversary

REMARKS

OF

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud today to pay tribute to Piedmont Airlines on the memorable occasion of its 20th anniversary. This enterprising firm is located in Winston-Salem, N.C., which I am pleased to say is in my congressional district. Piedmont Airlines has experienced a rapid growth and continually sets the pace among local service carriers. This was emphasized in 1966 when Piedmont became the first regional airline to show a profit without benefit of Federal subsidy, heretofore an unprecedented achievement among the local service air transport industry. In fact, Piedmont Airlines is proud to acknowledge that it provides more service for more people with less Federal subsidy than any other regional

airline. Piedmont has now grown to the point that it is authorized to operate in 10 States and the District of Columbia, serving 77 cities in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we all recognize the vast contribution this North Carolina airline has made to the State and to the Nation, I include the history of Piedmont Airlines in the RECORD:

HISTORY OF PIEDMONT AIRLINES

Piedmont Airlines has grown rapidly since the days when its parent organization, Piedmont Aviation, Inc., was incorporated July 2, 1940, under North Carolina laws as an aircraft sales and service operation.

At that time, Piedmont obtained a lease to conduct its business at the Winston-Salem Municipal Airport, now known as the Smith Reynolds Airport, and received distributor franchises from Piper Aircraft Corporation and from Stinson Aircraft.

Until the outbreak of World War II, Piedmont was active in aircraft sales and service, flight training, and aircraft repair and engine overhaul. The company's primary and advanced flying schools were approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in 1940. The repair and overhaul facilities were approved by the same agency in 1941, making Piedmont's the only repair station between Washington, D.C., and Atlanta, Georgia.

During the war years, Piedmont devoted its entire efforts to the war program through government contracted flight training schools. After the ending of hostilities, Piedmont returned to its peacetime purpose—commercial aviation. And, seeing the need for air service to smaller communities, the company filed application June 6, 1944, with the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct scheduled local service airline operations in the Southeast. This application was included in a proceeding known as the Southeastern States Case, which in its outcome gave Piedmont authority to provide local air service over routes between Cincinnati and Louisville in the West and Norfolk, New Bern and Wilmington in the East.

Cities served on the routes between the terminal points included Southern Pines, Charlotte, Asheville, Goldsboro, Raleigh-Durham, Greensboro-High Point and Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Tri Cities (Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport), Tennessee; Lexington, Kentucky; Charleston, West Virginia; and Danville, Roanoke, Lynchburg and Richmond, Virginia.

The Airline Division of Piedmont Aviation, Inc., was formed January 1, 1948. Piedmont's first schedule was flown February 20, 1948, between Wilmington, North Carolina, and Cincinnati, Ohio, via intermediate cities. By May 14 of that year, all routes authorized by the CAB were being operated. At the end of 1948, Piedmont was providing air service to nineteen cities in the Southeast.

Piedmont, not resting on its laurels, continued looking to the future for better service to cities along and adjacent to its routes. By 1955, the airline, by government authorization, had added service to fourteen more cities.

On March 18, 1955, Piedmont began service to Columbus, Ohio, and the following August, service was begun to Washington, D.C., thus providing flights to two additional major cities, both excellent connecting points for its passengers.

The original certificate for Piedmont Airlines was for a three-year period. When application was made for its renewal, the CAB decided to renew the certificate for seven years—the longest such renewal given a local service carrier up to that time. The CAB, in reaching its decision, said, "The record achieved by Piedmont is so outstanding among local service carriers using DC-3 equipment as to merit special recognition."

Piedmont was granted a permanent certificate December 6, 1955, effective February 2, 1956.

On June 10, 1956, Piedmont announced its order for eight new Fairchild F-27 prop jet transport planes at a cost of more than \$6 million. Delivery of the 36-passenger, twin engine planes, powered by the famous Rolls Royce Dart prop jet engines, began in October, 1958. Piedmont's order was, up to that time, the largest ever placed by any of the nation's thirteen local service airlines.

The prop jet engines on the F-27 give the airplane a cruising speed of 280 miles per hour. Other advantages of the F-27 are weather radar equipment, automatic navigation and approach system, high wing configuration allowing a panoramic view from each cabin seat, pressurized and air-conditioned cabin, and a 2,250-mile range.

Scheduled operations with the new F-27 Pacemaker began November 14, 1958.

January 24, 1961, Piedmont received from the CAB authority to serve a route from Norfolk, Virginia, to Knoxville, Tennessee, including extensive additional service to many cities along Piedmont's system and two new communities being added. Rocky Mount and Elizabeth City, North Carolina, received Piedmont service for the first time.

Another milestone in Piedmont's progress was achieved when, on December 4, 1961, the company announced the purchase of seventeen Martin 404 aircraft and sale of fourteen of its seventeen Douglas DC-3 airplanes. The seventeen 404's and Piedmont's fleet of F-27 aircraft comprised the largest fleet of modern, pressurized aircraft in the local service air transport industry at that time.

The Martin 404, dubbed the "404 Pacemaker" by Piedmont, has a 44-passenger capacity as compared with the 24-passenger DC-3, which had been the backbone of the Piedmont fleet since the airline's beginning. Unlike the DC-3, the 404 is pressurized, air-conditioned, and equipped by Piedmont with airborne weather radar for detecting storms while the airplane is in flight and circumnavigating them. Pressurization within the cabin of the 404 permits rapid climbs and descents with no passenger discomfort. Powered by two Pratt Whitney 2400 horsepower engines, the 404 Pacemaker has a cruising speed of 265 miles an hour, double the horsepower and over a hundred miles per hour faster than the DC-3.

The purchase of other Martin 404 aircraft in subsequent months increased their number, and on February 20, 1963, the fifteenth anniversary of the airline, the last DC-3 airplane was retired after making its final scheduled run from Columbus, Ohio, to New Bern, North Carolina, via intermediate points. Aboard the "sentimental journey" were Piedmont President T. H. Davis and other company officials who were greeted by community leaders at each stop along the way.

Perhaps the most far-reaching single development in Piedmont's history up to that time came March 20, 1962, with a Civil Aeronautics Board order authorizing for the company a vast network of new North-South routes and new service authority. Included in the CAB order was authorization to serve eight new communities, including the major connecting points of Atlanta, Georgia, and Baltimore, Maryland, thus introducing two new states into Piedmont's system. Other new cities awarded Piedmont service for the first time were Pulaski-Radford-Blacksburg (New River Valley Airport), Virginia; Goldsboro, North Carolina; Jacksonville-Camp Lejeune, North Carolina; Florence, South Carolina; Columbia, South Carolina; and Augusta, Georgia. The authorization of the new cities and the substantial increase in service to Piedmont's existing cities added about 2,000 more route miles to its system, representing an expansion of about fifty per

cent over its former size. In the same Board order, the CAB gave Piedmont authority to operate year-round at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina (heretofore a seasonal stop). Also highly significant was the fact that the CAB gave to Piedmont liberalized operating authority along the new and existing routes, which permitted more express-type service for its travelers and shippers. The new service began June 25, 1962.

Piedmont, heretofore primarily an East-West air carrier, became a North-South carrier as well and multiplied substantially its opportunities of wider service to the public.

On August 23, 1962, Piedmont filed with the CAB an application for authority to serve Greenville-Spartanburg, South Carolina, on a segment between Charlotte and Asheville. After a favorable recommendation by the CAB Examiner, the Board handed down its final decision January 25, 1967, providing service to these communities by Piedmont. Starting date for flights at the Greenville-Spartanburg jetport is April 1, 1967. The addition of Greenville and Spartanburg adds the seventy-first and seventy-second cities to the company's route system.

On March 18, 1963, Piedmont filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board applications for authority to serve four important cities to the South: Charleston, South Carolina, Savannah, Georgia, Brunswick-Sea Island, Georgia, and Jacksonville, Florida. The company has also applied for another segment from Greenville-Spartanburg, South Carolina, to Augusta, Savannah, Brunswick-Sea Island, and Jacksonville. These applications are now pending before the CAB.

Another highly significant CAB application was filed by Piedmont August 27, 1965, which asked for authorization to provide service between Roanoke, Virginia, and New York City, and including Lynchburg, Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, Hot Springs, Virginia, and Harrisonburg-Staunton-Waynesboro (Shenandoah Valley Airport), Virginia, with new service also provided to Washington, D.C., through Dulles International Airport.

In an unprecedented action the CAB on July 6, 1966, issued a "show cause" order tentatively approving Piedmont's application for New York service and affording any interested party twenty days within which to file objections. For perhaps the first time in history in such a situation, there were no airline objections to the New York service and the CAB issued the final order September 30, 1966, authorizing the service. The company began flights November 15, 1966, with five round trips daily into the LaGuardia Airport. Several of the flights were also scheduled to serve Dulles International Airport. The March 15, 1967, schedule revision increased the round trips provided New York to seven.

Cities provided direct one-plane service on the initial schedule were Roanoke, Lynchburg, Charlottesville, Shenandoah (Harrisonburg-Staunton-Waynesboro), all in Virginia, and Wilmington, Fayetteville-Fort Bragg, and Winston-Salem, in North Carolina. Other cities given single-plane service to New York include Charleston, Beckley and Bluefield-Princeton, all in West Virginia; Pulaski-Radford-Blacksburg (New River Valley Airport), Virginia; Asheville and Kinston, both in North Carolina; Augusta and Atlanta in Georgia; and Cincinnati, Ohio.

On December 16, 1964, Piedmont filed an application with the Civil Aeronautics Board for service beyond Knoxville, Tennessee, to Nashville, Tennessee. The application not only captured the interest of Nashville itself but also the support of communities in the two Carolinas and Virginia who saw the need for new and additional service to the Tennessee state capital.

As an outgrowth of that application, the CAB issued October 18, 1966, an order setting up a proceeding to determine whether Pied-

mont should be extended to both Nashville and Memphis, Tennessee. It is contemplated that a hearing will be held soon to determine whether Piedmont shall be granted this authority.

Other applications pending before the CAB include: A Huntington, West Virginia-Columbus, Ohio, extension via Portsmouth, Ohio; a route from Huntington to Lexington, Kentucky; and a route between Louisville, Kentucky, and Cincinnati, Ohio. Since the first year of airline operation, in which 39,370 passengers were carried 9,296,288 passenger miles, Piedmont Airlines has made rapid strides in traffic. The first millionth passenger was boarded in 1955, seven years after the airline began service. Two and one-half years later the second millionth passenger was boarded. And on December 7, 1964, Piedmont achieved its sales goal of a million passengers in a single year and wound up the year with 1,073,004. In 1965, the million-passenger mark was set as early as October and in 1966 the millionth passenger was boarded in August. The record for a single day in terms of passengers boarded is 6,064 passengers October 21, 1966, and July, 1966, thus far stands as the record month for passenger volume with 154,882 passengers using Piedmont's service.

A financial landmark was reached on October 21, 1964, when the Board of Directors declared a cash dividend of 10¢ per share on the company's common stock, the first cash dividend in Piedmont's history. It was also the first cash dividend to be paid by any publicly-owned local service airline in the nation. The Directors have declared a similar cash dividend of 10¢ per share, each six months since that time.

Anticipating even further increases in passenger, cargo and mail volume, Piedmont made two major aircraft purchases in the early months of 1966. In January the company placed an order for six Boeing 737 jetliners with an option for six more, representing the largest pure jet order and option agreement in the local service airline industry. The twin engine 737 is designed to operate over short-to-medium ranges at cruise speeds up to 580 miles per hour. The 737, featuring the same roomy cabin width and height as the largest intercontinental jet, will be arranged for a spacious 90-passenger first class seating configuration and will have built-in airstairs and a built-in power unit for starting the aircraft and for heating and cooling on the ground, thus contributing to ground time efficiency. Delivery of the 737 will begin in March of 1968 with one per month expected thereafter until all six have been put into service. The Boeing 737's will be used primarily in the major traffic markets on Piedmont's system.

In recognition of needs of the several moderate sized communities Piedmont is certificated to serve, the company in April 1966 ordered ten new Fairchild Hiller FH-227B twin prop jet airliners. The FH-227B, similar in appearance to and following in the tradition of the dependable F-27 operated by the company since 1958, is six feet longer than its predecessor and has a 44-passenger seating arrangement. It also has more powerful Rolls Royce engines, an advance cabin pressurization system, and cruises at 300 miles per hour. The first FH-227B was delivered to Piedmont in November of 1966. After installation of seating and other cabin appointments by Piedmont's maintenance department, it went into scheduled service in March. Other FH-227B's are to be added to the fleet at intervals of approximately thirty days until all ten are in service.

To provide pure jet service to its growing numbers of passengers and shippers during the interim until the Boeing 737's arrive in 1968, Piedmont has leased two Boeing 727 trijet airliners. The first three engine 727, familiar to airline passengers the world over, became a part of Piedmont's fleet March 15,

1967, serving primarily the major markets of New York, Washington and Atlanta, with intermediate stops. The second 727 had a scheduled delivery date of April 15. Containing many of the features to be included in the upcoming Boeing 737, the 727 is a medium range jet with built-in power unit and airstairs and roomy cabin interior. Piedmont is providing spacious first class seating in the 727 for 92 passengers.

According to the latest available CAB records, Piedmont is the only regional airline in the nation to have all its cities exceed the CAB's minimum "Use It or Lose It" standard of five boarding passengers per day at each point. The company, in announcing this industry "first", reiterated its policy of serving each airport on its system with a minimum of two daily round trips.

To test the market potential for "middle-of-the-night" airline service, Piedmont in September of 1966 inaugurated a new series of flights between Washington and Atlanta via Fayetteville and New Bern, all operating in the late-night and early-morning hours and labeled "Night Owl Pacemaker" flights. The flights are aimed at a market of passengers, especially military personnel, who prefer to travel later at night.

Piedmont now has a 9,000 route system over which its airplanes fly more than 53,000 miles a day. There are over 2,600 employees system-wide, and the annual payroll is over \$17 million.

Piedmont now has the highest load factor of any of the nation's thirteen regional airlines and higher than many of the larger trunk airlines.

RECORD OF ANNUAL GROWTH, PIEDMONT AIRLINES

Year	Passenger ¹	Ton-Miles		
		Airmail	Air express	Air-freight
1948.....	39,370	18,785	18,832	15,548
1949.....	86,154	31,229	41,129	62,414
1950.....	123,762	51,835	84,454	134,346
1951.....	189,369	65,808	85,107	126,328
1952.....	224,206	85,823	95,688	147,652
1953.....	269,773	107,689	104,408	179,820
1954.....	308,194	109,868	107,381	153,356
1955.....	360,569	135,488	123,221	161,013
1956.....	403,784	172,230	153,487	144,474
1957.....	433,554	161,235	115,884	167,511
1958.....	445,261	170,815	145,056	153,422
1959.....	515,660	184,524	163,018	190,479
1960.....	494,541	166,610	170,399	234,539
1961.....	541,459	182,615	203,856	306,847
1962.....	721,683	368,334	381,915	525,897
1963.....	895,486	471,378	427,685	644,200
1964.....	1,073,004	617,648	478,042	855,068
1965.....	1,288,825	755,502	556,218	1,155,203
1966.....	1,606,772	1,058,227	670,559	1,452,895
1967.....	1,829,583	1,509,468	668,532	1,800,740

¹ Revenue passengers excluding charter.

PIEDMONT AIRLINES FACT SHEET

1. Piedmont Airlines began scheduled local service operations on February 20, 1948.
2. The number of employees has grown from 158 in 1948 to over 2,600 persons today.
3. Piedmont Airlines is authorized to operate into ten states and the District of Columbia, serving 77 cities in that area.
4. Piedmont Airlines presently has a fleet of 32 Martin 404 Pacemaker aircraft, 10 FH-227B prop jet aircraft, and a Boeing 727 jet airliner, for a total fleet of 43 airplanes.
5. Average miles flown exceed 53,000 daily, or over twice the distance around the world.
6. Piedmont Airlines has carried over 11.8 million passengers through 1966.
7. About 60% of the passengers who enjoy Piedmont service are "interline" or connecting passengers.
8. The total annual payroll system-wide of Piedmont is over \$17 million.
9. There are approximately 9,000 people in the Piedmont "family," employees and dependents, or the equivalent of a moderate sized community.

10. There are over 7,000 shareholders in Piedmont Airlines parent organization Piedmont Aviation, Inc.

11. In 1967, Piedmont flights carried 1,829,583 passengers and 14,527,930 pounds of air freight, 6,089,790 pounds of air express, 8,866,838 pounds of air mail and 2,825,750 pounds of first class mail.

12. Piedmont Airlines in a recent year operated 175 charter trips.

13. Piedmont has recently purchased 10 YS-11A-200 turbo-prop jetliners from the Nihon Aeroplane Manufacturing Company of Japan.

14. Officers of Piedmont Airlines are: T. H. Davis, President and Treasurer; C. G. Brown, Jr., Vice President-Traffic and Sales; H. K. Saunders, Vice President-Operations; T. W. Morton, Secretary and Controller; W. W. Barber, Assistant Vice President-Purchasing; H. M. Cartwright, Assistant Vice President-Maintenance and Engineering; W. G. McGee, Assistant Vice President-Sales; and R. E. Turbiville, Assistant Vice President-Traffic.

Address by George D. Woods, President of the World Bank

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on February 9, 1968, at New Delhi, India, Mr. George D. Woods, president of the World Bank, made an interesting and illuminating address to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Mr. Woods' references to the urgent need of developing nations for funds and the advantages of multilateral organizations strike me as particularly interesting and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Woods' speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ADDRESS OF GEORGE D. WOODS, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK, INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION, INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT, NEW DELHI, FEBRUARY 9, 1968

It is a special privilege and a special opportunity to address this second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The delegates here have traveled from the four corners of the earth, and the subjects they are to consider are of great import for the shape of the future. Quite apart from that, this Conference stands out as a symbol: it gives expression to the hopes of mankind that out of all the variegated and sometimes conflicting activities of peoples and nations there will emerge some kind of rational order. Our planet earth, with the moon within reach and a landing on Mars a possibility, seems smaller and smaller. Its peoples seem more and more dependent on each other. It is right to be here on this vast subcontinent, in India, to explore the stubborn problems of development and of trade.

It would be less than human not to admit that this occasion also has a particular meaning for me. In all probability, it is the last time that I will be speaking to an important intergovernmental conference as the President of the World Bank. And while I do not intend to use the occasion for reminiscence, perhaps you will permit me to give a somewhat personal and subjective view of the state of economic development two-thirds of

the way through this Twentieth Century. While I shall not address myself to the Conference agenda items, the World Bank Group is deeply interested in them, and our representatives here will express our views on these matters.

The state of economic development must and can be improved. The Secretary-General and most of the delegates here know that by nature I am an optimist. I am not going to recant the views I have often expressed, that in many parts of the world development is succeeding, and that in many others it can begin to succeed. But so far, our accomplishments have fallen short of our aspirations.

We must be frank to say that in many parts of the world, the situation is discouraging, even disturbing. Here in our host country, the home of one-seventh of all the human race, after 20 years of independence many millions of people have yet to experience more than the feeblest manifestations of progress. Those who believe as I do that India is engaged in a task of deep meaning for all the developing countries, must be gravely concerned by the uncertainties that cloud her national life. India is an exceptionally dramatic case because of its size and its location on the troubled Asian continent; but it is by no means the only country where hope has dwindled toward despondency.

Why is this? Everyone in this hall, I am sure, agrees that the advance of the developing countries is of first importance to mankind. Delegates from the rich countries state this belief no less vehemently and frequently than those from the poor countries. But I am afraid that the record shows that the agreement still needs to be nurtured by decisions and deeds—by the rich and the poor—to give it reality and substance.

The basic reason may be that vast force in human affairs which is called inertia. Social values are slow to change; and the institutions that give them expression are slower still. Few institutions deliberately seek innovation; many, to say the least, shirk the ordeal of changing themselves in order to respond more quickly to changing human needs. And inertia, it seems to me, can only be overcome by perception: the leaders of both the prosperous and the poor countries must now grasp fully the nature of the situations that confront them.

For the less developed countries, it is earlier in their evolution, and there is much more to be done, than many of their governments are aware. On the face of our planet today, perhaps a billion people live in countries that have modern economies, in countries those societies are largely agreed on political forms and social objectives, in countries where, broadly speaking, progress toward those objectives is continuous. That leaves more than two billion people living in countries that are still facing the travail of economic and social transformation. Some of these countries are well along; and we can predict with some confidence that they will achieve stable societies and a relatively high standard of living within the next 30 or 20 years or even less. But other countries have scarcely begun the process: most important, some have still to achieve some semblance of political stability.

Every developing country, by definition, is still nation-building. Its main task is to become truly independent—not in a narrowly nationalistic sense, but in the sense that it is making the most of its resources for the good of its people, and that the nation itself, far from being dependent for direction and momentum on external forces, is a self-starting society in which the individual citizen has opportunity to develop his own creative and constructive possibilities.

Many countries fall to meet this ideal by

the simplest possible test: they cannot feed themselves. I do not contend that any nation can or should achieve perfect, self-contained sufficiency in agriculture. But about 40 developing countries are net importers of food. The underdeveloped world imports $4\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars worth of food a year. So long as the poorer nations must continue to spend large amounts of precious foreign exchange on food imports, they are going to have to skimp on imports of the capital goods needed for development. It is abundantly clear that the underdeveloped countries must achieve much greater agricultural productivity if they are going to become modernized.

This is no less true for being trite; and trite as it is, it is a lesson that many of the less developed countries are just beginning to learn. But an increasing number at least are devoting to agriculture some of the attention that it deserves, in the form of investment, research, incentives and supports to production. Some have already learned how great are the dividends paid by a virile and healthy agricultural sector. For the future, important scientific advances are to be expected in agriculture; and the countries which now effect the necessary institutional and policy changes can be optimistic about the chances of beating back hunger and increasing their rate of economic growth.

If one hallmark of the less developed countries is that they are hungry, another is that they have the highest rates of population increase in the world. As an exercise in simple division, this depresses per capita income and standards of living. Even in countries not now overpeopled, the rapid growth in numbers works further damage to the dynamics of development: at the same time that it greatly increases a society's needs for the bare necessities of food, shelter and clothing, and for capital investment in schools, hospitals and elementary services, it seriously diminishes the ability to produce a surplus, to save and to invest in the expansion of production and the growth of income.

Of all the problems of the less developed, rapid population growth may be the most stubborn; it is certainly not easily within the reach of pressures and inducements of the kind that governments are able to provide. The experience of Japan immediately after the war, nevertheless, offers a remarkable demonstration of what can be done. Some underdeveloped countries now are beginning to show what they can do; the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea already have achieved a measurable reduction of birth rates, and the same trend is appearing in Ceylon. This is a start; if the problems can be met on a far wider scale, economic prospects of the less developed countries will become far more encouraging.

Another task is to conserve the capital that the underdeveloped countries already have. The apparently humdrum business of preventing the loss of capital already invested could greatly improve standards of living throughout the less developed world. Adequate maintenance of capital assets in the developed countries is planned and carried out as a matter of course. But in the poorer countries, the very concept is often lacking; and for want of maintenance, these countries must unnecessarily expend many millions of dollars annually to replace industrial machinery, buildings, power and transportation facilities that have been reduced to the point of uselessness or minimum efficiency through lack of care. To develop the concept and practice of maintenance, like many other things in the spectrum of economic progress, raises new and different problems, but few would be more worth solving.

Waste can be found in many sectors, but nowhere is it more serious than in agriculture. It is said that of all the crops produced in the world each year, about one-third—mostly in the hungry countries—is lost to

spoilage, insects, vermin, fungus and plant diseases. If this loss could be prevented through better storage, herbicides and pesticides, the food crisis at least temporarily would disappear; and the problem of development finance in many countries would be considerably lightened. This is another unspectacular activity about which more should be done.

The developing countries must not only conserve the assets they have; they must also take measures to attract new investment—and particularly capital from abroad, with the technology, the experience in management and the links to world markets that international investment affords. Countries that adopt policies and take measures to make private capital welcome will find that such a course encourages the investment of public funds as well.

A task underlying all the other efforts is the improvement of human resources. "The foundation of every State," said Diogenes two thousand years ago, "is the education of its young." The spread of knowledge and useful skills is what led Europe out of the Dark Ages; it is the spread of knowledge that today will speed the developing countries into the last third of the Twentieth Century.

Despite the high value that the developing countries themselves have placed on schools, the educational effort has been tragically weakened by the expenditure of funds to no good purpose: on unplanned and unbalanced educational systems, on outmoded curricula and instruction not matched to the country's need for work and skills. A responsible and well-informed group of Latin American experts estimated a few years ago that half the expenditures on education in that part of the world has been wasted. Here is a sector in which development assistance must encourage and support a greatly improved effort.

The tasks of economic development place an exceptionally heavy burden on the leaders of the less developed countries. It is they, often in the most adverse and discouraging circumstances, who must stir the country's energies and wed them to the best use of resources, they who must create a sense of common purpose as the basis for orderly political evolution and change.

There are many leaders in the less developed countries today who are courageous, selfless and devoted; but unhappily there are some who are not. We see instances of personal aggrandizement; we witness waste through conspicuous and unproductive public expenditures; we see attempts to evade responsibility by blaming internal problems on other countries; we see failure to advocate and enforce necessary steps involving effort and a measure of sacrifice. And how to accomplish peaceful changes in the distribution of political power is a problem that in many of the less developed countries remains unsolved.

One of the serious liabilities of some poorer countries, in short, is leadership that does not lead. And one of the results is likely to be public apathy and cynicism instead of the ferment of enthusiasm and the hard work needed for economic progress.

The high-income countries, no less than the developing ones, stand in need of a new perspective. For them the time is *later* than they seem to think. The world is already well on the way to new extremes in the imbalance of population and income. The swift movement of these trends is not being adequately recognized in the priority accorded to development finance among the other claims on the energies and resources of the high-income countries.

Changes in population have been striking since the end of World War II and are proceeding at an accelerating speed. Only a little more than 30 years from now, for instance, Brazil will be as populous as the

United States or the Soviet Union is today, and at the same time, in the year 2000, the Philippines will be bigger than any country of Western Europe. The proportion of the world's population that lives in less developed countries, as compared with the number living in high-income countries, today is about two to one. Present trends would raise the ratio as high as three to one by the end of this century.

While the populous countries are rapidly becoming more populous, it is likely that the prosperous countries will go on becoming much more prosperous. On the basis of reasonable estimates, the gross national products of the high-income countries, which today total around \$1,500 billion, will at least quadruple, to a figure of \$6,000 billion or more by the end of the century.

The inescapable conclusion is that if we are to prevent an intolerable economic and political fission of the world, the development of the poorer countries requires a more effective and constructive participation of the developed nations on a high-priority basis.

Present policies of development assistance show too little recognition of this fact. The high-income countries do not seem to be thinking about tomorrow. Their aid policies have tended as much to mirror their own narrowest concerns as to focus effectively on the situation of the developing countries and its long-term meaning for the world as a whole. It is possible to overstate the case, but nevertheless it is true that up to now, bilateral programs of assistance have had as one of their primary objectives helping the high-income countries themselves; they have looked toward financing export sales, toward tactical support of diplomacy, toward holding military positions thought to be strategic.

These policies have not opened the window on a clear view of the tasks that ought to be undertaken in the less developed world. They have tended to distort assistance in favor of things rather than people. They have favored big construction which has required sales of big items of heavy equipment; they have delayed the attack on the fundamental problems of agriculture, of population growth and of education. They have obscured important differences in the developmental problems of different countries and different regions—between the tasks to be undertaken, for example, in Latin America and those in Africa south of the Sahara. Some aid has not only failed to be productive: by doing the wrong thing at the wrong time, by making the wrong use of the slender resources available, at times it may actually have retarded economic growth. Solutions to the problems of trade between the rich and the poor—most particularly with respect to prices of primary products—have not been devised.

It is time to consider basic changes. I would like to mention just three. Development assistance must, first of all, turn away from expediency and toward effectiveness. It must show a much greater skepticism about the extent to which the technology of the high-income countries can simply be transferred to the underdeveloped. It has been a long and painful experience to discover that the development of agriculture in the poorer countries requires different techniques from those used elsewhere. It is already evident that political institutions undergo a sea change when they travel from the countries which gave them birth; it may well be that forms of industrial and social organization, likewise, are not so transferable as we now suppose. Development finance must therefore demonstrate a greater regard for important national, cultural and regional differences that make the problems in each developing society unique. Development assistance must be much more concerned with helping the poorer countries evolve the technologies and build the institutions appropriate to their own circumstances.

The second change needed is toward a

greater modesty and realism in expectations. There is no such thing as instant or painless development. Development requires deep-seated changes; these are not only going to take time, as more and more people are beginning to realize, but they no doubt will lead to continuing turbulence and even violence. For this, the nations providing assistance must realistically be prepared; they must not be easily discouraged or deterred.

The third and immediate change needed is improvement in the amounts and terms of capital transfers. As the members of this assembly are aware, the amount of these transfers, so far from keeping pace with what needs to be done, has tended to stagnate. Moreover, in many cases, capital is being transferred on terms that will eat heavily into the capacity of the receiving countries to finance future growth. The outstanding external public debt of the developing countries as a group is something over \$40 billion. The problem is not only to alleviate the terms of future assistance for the ten or so developing countries that owe half this debt to 12 or 14 developed nations. There is equally urgent need to extend terms—amortization as well as interest—which will avoid similar problems in the future for the newer countries which are now at the point where they can use large sums for financing their development needs.

At the present time, some of the principal aid-giving countries are in the worst possible position: they are giving amounts of aid sufficiently large to irritate their own national legislatures, but too small to help accomplish real economic progress. No businessman would deliberately make less investment in an enterprise than was necessary for its success or on terms that would cloud its prospects; but that is what the developed countries, as a group, are doing today. If there is anything we should have learned by now, it is that we should make the most of our opportunities: the response to good performance in a developing country should be massive applications of development finance to multiply production and achieve lasting economic momentum.

There is evidence that the attitude of some high-income countries toward development assistance is beginning to change. Recently, the governments of half a dozen countries—Canada, Denmark, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands and Sweden—have reached decisions to increase their budgets for development assistance, in some cases by as much as 25% annually over the next few years. Another step now well advanced, I am happy to be able to report, is to increase the resources of the World Bank's affiliate, the International Development Association. This second replenishment is intended to enable IDA operations for a three-year period ending June 30, 1970, and will permit IDA to lift its commitments by an average of 60% annually over the level which the first replenishment was designed to achieve. I expect that negotiations will be completed in a matter of weeks and actions required by various legislative bodies will follow without undue delay.

But these are only thin streaks of light on a grey horizon. It is clear enough that the targets for development assistance often stated by the high-income countries, and thus far achieved only by France, cannot be reached until well after the end of this Development Decade of the 1960s, and then only if the tempo of increase quickens.

It is still my opinion that the developed countries would materially benefit their own interests if they could achieve a unified and consistent perspective of the problems of growth in the less developed countries and of the importance of that growth to their own well-being. For that reason, I have suggested that a group of leaders of intelligence, integrity and prestige be brought together for the purpose of studying the consequences

of 20 years of development assistance, assessing the results, clarifying the errors and proposing the policies which will work better in the future. This proposal for a "grand assize" has been under consideration by governments and the reaction is generally favorable. I expect the group will be assembled and the study—in consultation with the countries of the Development Assistance Committee and the developing countries—will be started in the near future.

Embracing virtually all aspects of the development efforts and virtually all the nations engaged in it are the international organizations. Many of these are specialized agencies associated with the United Nations, but they also include the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as well as the regional development banks. These entities have made significant contributions to economic development and the protection of peace. Their continuing participation in the world's everyday work is not the less useful because it is largely unhonored and unsung.

It would be unrealistic, nevertheless, not to recognize that the international organizations are in danger of disappointing the publics which support them. One reason may be that these organizations and their parliamentary bodies sometimes succumb to the risk of contributing more to the already worldwide surplus of oratory than to the stock of new ideas and useful activities. Another reason, unquestionably, is the continuing multiplication of new organizations. In the end, the sight of so many hands outstretched from so many different directions, in gestures either of help or of supplication, must lead to confusion and bewilderment.

It is time, I suggest, for us in the international organizations to take an anti-proliferation pledge: to reserve the creation of new entities for functions that clearly have no possible home among the many rooms offered by the international family; to allow the organizations to concentrate their attention on the improvement of existing efforts; and to permit them to work out a more effective coordination and distribution of labors among themselves. Looking at world and regional organizations directly concerned with development finance, it is easy to see, for instance, that we should go further in coordinating and centralizing functions of research, fact-gathering and reporting. That would reduce demands on the time and patience of our client countries and would increase our own efficiency. I am sure that other important opportunities for a better distribution of effort exist not only among the financial institutions but throughout the structure of international organizations.

I wish also to observe that international organizations, no less than national entities, must be alert to the necessity for new approaches. The tendency of any institution is to develop and apply standard formulas, a tendency from which I may say the World Bank Group is not immune. Working out new solutions and breaking old habits is not an easy task; but it will always be necessary for progress. In the World Bank Group, for instance, we have been slow to finance state-owned enterprises because of the problem in many countries of ensuring efficient management of undertakings that, for want of private savings, must operate under government sponsorship. We have only scratched the surface of financing projects to promote tourism, even though the results of such financing may be of first importance for economic development in a number of countries. No doubt other international organizations have barriers of thought which it would be equally useful to break down.

If there is one thing which all of us in the development business should remember, it is that we do live in a world of change. A world in which not only problems but opportunities are multiplying at increasing

speed. The new opportunities being opened up by advances in technology, if we take advantage of them, could bring about important breakthroughs on some of the most difficult development problems, and could help bring about a spectacular transformation of the prospects of the developing countries. Let me mention a few possibilities:

One—Greatly increased yields in agriculture through the availability of large quantities of fertilizers at low cost. This can be achieved on the basis of new processes for producing cheap ammonia. A high degree of international cooperation is required to achieve the chain of primary materials, manufacturing facilities and financing and distribution organizations needed to serve individual countries. The problems which must be solved are formidable, but in my opinion not insoluble. Progress on this front would be of the greatest significance.

Two—A considerable fortification of nutrition, through the continuing development of plants producing high crop yields and containing high protein and caloric values. Advances already made in this respect are beginning to be widely applied here in India, for instance. Recent successes in the laboratory put us on a biological frontier which considerably increases the possibilities of developing products which will exceed in nutritional values anything now found in nature.

Three—Overcoming water shortages by making sea water usable for drinking, for industrial use and eventually for agricultural use. Processes for large-scale de-salting of sea water are soon to have their first trials; and the cost of making sea water suitable for drinking and for irrigation may in this generation approach levels which would make possible application on a wide scale.

Four—A worldwide slowing in rates of population growth, based on simple, inexpensive and reliable methods of birth control. Here the problem is not only further technical advance but also accelerated social action to see that the technology is used.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to this meeting as a banker, not as a diplomat, and I have not used the guarded phrases which international civil servants often employ. One of the great contributions which this meeting could make to the progress of human affairs would be to bring about a sharper feeling of urgency about the tasks of development. It therefore seemed to me that to indulge in an exercise of mere politeness would be a disservice to the Conference and would scarcely recognize the importance of its deliberations.

I have stated my opinion that up to now, performance in development and in development assistance has fallen short of our aspirations. The prosperous nations have been irresolute and to some extent even irrelevant in their efforts to assist the less developed countries. The underdeveloped world is very far from being in a position to say that it has done all it could to help itself. Among international organizations, a multiplicity sometimes verging on disarray is evident.

Despite this, much progress has been made and much more, I am convinced, is in prospect. Sheer physical achievement in the less developed world—the tens of millions of kilowatts of electric generating capacity, the hundreds of thousands of miles of highways and railways constructed or reconditioned, the multitude of industrial plants—has been tremendous.

Throughout many parts of the less developed world, an infrastructure has been put down on the basis of which other kinds of economic growth can and should proceed more rapidly. Even more portentous for the future is the growing number of people who are acquiring the skills and attitudes which will accelerate that growth. A number of countries have acquired the momentum that will carry them to satisfactory standards of

living; and I think that in their forward movement, others will join in increasing numbers.

The speed at which development moves forward will depend much on the spirit in which the older and richer countries, the newer and poorer countries, and the international organizations all conduct their common efforts. *Imagination* will be indispensable to meet the many and almost infinitely diverse challenges of the situation of the developing nations. *Patience* is a quality which will be needed in plenty, because the way for many nations will be long; pauses and setbacks are bound to happen.

The tasks facing rich and poor countries alike—of reconciling rival political views, of relaxing social tensions, of refereeing intense competition for budgetary resources, of providing for internal order and external defense—these common tasks ought to engender mutual respect and tolerance between the countries giving aid and those receiving it. And in the face of the scale and seriousness of these responsibilities which national authorities are carrying, *humility* is the way the international agencies, with their armies of initials, ought to conduct their business of trying to act as inspiration and guide to development.

Savants and scholars, Mr. Chairman, tell us that humanity is now passing through a revolutionary transformation more important than anything since the changes that followed on the invention of agriculture, perhaps ten thousand years ago. Advances in scientific discovery and technical application follow each other with more and more bewildering speed. The technological revolution greatly increases the potential of mankind, but increases it both for good and ill; we stand at a point where humanity literally has the power either to blow itself to bits or to achieve for the whole human race security and comfort of which kings of old never dreamed.

So far the world is only beginning to tap its new potential. The very coming together of this Conference, which provides a crossroads for discussion, is a hopeful sign that no one is satisfied with the present state of affairs. It gives reason to hope that at this particular turning in the road of human history, we will go in the right direction: that just as man turned long ago from savagery to civilization, he will now turn toward an increasingly better life on this planet.

Howard Ellis, Champion of Freedom of the Press

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Howard Ellis, one of Chicago's outstanding attorneys and a man internationally known for defending the freedom and rights of the press, died on Sunday, February 18.

Mr. Ellis was senior member of the law firm of Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chafetz & Masters, and served as general counsel for the Chicago Tribune, an outstanding Chicago newspaper.

This noted attorney was a man of integrity who was devoted to his country and lived according to the high ideals and principles which he never compromised.

Howard Ellis' untimely death leaves a tremendous gap among the ranks of

those who have courageously championed the cause of freedom of the press.

Those who had the privilege of knowing Mr. Ellis intimately, as well as those who had the opportunity to associate with him occasionally, have suffered a great loss for he was a man highly respected and affectionately regarded by his community.

An editorial about Howard Ellis, which appeared in the February 20 edition of the Chicago Tribune, follows:

HOWARD ELLIS

Howard Ellis was one of the fortunate few to be able to do in his lifetime something which will be remembered. He was a lawyer, and a distinguished one, but his services transcended the routine of office and courtroom which affords so many lawyers a comfortable living.

The record he leaves behind provides an imperishable contribution in defense of the freedom of the press. Howard Ellis was a principal in some of the landmark cases of our time. He and his late associate, Weymouth Kirkland, were general counsel for the Tribune. Together they represented this newspaper in cases which gave added impregnability to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press.

Mr. Ellis was also an expert on the law of libel. In Henry Ford's suit against the Tribune, he enunciated the doctrine of "fair comment" which the courts have not only accepted but greatly extended.

In 1920 Mr. Ellis and Mr. Kirkland represented the Tribune before the Supreme court of Illinois in a suit in which the Chicago city administration of William Hale Thompson tried to reactivate the discredited doctrine of libel upon government. Chief Justice Floyd Thompson, in the decision holding for the Tribune, said, "If this action can be maintained against a newspaper it can be maintained against every private citizen who ventures to criticize the ministers who are temporarily conducting the affairs of his government."

When the Saturday Press of Minneapolis was suppressed by injunction in 1930, the Tribune intervened in behalf of the proprietor, J. M. Near. Ellis and Kirkland carried the case to the United States Supreme court, which held the Minnesota gag law unconstitutional. Chief Justice Hughes said that the Minnesota law was "the essence of censorship" and that previous restraints upon publication to protect public officers could not be countenanced.

Mr. Ellis was also of counsel in another action brought against the city of Chicago by the Tribune, attacking the payment of "expert fees" in land appraisals. This challenge did much to discourage the perpetuation of a political abuse.

We who knew him will miss Howard Ellis tremendously. He was a man of charm, of great intellectual capacity, and one of the most brilliant legal scholars in the bar. His abiding monument is the service he performed in the great cause of free and unfettered expression.

Statement in Support of H.R. 14935, 90th Congress, To Regulate the Mailing of Master Keys for Automobiles

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my congratulations to Chairman

Nix and his subcommittee for the work performed in drafting this fine legislation regulating the mailing of master keys for motor vehicles.

I think there is an imperative and growing need for this legislation. Each year the American public is burdened with increasing costs for automobile insurance. Without question, one of the factors contributing to increasing automobile insurance premiums is the mounting number of stolen automobiles. Each year we have a marked increase in the number of automobiles reported stolen. Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics indicate that the number of vehicles stolen has increased 71 percent in 5 years, from a total of 326,000 in 1961 to 557,000 in 1966. Furthermore, the FBI reports that for the first 9 months of 1967, January through September, the number of automobiles reported stolen had increased by 17 percent over the number for the comparable period of 1966. At the present rate one vehicle is stolen in the United States every minute around the clock throughout the year, and by 1970, if we continue at the present rate, we will surpass a million automobiles stolen per year reaching an average of one every 30 seconds.

Last year in testimony prepared for the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, Michael J. Murphy, president of the National Automobile Theft Bureau, called for a Federal law prohibiting "the indiscriminate sale of master keys in interstate commerce." Mr. Murphy said mail order firms solicit sales of master keys by direct mail and through advertisements in national magazines. He said:

The ads state that the sets are for legitimate use only, but we have found that nearly anyone can obtain complete sets with ease.

Mr. Murphy explained that members of his staff using their home addresses purchased master keys without trouble.

Mr. Murphy further stated:

We have no figures to support our contention that a growing number of thieves are also among the customers, but our agents and the police with whom we work point to a rising number of stolen cars recovered which show no signs of forcible entry, an increasing number of cars stolen from once comparatively safe parking lots and garages, and frequent arrest of persons in possession of master keys.

A particularly disturbing aspect of the indiscriminate sale of master keys is that to the extent that these keys are used for theft of automobiles, the United States Government is abetting this crime by allowing irresponsible operators to advertise, sell, and deliver master keys through the U.S. mail service.

Enactment of this legislation would be of benefit to local law enforcement officials by reducing the flow of master keys to juveniles and irresponsible members of society.

The proposed legislation will not preclude the sale and use of master keys for legitimate purposes. It is intended to restrict such sales to legitimate users only.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of the bill, H.R. 14935. I realize that even with enactment of the proposed legislation we cannot expect to

keep master keys completely out of the hands of professional auto thieves, but, at the very least, we can eliminate the ready availability of them. I think that it is particularly important that we act to remove the temptation for youngsters to obtain master keys. We do not know to what extent this temptation contributes to juvenile delinquency, but with our increasing juvenile delinquency rate, we do know that we must seriously consider every means to reduce contributing factors. Again, may I say that I thank you for the occasion to express my views on this proposed legislation which our country needs.

Some Facts About the Draft System and the Man Who Directs It

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's action last week in removing draft deferments for almost all graduate students, effective this June, is of considerable importance to many people.

To contribute to the understanding of why this was done, by whom it was done, and, most important, the personal philosophy of the head of the Selective Service System who must put these rules into effect, the following articles will be helpful: "Draft Call of Oldest Laid to President," from the Washington, D.C., Post of February 18, 1968; "For the Long Haul, a Tougher Draft," from the New York Times of February 18, 1968; and "The Homespun Philosophy of Draft Director Hershey" from the Washington, D.C., Star of February 18, 1968:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 18, 1968]

DRAFT CALL OF OLDEST LAID TO PRESIDENT (By Morton Mintz)

Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey said yesterday that the controversial policy of calling up the oldest draft-eligible men first was continued Friday by order of the White House.

"The decision was made from the top," Hershey said in a telephone interview.

In a telegram Friday to all state directors of the Selective Service System, Hershey said, "A change in the order of call is not justified at this time. Fairness and equity . . . as well as the interest of the Nation, require that this long-standing practice be maintained."

This ran counter to President Johnson's message of March 6, 1967, on the Selective Service System. Three recent studies of the draft "reveal that the current order of call is undesirable from the point of view of everyone involved—and is actually the reverse of what it should be," the President said.

"I will issue an Executive Order directing that in the future, as other measures I am proposing are put into effect, men be drafted beginning at age 19," Mr. Johnson added.

The order was never issued. Last summer, Congress itself revised the Selective Service Act. It continued deferments for undergraduates and eliminated them, as of next June, for most graduate students. This

laid the groundwork for the new draft uproar.

Friday's announcement that there would be no change in the order of call was coupled with another, which carried out the Congressional mandate by ending graduate deferments except for medical and dental students, who were singled out by the National Security Council.

The combined announcement produced a stream of angry protests from university spokesmen who foresaw a devastating impact on graduate school enrollments.

"The Council of Graduate Schools is appalled," said its president, Gustave Arlt, in one of the stronger reactions. "It is obvious that the decisions were based on purely political considerations."

In a telecast taped last Wednesday for use tonight, Vice President Humphrey recalled "the Burke Marshall Commission" and said, "I hope that the Congress will take note of the recommendations of that Commission and make a very substantial revision of Selective Service."

Marshall, former chief of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, headed President Johnson's National Advisory Committee on Selective Service. Its report preceded the President's 1967 message.

One of its disregarded recommendations was that 19-year-olds be drafted first.

In Bedford, N.Y., Marshall said in a telephone interview: "I don't understand . . . the reasoning that led them to the conclusion that they couldn't reverse the order of call."

Hershey said one suggested alternative, setting up several separate age groups for each draft call, would create a "bedlam" of administrative difficulties, although he "would not say we couldn't do it."

The educators' view is that the Government has created a bedlam in higher education by pursuing a policy that will mean fewer draft calls for groups who in large numbers do not go to college at all—Negroes and the poor.

Russell I. Thackrey, executive director of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges said that the "prime target" of the draft now becomes the estimated 226,000 first-year graduate students and seniors graduating next June. The total is only 14,000 short of the expected draft call for the fiscal year beginning in July.

On "Face to Face" (WTTG) at 7 tonight, the Vice President takes a different tack. ". . . students have really less to complain about Selective Service than most other people," Humphrey says on the taped-in-advance program.

"It's the non-student that really gets hooked in this one and really gets hooked up. I should say, in this business."

Dean Colin S. Pittendrigh of Princeton University's graduate school said that an intake of graduate students will give the armed forces "older men, primarily intellectuals . . . not the most useful soldiers."

The most useful in the eyes of the Army are said to be 19-year-olds. Gen. Hershey hinted in the interview, however, that the Army's view is not necessarily that of the Defense Department. He remarked that his own son-in-law is an Army officer who "would like to have some men old enough to be non-coms."

Kingman Brewster, president of Yale University, is one of several educators who prefer no student deferments at all and a substitution of a system of random selection for the draft.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1968]

FOR THE LONG HAUL, A TOUGHER DRAFT

After several months of hesitation, President Johnson acted on Friday to remove one of the most criticized inequities in the draft system—deferments for graduate students.

The National Security Council—in effect Mr. Johnson, who is its chairman—made public a decision to abolish most graduate student deferments effective this June. The Council also suspended indefinitely the administrative basis for occupational deferments granted to about 170,000 men, another aspect of the draft system the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service had attacked as unnecessary and inequitable in its report to Mr. Johnson last winter.

SOME EXCEPTIONS

The Council made exceptions in both areas. Graduate students in medicine and dentistry and those in the allied fields of osteopathy, optometry and veterinary medicine will continue to be deferred. About 50 per cent of these students will eventually be taken into service anyway through the special doctors draft.

Other graduate students who had completed a year of graduate study by last Oct. 1 toward a doctoral or an equivalent professional degree, or a combination of master's and doctoral degrees, will continue to be deferred for a total of five years, including any years of graduate study prior to Oct. 1, 1967.

But the rest, the great majority, will now be vulnerable to the draft.

Despite the suspension of the lists of critical occupations and essential activities by the N.S.C. the nation's 4,084 local draft boards will retain wide discretionary powers to continue such deferments to avoid hardships for their communities.

About half the 339,474 occupational deferments held by draft registrants are already based on this discretionary power. A board may, for example, defer the only electrician available at a local manufacturing plant if his induction would hamper the plant's ability to operate.

OLDEST FIRST

Mr. Johnson left intact the current draft process under which the oldest men are taken first in the chronological order of their birth dates.

His decision on graduate deferments in these circumstances aroused educators because of the serious effect on the graduate schools and it was expected to have wide political repercussions.

Beginning this June for the first time, the sons of the urban middle class will begin to feel the burden of the heavy draft calls that have been levied since 1965 to conscript soldiers for the battlefields in Vietnam.

Administration officials said they expected from 100,000 to 150,000 men to be drafted during fiscal year 1969, beginning July 1, as a result of the decision on graduate deferments. Another approximately 75,000 are expected to volunteer for service under the threat of the draft.

They will include the June graduates of four-year colleges, current first-year graduate students and men who will receive their master's degree this June. There are now approximately 350,000 four-year college seniors, 144,000 first year graduate students and 56,000 master's degree and Ph.D. candidates.

About 41 per cent of the roughly 550,000 men in these categories will thus either be drafted or induced to enlist by the threat of conscription if the higher combined official estimate of both groups, 225,000 men, is taken.

The magnitude of the effect can be ascertained when the major portion of these 225,000 men—the 150,000 who may not choose to enlist and are drafted outright by 1969—is compared to the 14,000 four-year college graduates who will be drafted during the current fiscal year.

To avoid this roughly 10-fold increase, educators had pressured Mr. Johnson to institute a new draft selection process whereby men would be taken in proportions from each

age group from 19 through the cutoff age of 25 years.

REASONING GIVEN

White House sources said this proposal was rejected, however, on two grounds. First, it would have been unfair to the draft registrants by exposing them to repeated and growing jeopardy as they progressed through each age group; and second, it would have been administratively unworkable with the 4,084 local boards.

The sources pointed out that Congress had rejected last summer Mr. Johnson's attempt to create a random selection system, or draft lottery, which would have eased the impact on the graduate schools and was favored by educators.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 18, 1968]

THE HOMESPUN PHILOSOPHY OF DRAFT DIRECTOR HERSHEY

(By John Barbour)

The man who drafted 14 million young Americans for three disparate wars considers his critics regrettably, as a plowman considers an acre of marshland unfit for the plow.

He is 74 now, but still with a drawling sense of irony learned in boyhood on an Indiana farm where orphaned lambs were bottle-fed, calves were weaned early, and a boy at age 4 kept the woodbox full for seven days a week.

"Well," said Lewis Blaine Hershey, his voice rising and bending with age, "fortunately for the people who want to be against something, the draft is very easily personalized because it happens to have a director."

"And it's a lot easier to hate a guy than it is to hate an idea."

For some, this rough-speaking, heavily built man is both the idea and the guy. In 28 years, as director of Selective Service, he's been assailed before. But his critics are more vehement, angrier now.

They call for his resignation, a revision of the draft law, an end to the war in Vietnam. They accuse him of restricting free speech, of not being uniform in draft policy, of being too old to do his job. His headquarters has been picketed. Draft centers have been mobbed. Congressmen and senators, clergymen and professors, students and mothers have berated him in dramatic, emotional and erudite prose.

PEOPLE TOO SMART

But Hershey settles into the big brown leather chair next to his desk and remembers how as a young man in Indiana he took a prisoner unshackled to the state work farm for his father who was sheriff. They had a flat tire, and the prisoner worked voluntarily and feverishly to change it so they could catch the train in time.

"Well," Hershey drawled, "he had enough sense to know I had a duty. And, after all, if people aren't too smart, they generally understand. Sometimes people get too smart. They get so much knowledge it bothers them. They know how it happened in Rome, and how it happened in Greece, and how it happened several other places. And they kind of lose sight of how it's happening here."

"I do think," Hershey said, "that we got some people who have carried the ideas of building an ideal world to the place where they're quite a little remote from the world they find."

The world of Lewis Hershey is a down-to-earth world, and an imperfect one. Because of an old polo accident, he wears a glass eye, but he squints so tightly it is often hard to tell which eye is the bad one. His creased face has the look of a pioneer fort with rifle slits through which someone is watching.

From within, he measures his critics and their reasons.

"I get caught by all the people who are

on the Hill who are raising hell," he said. He can appreciate, he added, a man who is running for office who attacks him to get his name in the papers. He can understand criticism from a senator who gets 300 letters from women whose sons have been inducted.

"Do I blame the mother for writing?" he asked. "Hell, no. But on the other hand, do I blame her for having lived pretty nicely in this country for a long time? You can't have one without the other."

THE BOUNTY JUMPERS

The criticism bothers him. But this day in his spacious office, surrounded by the flags of every state and territory that has a draft office, he was philosophical about it.

He talked of Civil War days, of the bounty jumpers, boys who took anywhere from \$300 to \$1,300 for volunteering, who'd then disappear and go elsewhere to take another name and volunteer again for another bounty.

"Well, of course," Hershey said, "they couldn't do that very long. So they started sending them under guard—volunteers, you see, under guard."

But even that didn't work. They'd still run off, jump on trains, kill each other to steal the bounty. Finally it got so bad, he said, the conscription officers had to take their volunteers off to war in handcuffs.

The specter of that kind of coercion and that kind of chaos haunts Hershey. It is the way armies are raised in primitive countries. The result, he said, is that you get only the men too poor to buy their way out, or not smart enough to talk their way out. In Hershey's turn-of-the-century rural Indiana, militia service was considered on a par with taxes, and a man could get credit for militia time by working on the roads. Hershey, whose father was once road supervisor, helped keep track of the time.

War by war, the U.S. Selective Service System was built out of chaos into the neighborhood-oriented draft that Hershey took over shortly before World War II. The idea was to leave the individual cases to local decisions while setting a national standard for registration.

"The thing you've got to have in a selective service system is one that produces people either by enlistment or by being inducted to the numbers that the armed forces want," Hershey said.

"And one of the things if I were the enemy, if I were a person who didn't like the United States, I would try to destroy the Selective Service System if I possibly could, because it's the one area in which people are more immediately participating in governing themselves by deciding on a local level who should go, and not to suit a lot of people."

RUGGED APPEAL

In his rambling way, Hershey shifts from folksy recollections to a sort of homespun eloquence. He spices his sentences with small, sardonic chuckles, often leaves them incomplete as if the ending should be understood, as if there were one possible conclusion inherent in his shrug or vocalized pause. His verbs and pronouns take on a farmer's indifference for singular or plural. Out of it all comes a gentle charm and rugged appeal.

Perhaps, he said, there is no way to make a draft system completely uniform. The British and the Turks, seeking ways, asked him how do you take some of the men, and leave some. And he told them he'd been at it for a long time, but he didn't have the answer yet, not one everyone would like. Too many things make for inequality.

"A physical examination that rejects 40 to 50 percent of the people?" Hershey said. "How are you going to tell the public that that's fair?"

"We have been shouting around in the past, probably too much, about homosexuality. And yet, the armed forces, if they have any evidence, are going to reject them. Well,

how is it that all you have to be is a homosexual to get out of doing your duty?

"I don't know the answer to the thing, and there isn't anything I can do about it. Because the Congress says who has to go, the armed forces says whom they'll take, and tell me how fast they'll take anybody. And all we got to do is figure how the individual fits into that pattern. We didn't give him the obligation."

Those who object to war on religious grounds are not new to the system. But even they vary. One, Hershey explained, may not like war but decide the only way to be rid of it is to fight it. Another may object to bearing arms, another to wearing the uniform. They do not object to some humanitarian service in the nation's interest.

THE OBJECTORS

But then you have some, he said, who will not tolerate any of it, not for religious beliefs, but as a matter of conscience.

"It does make a problem," Hershey said. "Because no matter what you tell them you're in trouble. If you say, 'I'm not going to ask you to scar up your conscience because you're going to have to live with your conscience a lot longer than you have to live with me or anybody else. And if your conscience prevents you from doing anything, the only honest thing is to go to the penitentiary.'"

"But that's a helluva thing to tell a kid. But what are you going to tell him, if in the first place he says, 'I'm not against all war. I'm just against this war. It's not for religious reasons. But I just can't participate in it. What shall I do?' You see, there's not much of anything to tell him. Yet, when you tell them to go to the penitentiary, they said the director of selective service went around advising young men to go to the penitentiary."

Hershey has served, but not fought, in two wars, one against a Mexican bandit, one against a German emperor. He has gathered men for three wars, against a Nazi dictator, against the Korean Communist, and this war in Vietnam. Much of the present trouble stems, he admits, from the confusion, the nonexistent fronts, the omnipresent guerrilla and the remoteness of the limited conflict. It's hard to get people to realize "exactly what the situation is, especially if you don't know what it is, and I don't pretend to."

"But I do know," he said, "that we've massed distance to the point where we can't use it as I was brought up to use it. Now in the old days, if you cut the trees back far enough so you got two or three shots at the Indians as they came in toward the cabin, you figured you could defend it. But where you going to put your outposts now? And how?"

CONFUSED YOUNGSTERS

Ultimately, for this man with 13 grandchildren, the problem gets down to youngsters.

"In a way I am responsible that the boys between 19 and 26 are liable," Hershey said. "Of course, Congress passed the law. Just the same, so far as the boy is concerned, I'm the guy."

Yet today's youngsters, he feels, are not fundamentally different, and if he were younger, "I'd be quite challenged to take on some of these kids because I don't think there's any problem with them."

"I've had some discussions with these kids when they decided to quit fooling with the United States," Hershey said. "And I've said to them, 'Are you through with the United States? Is it all right for them to be through with you?' And they said, 'Well, that's fair enough.' So I said, 'All right, don't walk on the sidewalks, but don't get into the street either, because both of them are part of this thing.'"

During one demonstration, a young boy whose brother was flying in Vietnam came

out of the crowd and asked to see Hershey alone. "He sat in this chair," Hershey remembered. "I think he came in to tell me that he tore up his card, and I think he had it in his pocket, but I never saw it. He said he was through with this country, but after we talked awhile he ended up saying, 'I guess I'm confused.'"

The youngsters he's met, he said, are surprisingly honest when you get them alone, but not always in a group. The circumstances of their growing up are different.

"Remember when I was a kid, kids didn't have a television set; they never heard a radio; until I was 8 or 9 years old, if they ever got their mail, they drove somewhere to get it, because we didn't even have rural routes."

LEARN MEANNESS

"And a kid," Hershey said, "living like I did, didn't have the opportunity to learn a lot of meanness. I had to do it more or less on a limited scale. You see I didn't have a chance to see how they could be mean everywhere: 'Let's get on the television at such a time of day because they're going to have the latest meanness. It's going to be demonstrated.'"

"And so these kids," he went on, "haven't had the time to build up the immunity that you build up against measles or some sort of thing when you get exposed to it. And we were not angels either. I don't think I was any worse than most, but there were attempts to gain attention by devilry when I was young. We didn't have the facilities. Even a fella on a bicycle—which I never had—couldn't have run over anybody near as hard as if he'd had a car."

"And not only that, I think there is a little tendency to delay adulthood in the more civilized your society," Hershey said, "because when you get out on the frontiers you better grow up. When my people went out to Indiana, the people who couldn't get up a tree very fast got eaten up by the wolves. And so you didn't have a problem. The guy who was a little slow, he wasn't around."

"But at the present time, we overprotect our young in the first place, and yet we push them into adulthood at the same time—which has the kid going forward and astern."

Of Hershey's two sons, one is in the Marine Corps and was wounded in Korea, and the other was a Naval officer in World War II. They too lived differently from the boy who grew up on an Indiana farm.

TREE-SITTERS

"I've seen a lot of these things before," Hershey said from the perspective of father. "I saw kids sit in trees, but they quit doing it. We got to worrying about it. Thought all the kids would go up in the trees. But they didn't. They came down pretty soon, and there wasn't anybody left sitting in the trees."

"I had a kid in the Marine Corps now that stayed 36 hours in a tree. Made some kind of a record. But we shouldn't have worried too much, because he came down. I don't believe he's been up in a tree since I don't know when."

In a sense, Lt. Gen. Hershey is a bridge between newborn America of today, struggling with the puzzles of its adulthood. His grandmother, wearing the black bonnet and black clothes in the custom of Mennonites, told him of seeing Lafayette when she was a child. He remembers starting the morning fire with corncobs soaked in kerosene oil and being taught that work "was good for you," and that the wealthy man who didn't work because he didn't have to was little better than the bum who wouldn't work at all.

He went to a one-room schoolhouse heated by stove, where "for better or for worse, I knew my teachers well." And he taught in a one-room schoolhouse, and was a part-time deputy when his father was sheriff because the job was "just a little more than one man

could do, and quite a lot less than two could do." And with what his father paid him out of his own pocket, Hershey went to college.

In his present world, the general works with the Red Cross and the Boy Scouts, is frightened by the prospect of having nothing to do some day, and doesn't like to think of who will replace him.

"I'm probably shortsighted enough to think that in my lights I'm right," he said. "I have felt that to the best of my knowledge and ability I was doing what I thought was good for my country, and that was selfishness because I have some children and some grandchildren. They're going to have to live in this country, and if there isn't a country, I don't know where they will live."

"And I happen to believe from what I know of our history and what I've lived, I just don't know any country I like better than this one. Ah, what is it? 'England with all thy faults I love thee still,' said somebody. And I could say the same thing about America."

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XXI

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the first session of the 90th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes taken during the first session. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through 36,418 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bill which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the first session of the 80th Congress. This is the 21st report of my voting and attendance record. These 21 reports show how I voted on 2,897 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 93 percent.

In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 202 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls. I answered "present" to 193 quorum calls and I was absent for nine quorum calls.

The report follows:

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
2	Jan. 10	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 246, Gerald Ford 186)	Ford.
3	Jan. 10	H. Res. 1, authorizing the seating of Adam Clayton Powell and providing for an investigation and report on his conduct within 60 days:	
4	Jan. 10	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Rejected 126 to 305)	Nay.
5	Jan. 10	On amendment denying the seating of Powell and providing for an investigation and report within 5 weeks. (Agreed to 364 to 64)	Yea.
6	Jan. 10	H. Res. 7, adopting the rules of the 89th Cong. as the rules of the 90th Cong.:	
7	Jan. 10	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Rejected 196 to 224)	Nay.
8	Jan. 10	On amendment eliminating 21-day rule which gave authority to Speaker to bypass Rules Committee and call up legislation. (Agreed to 232 to 185)	Yea.
11	Feb. 8	H. Res. 226, providing for consideration of H.R. 4573, increasing temporary national debt limit from \$330,000,000,000 to \$336,000,000,000:	
12	Feb. 8	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Agreed to 223 to 184)	Nay.
13	Feb. 8	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to include participation sales certificates under debt limit. (Rejected 155 to 261)	Yea.
15	Feb. 20	On passage. (Passed 215 to 199)	Nay.
17	Feb. 21	H.R. 2, barring merger of Army Reserve and National Guard:	
18	Feb. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 324 to 13)	Yea.
19	Feb. 21	H. Res. 83, authorizing Agriculture Committee to make various investigations:	
20	Feb. 21	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 231 to 85)	Not voting.
21	Feb. 21	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 304 to 18)	Not voting.
22	Mar. 1	H. Res. 278, ordering public censure and punishment of Adam Clayton Powell as recommended by special committee:	
23	Mar. 1	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Rejected 202 to 222)	Yea.
24	Mar. 1	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments) on substitute language excluding Adam Powell from Congress. (Ordered 263 to 161)	Yea.
25	Mar. 1	On substitute language excluding Adam Clayton Powell from Congress. (Agreed to 248 to 176)	Nay.
26	Mar. 2	On agreeing to resolution as amended. (Agreed to 307 to 116)	Yea.
28	Mar. 2	On ordering previous question on the preamble of resolution. (Ordered 307 to 9)	Yea.
29	Mar. 2	H.R. 4515 (later S. 665) authorizing supplemental appropriations of \$4,500,000,000 for Vietnam war:	
30	Mar. 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar funds for North Vietnam bombing. (Rejected 18 to 372)	Not voting. ³
31	Mar. 8	S. 665, authorizing supplemental appropriations of \$4,500,000,000 for Vietnam war:	
32	Mar. 9	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 363 to 13)	Yea.
33	Mar. 9	H.J. Res. 267, authorizing emergency food assistance to India:	
34	Mar. 9	On passage of joint resolution. (Passed 311 to 63)	Yea.
35	Mar. 9	H. Res. 376, authorizing special counsel to represent the House of Representatives in litigation filed by Adam Clayton Powell:	
36	Mar. 15	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Agreed to 254 to 85)	Yea.
37	Mar. 15	H.R. 6098, extending tax on purchase of certain foreign securities (interest equalization bill):	
38	Mar. 16	On passage. (Passed 261 to 138)	Yea.
39	Mar. 16	H.R. 7123, appropriating \$12,000,000,000 for Vietnam for fiscal 1967 (supplemental):	
40	Mar. 16	On passage. (Passed 385 to 11)	Yea.
41	Mar. 16	H.R. 6950, restoring investment tax credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation:	
42	Mar. 20	On passage. (Passed 386 to 2)	Yea.
43	Mar. 20	H.R. 2068, increasing certain veterans' benefits:	
44	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 359 to 0)	Not voting. ¹
45	Mar. 20	H.R. 2513, establishing Commission on National Observances and Holidays:	
46	Mar. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 35)	Not voting. ¹
47	Mar. 21	H.R. 5277, authorizing funds for Pacific Trust Territory civil government:	
48	Mar. 21	On passage. (Passed 371 to 15)	Yea.
49	Mar. 22	H.R. 7501, appropriating \$7,500,000,000 for Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office for fiscal 1968:	
50	Mar. 22	On amendment eliminating 15 new positions authorized for Treasury. (Agreed to 210 to 175)	Yea.
51	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce total funds by 5 percent. (Rejected 168 to 217)	Yea.
52	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 371 to 7)	Yea.
53	Mar. 22	H. J. Res. 428, supporting increased aid to Latin America under Alliance for Progress:	
54	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to welcome the OAS meeting at Punta del Este, Uruguay, without promising aid ahead of time. (Rejected 147 to 210)	Yea.
55	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 234 to 118)	Not voting. ³
56	Apr. 5	H. Res. 364, authorizing \$250,000 for House Committee on Science and Astronautics:	
57	Apr. 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide minority staff. (Rejected 176 to 215)	Yea.
58	Apr. 5	H. Res. 221, authorizing \$350,000 for House Committee on Un-American Activities:	
59	Apr. 5	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Accepted 305 to 92)	Yea.
60	Apr. 5	On motion to recommit with instructions that open hearings be held on the justification for funds. (Rejected 92 to 304)	Nay.
61	Apr. 5	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 348 to 43)	Yea.
62	Apr. 6	H. Res. 413, providing for consideration of H.R. 2512, revising the copyright laws:	
63	Apr. 6	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 347 to 42)	Yea.
64	Apr. 6	H.R. 2512, revising the copyright laws:	
65	Apr. 6	On motion to strike enacting clause (kill the bill). (Rejected 126 to 252)	Nay.
66	Apr. 11	H.J. Res. 493, postponing railway strike for 20 days:	
67	Apr. 11	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 396 to 8)	Yea.
68	Apr. 11	H.R. 2512, revising the copyright laws:	
69	Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed 379 to 29)	Yea.
70	Apr. 12	H.R. 5404, expanding and improving National Science Foundation:	
71	Apr. 12	On passage. (Passed 391 to 22)	Yea.
72	Apr. 13	H. Res. 418, establishing a standing House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:	
73	Apr. 13	On passage. (Passed 400 to 0)	Not voting. ¹
74	Apr. 20	H. Res. 443, expressing condolence over death of Konrad Adenauer:	
75	Apr. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 357 to 0)	Not voting. ¹
76	Apr. 20	H.R. 207, authorizing nuclear power and desalting plant in California:	
77	Apr. 20	On passage. (Passed 315 to 38)	Not voting. ¹
78	Apr. 27	H.R. 9029, appropriating \$1,400,000,000 for Department of the Interior for fiscal 1968:	
79	Apr. 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce bill by 5 percent. (Rejected 158 to 231)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 376 to 11)	Yea.
81	Apr. 27	H. Res. 442, providing for consideration of H.R. 2508, setting population guidelines for the States in establishing congressional districts:	
82	Apr. 27	On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 284 to 99)	Not voting. ³
83	Apr. 27	H.R. 2508, setting population guidelines for the States in establishing congressional districts:	
84	Apr. 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete exemption allowing Representatives at Large from Hawaii and New Mexico until 1972. (Rejected 161 to 203)	Not voting. ¹
85	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 289 to 63)	Not voting. ¹
86	May 1	H.J. Res. 543, postponing railway strike for 47 days:	
87	May 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 56)	Yea.
88	May 3	H.R. 9481, appropriating \$2,000,000,000 for military and civilian pay (supplemental):	
89	May 3	On passage. (Passed 391 to 6)	Yea.
90	May 9	H.R. 9240, authorizing defense procurement, research, and development:	
91	May 9	On passage. (Passed 401 to 3)	Yea.
92	May 11	H. Res. 161, providing additional \$1,200 annually for Members' telephone expenses:	
93	May 11	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 189 to 157)	Nay.
94	May 11	H. Res. 464, authorizing additional 78 members of Capitol Police:	
95	May 11	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 334 to 16)	Yea.
96	May 17	H.R. 9960, appropriating \$10,000,000,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968:	
97	May 17	On amendment to eliminate \$10,000,000 for rent supplements. (Agreed to 232 to 171)	Yea.
98	May 17	On motion to recommit with instructions to omit all but planning funds for model cities program. (Rejected 193 to 213)	Yea.
99	May 17	On passage. (Passed 347 to 56)	Yea.
100	May 17	H.R. 6431, extending community mental health center program:	
101	May 17	On passage. (Passed 353 to 0)	Yea.
102	May 24	H.R. 7819, authorizing funds for Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs:	
103	May 24	On amendment restoring formula giving greater emphasis to impoverished children in poorer States. (Accepted 221 to 195)	Yea.
104	May 24	On amendment allowing States to participate in planning supplementary educational centers. (Accepted 230 to 185)	Yea.
105	May 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to hold further hearings. (Rejected 180 to 236)	Yea.
106	May 24	On passage. (Passed 294 to 122)	Nay.
107	May 25	S. 1432, extending and revising military draft:	
108	May 25	On passage. (Passed 362 to 9)	Yea.
109	May 31	H.R. 10345, appropriating \$2,200,000,000 for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary:	
110	May 31	On amendment placing limit on sale of participation certificates. (Accepted 185 to 144)	Yea.
111	May 31	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce all but FBI spending by 5 percent. (Accepted 171 to 156)	Yea.
112	June 5	H.R. 10226, extending free mailing privileges to overseas and hospitalized members of Armed Forces:	
113	June 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316 to 0)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
119	June 6	H.R. 10509, appropriating funds for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1968:	
120	June 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce spending by 5 percent except for school lunch and milk programs. (Rejected 175 to 222)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 357 to 38)	Yea.
122	June 7	H. Res. 504, providing for consideration of H.R. 10328, increasing national debt limit from \$336,000,000,000 to \$365,000,000,000:	
		On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Agreed to 291 to 99)	Yea.
123	June 7	H.R. 10328, increasing national debt limit from \$336,000,000,000 to \$365,000,000,000:	
		On passage. (Rejected 197 to 210)	Nay.
126	June 8	H.R. 9029, appropriating \$1,400,000,000 for Department of the Interior for fiscal 1968:	
		On agreeing to conference report (\$34,338,000 above House bill). (Agreed to 321 to 49)	Nay.
128	June 8	H.R. 1318, extending food stamp program:	
129	June 8	On amendment requiring States to pay 20 percent of program costs. (Rejected 173 to 191)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 230 to 128)	Nay.
131	June 12	H.R. 7476, establishing 1-year deadline for redemption of outstanding silver certificates in silver bullion:	
		On passage. (Passed 234 to 109)	Yea.
135	June 13	H.R. 10738, appropriating funds for Department of Defense for fiscal 1968:	
		On passage. (Passed 407 to 1)	Yea.
139	June 19	H.R. 6111, establishing Federal Judicial Center for research and planning:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 229 to 98)	Not voting. ¹
140	June 19	H.R. 10730, extending grant programs of Older Americans Act:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 331 to 0)	Not voting. ¹
141	June 19	H.R. 480, extending wetlands conservation program:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 328 to 8)	Not voting. ¹
142	June 19	H.R. 482, increasing duck stamp fees for wetlands program:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 238 to 97)	Not voting. ¹
144	June 20	S. 1432, extending and revising military draft:	
		On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 377 to 29)	Not voting. ¹
145	June 20	H.R. 10840, providing penalties for desecration of the American flag:	
		On passage. (Passed 385 to 16)	Not voting. ¹
		H.R. 10867, increasing permanent debt limit from \$285,000,000,000 to \$358,000,000,000 with authority to temporarily borrow additional \$7,000,000,000 during the fiscal year:	
147	June 21	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to set permanent debt limit at \$336,000,000,000. (Rejected 191 to 224)	Yea.
148	June 21	On passage. (Passed 217 to 196)	Nay.
153	June 26	H.R. 8582, increasing number of associate judges on District of Columbia Court of Appeals from 2 to 5:	
		On passage. (Passed 335 to 6)	Yea.
154	June 26	H.R. 10783, strengthening District of Columbia crime laws:	
		On passage. (Passed 355 to 14)	Yea.
156	June 27	H.R. 10943, authorizing teacher education programs:	
157	June 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate Teachers Corps provisions. (Rejected 146 to 257)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 311 to 88)	Yea.
160	June 28	H.R. 10340, authorizing funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968:	
161	June 28	On motion to recommit with instructions to cut \$136,400,000 and provide for Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. (Agreed to 238 to 157.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 342 to 53)	Yea.
163	July 11	H.R. 10805, extending U.S. Civil Rights Commission:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 283 to 89)	Yea.
165	July 12	S. 20, establishing National Water Commission to review water resource problems:	
		On passage. (Passed 369 to 18)	Yea.
167	July 13	H.R. 10595, prohibiting banks and savings and loan associations from cooperating with States in selling State lottery tickets:	
168	July 13	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 135 to 257.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 271 to 111.)	Nay.
170	July 17	S.J. Res. 81, providing for settlement of railroad labor dispute:	
		On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing for compulsory settlement after 90-day mediation period. (Agreed to 244 to 148.)	Yea.
173	July 18	H.R. 11456, appropriating funds for Department of Transportation for fiscal 1968:	
174	July 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds by 5 percent. (Agreed to 213 to 189.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 393 to 5)	Yea.
176	July 19	H.R. 421, prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with intent to incite riots:	
		On passage. (Passed 347 to 70)	Yea.
178	July 20	H. Res. 749, providing for consideration of H.R. 11000, providing additional rat control programs:	
		On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 176 to 207)	Nay.
180	July 25	H.R. 11641, appropriating funds for public works and the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968:	
181	July 25	On amendment deleting Dickey-Lincoln Dam project. (Agreed to 233 to 169.)	Yea.
182	July 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce appropriation by 5 percent. (Rejected 166 to 239.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 375 to 26)	Yea.
186	July 26	H.R. 9547, increasing U.S. contribution to Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations:	
187	July 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit funds to present level. (Rejected 185 to 217)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 275 to 122)	Nay.
189	July 27	H.R. 8630, extending authority for exemptions from antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding U.S. balance of payments:	
		On passage. (Passed 308 to 66)	Yea.
190	July 31	H.R. 6098, extending interest equalization tax on purchase of most foreign securities:	
		On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 223 to 83)	Yea.
192	Aug. 1	H.R. 11722, authorizing military construction for fiscal 1968:	
		On passage. (Passed 394 to 2)	Yea.
200	Aug. 8	H.R. 5037, authorizing \$75,000,000 for local law-enforcement improvement:	
201	Aug. 8	On amendment providing law-enforcement assistance through block grants to States. (Agreed to 256 to 147)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 377 to 23)	Yea.
204	Aug. 9	H. Res. 512, disapproving presidential plan to reorganize District of Columbia government:	
		On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 160 to 244)	Yea.
206	Aug. 10	H.R. 7659, authorizing mid-decade censuses in addition to 10-year censuses:	
		On passage. (Passed 255 to 127)	Nay.
208	Aug. 14	H.R. 43, authorizing \$92,400,000 for San Felipe water project in California:	
		On passage. (Passed 235 to 83)	Nay.
209	Aug. 14	H.R. 6279, expanding standard reference data system of Bureau of Standards:	
		On amending limiting funds and requiring annual congressional review. (Agreed to 319 to 2)	Yea.
214	Aug. 15	H. Res. 856, providing for consideration of H.R. 2516, providing penalties for interference with the exercise of civil rights:	
		On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 330 to 77)	Yea.
220	Aug. 16	H.R. 2516, providing penalties for interference with the exercise of civil rights:	
		On passage. (Passed 326 to 93)	Yea.
222	Aug. 17	H.R. 12080, Mills-Byrnes bill increasing social security benefits and improving public assistance programs:	
		On passage. (Passed 415 to 3)	Yea.
223	Aug. 17	S. 16, increasing veterans' benefits:	
		On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 404 to 0)	Yea.
224	Aug. 21	H.R. 12257, expanding grants to States for vocational rehabilitation:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 340 to 0)	Yea.
226	Aug. 21	H.R. 11565, authorizing transfer of peanut acreage allotments:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 208 to 146, a 2/3 majority being required.)	Yea.
229	Aug. 22	H.R. 12474, appropriating \$4,600,000,000 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968:	
		On passage. (Passed 312 to 92)	Nay.
235	Aug. 24	H.R. 12048, authorizing \$2,800,000,000 in foreign aid in fiscal 1968:	
236	Aug. 24	On amendment deleting authority for arms credit sales. (Accepted 236 to 157.)	Yea.
237	Aug. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce technical assistance by \$33,000,000. (Agreed to 234 to 163.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed 202 to 194)	Nay.
239	Aug. 28	H.R. 8965, increasing Federal contribution to Dulles-Potomac sewer in Washington, D.C., area:	
		On passage. (Passed 118 to 109)	Nay.
240	Sept. 11	H.R. 11816, providing disability and death benefits for State or local police killed or injured while enforcing Federal laws:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 310 to 0)	Not voting. ¹
241	Sept. 11	H.R. 8654, permitting United States to appeal pretrial orders to suppress evidence:	
		On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 311 to 1)	Not voting. ¹

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
242	Sept. 11	H.R. 8775, increasing authorization for reclamation projects in Missouri River Basin from \$60,000,000 to \$68,000,000: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 225 to 83.)	Not voting. ²
244	Sept. 12	H.R. 10738, appropriating funds for Department of Defense for fiscal 1968: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 365 to 4.)	Yea.
245	Sept. 12	On motion to recede from Byrnes amendment prohibiting use of funds in bill to construct naval vessels in foreign shipyards. (Rejected 144 to 233.)	Nay.
253	Sept. 14	S. 602, authorizing \$886,700,000 for Appalachian development programs: On amendment reducing nonhighway programs by \$50,000,000. (Accepted 199 to 161.)	Yea.
254	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete channeling of funds through President, delete housing projects subsidy, and add \$2,500,000 for Great Lakes fishery conservation. (Rejected 178 to 184.)	Yea.
255	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 189 to 168.)	Nay.
257	Sept. 18	H.R. 4451, guaranteeing reimbursement for U.S. fishing vessels seized by foreign countries: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 147 to 175.)	Nay.
258	Sept. 18	S. 1657, extending dairy indemnity payments for 1 year: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 320 to 7.)	Yea.
259	Sept. 18	H. Res. 838, authorizing Judiciary Committee investigation of certain refugee matters overseas: On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 262 to 52.)	Yea.
262	Sept. 19	S. 953, extending food stamp program: On motion to agree to Senate amendments extending program 2 years. (Agreed to 196 to 154.)	Not voting. ²
264	Sept. 20	H.R. 9547, Inter-American Development Bank Act amendments: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on retaining provision for auditing. (Agreed to 274 to 126.)	Yea.
265	Sept. 20	H.R. 6418, increasing Federal grants for comprehensive health programs in the States: On amendment providing \$40,000,000 for special projects. (Accepted 227 to 173.)	Nay.
266	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 395 to 7.)	Yea.
267	Sept. 20	H.R. 6430, extending aid for mental retardation facilities: On passage. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yea.
270	Sept. 21	H.R. 6736, Public Broadcasting Act: On motion to recommit with instructions to provide grants to educational broadcasting stations and eliminate establishment of Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (Rejected 167 to 194.)	Yea.
271	Sept. 21	On passage. (Passed 265 to 91.)	Nay.
273	Sept. 25	H.R. 13042, providing for an elected school board for District of Columbia: On passage. (Passed 324 to 1.)	Not voting. ¹
274	Sept. 25	H.R. 13025, allowing District of Columbia government to issue rules for sale of alcoholic beverages: On passage. (Rejected 153 to 182.)	Not voting. ¹
277	Sept. 26	H.R. 12120, providing for juvenile delinquency control programs: On amendment giving States authority to coordinate programs. (Agreed to 234 to 139.)	Yea.
278	Sept. 26	On amending existing programs already covered by poverty programs. (Agreed to 241 to 132.)	Yea.
282	Sept. 27	H.J. Res. 849, making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit. (Agreed to 202 to 182.)	Yea.
285	Sept. 28	H.R. 478, requiring studies of impact on American workers of low-wage imports: On passage. (Passed 340 to 29.)	Yea.
287	Sept. 29	H.R. 10673, clarifying stockyard owners' rights and responsibilities: On passage. (Passed 234 to 6.)	Not voting. ¹
289	Oct. 2	H.R. 4930, authorizing increase in annual aid to Ryukyu Islands from \$12,000,000 to \$25,000,000: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 284 to 80.)	Nay.
290	Oct. 2	S. 223, authorizing sale of certain Government communications facilities in Alaska: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 357 to 1.)	Yea.
291	Oct. 2	H.R. 9796, authorizing loans of certain naval vessels to foreign countries: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 321 to 42.)	Yea.
293	Oct. 3	H.J. Res. 853, making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1968: On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments.) (Agreed to 213 to 205.)	Nay.
294	Oct. 3	H.R. 11722, authorizing military construction for fiscal 1968: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 377 to 33.)	Yea.
296	Oct. 4	H.R. 10196, appropriating funds for Departments of Labor and HEW for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to delete \$20,700,000 not requested in budget. (Agreed to 226 to 173.)	Yea.
297	Oct. 4	H.R. 1411, strengthening mail fraud laws: On passage. (Passed 353 to 32.)	Yea.
300	Oct. 10	H.R. 10509, appropriating funds for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1968 (conference report): On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment authorizing funds for cropland adjustment program. (Agreed to 337 to 8.)	Yea.
301	Oct. 10	On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment adding \$25,000,000 over budget request for Farmers Home Administration loans. (Agreed to 362 to 24.)	Yea.
302	Oct. 10	On motion to insist on House disagreement to Senate amendment adding \$1,600,000,000 over budget request for Commodity Credit Corporation. (Agreed to 391 to 3.)	Yea.
306	Oct. 11	H.R. 7977, increasing postal rates and Federal salaries: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete provision providing for pay increases in 1968 and 1969 without further congressional action. (Rejected 199 to 211.)	Yea.
307	Oct. 11	On passage. (Passed 318 to 89.)	Nay.
309	Oct. 16	H.R. 13048, extending Library Services and Construction Act: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 371 to 0.)	Yea.
310	Oct. 16	S.J. Res. 112, extending deadline for report of Commission on Urban Problems: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 343 to 10.)	Yea.
313	Oct. 17	H.R. 11456, making appropriations for Department of Transportation for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to Senate amendments which exceed budget requests. (Rejected 124 to 268.)	Yea.
314	Oct. 17	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 367 to 22.)	Yea.
315	Oct. 17	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing funds for Kelley Flats (Mont.) airport. (Rejected 161 to 222.)	Nay.
316	Oct. 17	H.R. 159, providing for independent Federal Maritime Administration: On passage. (Passed 324 to 44.)	Yea.
319	Oct. 18	H.J. Res. 888, appropriating continuing funds for fiscal 1968: On amendment to limit certain spending to fiscal 1967 level. (Agreed to 239 to 164.)	Yea.
320	Oct. 18	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 158 to 244.)	Nay.
321	Oct. 18	On passage. (Passed 253 to 143.)	Yea.
323	Oct. 19	H.R. 13178, strengthening present law protecting U.S. Capitol area: On passage. (Passed 336 to 20.)	Yea.
325	Oct. 19	S. 676, prohibiting the obstruction of Federal criminal investigations: On passage. (Passed 275 to 47.)	Yea.
327	Oct. 20	H. Res. 241, transferring legislative jurisdiction over national cemeteries to Veterans' Affairs Committee: On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 227 to 10.)	Yea.
328	Oct. 20	H. Res. 947, providing for consideration of H.R. 10442, allowing Forest Service to sell land under 80 acres for public school sites: On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 221 to 1.)	Yea.
329	Oct. 20	H.R. 10442, allowing Forest Service to sell land under 80 acres for public school sites: On motion to recommit with instructions to include language providing that payments be deposited in U.S. Treasury. (Rejected 30 to 191.)	Nay.
333	Oct. 23	H.R. 11627, authorizing State of Maryland to construct and operate 4 bridges or tunnels across the Chesapeake Bay: On passage. (Passed 342 to 9.)	Yea.
335	Oct. 24	H.R. 9960, appropriating \$10,000,000,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on House limitation on the sales of participation certificates. (Rejected 184 to 208.)	Yea.
336	Oct. 24	On motion to concur in Senate language increasing House allotment for model cities program from \$237,000,000 to \$537,000,000. (Rejected 156 to 241.)	Nay.
337	Oct. 24	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing \$40,000,000 for rent supplement contract authority. (Rejected 152 to 250.)	Nay.
338	Oct. 24	H.R. 13606, appropriating funds for military construction for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 362 to 26.)	Yea.
340	Oct. 25	H.R. 11641, appropriating funds for public works and Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 117 to 278.)	Yea.
341	Oct. 25	On motion that House agree to providing \$875,000 for planning of Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine. (Rejected 162 to 236.)	Nay.
342	Oct. 25	On motion that House agree to amendment increasing the amount appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for construction and planning by \$32,525,000 above the bill as passed by the House. (Agreed to 283 to 111.)	Nay.
343	Oct. 26	H.R. 9960, appropriating \$10,000,000,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit 2d conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to funding rent supplement contract authority. (Rejected 184 to 198.)	Yea.
344	Oct. 26	On agreeing to 2d conference report. (Agreed to 296 to 88.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
345	Oct. 26	H.R. 13510, increasing basic pay of U.S. servicemen by an average of 4.5 percent: On passage. (Passed 385 to 2.)	Yea.
346	Oct. 26	H.R. 2508, congressional redistricting bill: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to restore House-passed standards for redistricting. (Rejected 82 to 283.)	Nay.
347	Oct. 26	On agreeing to conference report declaring that no State be required to redistrict or hold elections-at-large prior to 1970 census or special census. (Agreed to 241 to 105.)	Yea.
349	Oct. 30	H.R. 10915, ending importation of extra-long-staple cotton from Egypt and the Sudan after their severance of diplomatic relations with the United States: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 101 to 244.)	Nay.
350	Oct. 30	On passage. (Passed 275 to 63.)	Yea.
354	Oct. 31	H.R. 12144, providing for cooperation with States in improving meat inspection programs: On passage. (Passed 403 to 1.)	Yea.
359	Nov. 2	S. 780, Air Quality Act of 1967 authorizing action to curb air pollution: On passage. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yea.
361	Nov. 3	H. Res. 966, providing for consideration of S. 2388, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967: On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 262 to 39.)	Yea.
362	Nov. 6	H.R. 11565, authorizing transfer of peanut acreage allotments: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 255 to 57.)	Yea.
363	Nov. 6	S.J. Res. 33, establishing a commission to study hazardous household products: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 206 to 102.)	Yea.
364	Nov. 6	H.R. 3639, consolidating existing laws regulating animal drugs and animal feeds: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Yea.
365	Nov. 6	H.R. 13165, extending Secret Service protection to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and her children until March 1969: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 302 to 11.)	Yea.
366	Nov. 6	S.J. Res. 114, extending duration of copyright protection in certain cases: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 308 to 6.)	Yea.
367	Nov. 6	H.R. 3982, increasing reimbursement of servicemen for shipment of trailers and household goods: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 319 to 0.)	Yea.
368	Nov. 6	H.R. 13669, revising procedures for settlement of various military claims: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 0.)	Yea.
369	Nov. 6	S. 1552, increasing membership on National Highway Safety Advisory Committee: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 252 to 65.)	Nay.
370	Nov. 6	S. 423, authorizing additional funds for harbor construction at Manele Bay, Hawaii: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 291 to 25.)	Yea.
374	Nov. 8	S. 1872, authorizing foreign assistance for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on language prohibiting the sale to or purchase of defense goods or services from any country which trades with or permits its ships to carry goods to North Vietnam. (Rejected 196 to 200.)	Nay.
375	Nov. 8	On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 205 to 187.)	Yea.
378	Nov. 9	H.R. 11641, appropriating funds for public works and Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1968: On motion that House agree to Senate amendment providing \$875,000 for planning of Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine. (Rejected 118 to 263.)	Nay.
380	Nov. 9	H.R. 8569, appropriating funds for District of Columbia for fiscal 1968: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 354 to 6.)	Yea.
386	Nov. 15	S. 2388, authorizing further funding of the Economic Opportunity Act: On amendment prohibiting use of funds to defend persons involved in unlawful disturbances or riots. (Agreed to 332 to 79.)	Yea.
387	Nov. 15	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce total authorization by \$460,000,000. (Agreed to 221 to 190.)	Yea.
388	Nov. 15	On passage. (Passed 283 to 129.)	Nay.
390	Nov. 16	H. Res. 978, providing for consideration of H.R. 13893, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1968: On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 200 to 190.)	Yea.
394	Nov. 17	H.R. 13893, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 135 to 177.)	Yea.
395	Nov. 17	On passage. (Passed 167 to 143.)	Yea.
396	Nov. 17	H. Res. 509, providing for consideration of H.R. 8, imposing criminal punishment on those who support through contributions or goods any country in armed conflict with the United States: On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 211 to 37.)	Yea.
399	Nov. 20	H.R. 13933, authorizing modifications in the Interstate Highway System: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 361 to 1.)	Yea.
400	Nov. 20	H.R. 12010, granting consent of Congress to Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 356 to 2.)	Yea.
401	Nov. 20	H.R. 9063, providing for determination of certain war claims of American nationals: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 348 to 10.)	Yea.
402	Nov. 20	H.R. 11527, amending rules on use of Federal land conveyed to the University of Maine: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 24.)	Yea.
404	Nov. 21	H.R. 6430, extending aid for mental retardation facilities: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 354 to 0.)	Yea.
405	Nov. 21	H.R. 6418, increasing Federal grants for comprehensive health programs in the States: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 347 to 3.)	Yea.
406	Nov. 21	S. 1031, authorizing funds for Peace Corps for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit with instructions to cut \$10,700,000 and to prohibit use of funds for attempts to obtain draft deferments for Peace Corps volunteers. (Rejected 141 to 203.)	Yea.
407	Nov. 21	On passage. (Passed 312 to 32.)	Yea.
410	Nov. 27	H.R. 12603, authorizing establishment of a National Visitor Center in Washington, D.C.: On passage. (Passed 316 to 34.)	Not voting. ¹
411	Nov. 27	S. 1003, increasing protection against flammable fabrics: On passage. (Passed 325 to 0.)	Not voting. ¹
413	Nov. 28	H.J. Res. 936, appropriating continuing funds for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 368 to 13.)	Nay.
414	Nov. 28	H. Res. 985, to agree to an amendment to bill H.R. 2275, which would prohibit at-large elections of Members of the House of Representatives except in the States of Hawaii and New Mexico: On ordering previous question (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 201 to 179.)	Nay.
415	Nov. 28	H.R. 12601, strengthening Internal Security Act concerning registration of Communists: On passage. (Passed 269 to 104.)	Yea.
417	Nov. 29	H.R. 12144, providing for cooperation with States in improving meat inspection program: On motion to instruct House conferees to agree to Senate amendments allowing Federal inspection of intrastate plants. (Rejected 166 to 207.)	Nay.
418	Nov. 29	H.R. 13706, removing the 6-percent interest limitation for farm credit system institutions: On motion to recommit with instructions to limit provisions to 2 years. (Rejected 102 to 269.)	Nay.
421	Dec. 4	H.R. 11276, extending grants for adult education programs: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 352 to 0.)	Yea.
422	Dec. 4	H.R. 13054, prohibiting discrimination in employment with respect to age: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 344 to 13.)	Yea.
423	Dec. 4	H. Res. 996, agreeing to conference on S. 2172, strengthening Internal Security Act concerning registration of Communists, and insisting on House amendments: On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 287 to 58.)	Yea.
426	Dec. 6	H.R. 6111, establishing Federal Judicial Center for research and planning: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 230 to 126.)	Nay.
427	Dec. 6	H.R. 12144, providing for cooperation with States in improving meat inspection programs: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 336 to 28.)	Yea.
429	Dec. 11	S. 2388, authorizing further funding of the Economic Opportunity Act: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 247 to 149.)	Nay.
430	Dec. 11	H.J. Res. 888, appropriating continuing funds for fiscal 1968: On ordering previous question on conference report (ending debate and precluding amendments). (Ordered 213 to 183.)	Nay.
431	Dec. 11	On motion that House concur in amendment requiring \$9,000,000,000 reduction in budgeted fiscal 1968 obligations for executive agencies. (Agreed to 366 to 26.)	Yea.
433	Dec. 11	H.R. 7977, increasing postage and Federal salaries: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 327 to 63.)	Nay.
435	Dec. 12	H.R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1968: On passage. (Passed 307 to 77.)	Yea.
436	Dec. 12	H.R. 4765, relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 274 to 104.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1967	Measure, question, and result	Vote
437	Dec. 12	H.R. 10595, prohibiting banks and savings and loan associations from cooperating with States in selling State lottery tickets: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 289 to 74.)	Nay.
439	Dec. 13	H.R. 12080, Mills-Byrnes bill increasing social security benefits and improving public assistance programs: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 390 to 3.)	Yea.
441	Dec. 13	S. 2171, strengthening Internal Security Act concerning registration of Communists: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 276 to 114.)	Yea.
443	Dec. 14	H.R. 13893, appropriating funds for foreign aid for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit 1st conference report (\$119,000,000 over House-passed version). (Agreed to 196 to 185.)	Yea.
444	Dec. 15	On agreeing to 2d conference report reducing amount of funding. (Agreed to 198 to 158.)	Yea.
445	Dec. 15	H.R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1968: On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 108 to 254.)	Nay.
446	Dec. 15	H.R. 7819, authorizing funds for Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs: On agreeing to conference report. (Agreed to 286 to 73.)	Yea.
447	Dec. 15	H.R. 12555, protecting veterans from pension cuts resulting from social security benefit increases: On passage. (Passed 353 to 0.)	Yea.

¹ Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."² Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."**It Is Easy To Rationalize****HON. CHESTER L. MIZE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. F. T. Fowler of the First Baptist Church, Topeka, Kans., has recently made a recommendation for "a way in which a Christian can live with his conscience and keep the peace." His thoughts merit consideration. I respectfully bring them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

IT IS EASY TO RATIONALIZE

(By Dr. F. T. Fowler)

In my ministry I have fluctuated between pacifism and the use of force as an approach to international problems. I have found Jesus' teaching to be anti-force, setting forth non-violent resistance.

For the first three hundred years of Christian history no Christian bore arms. Apparently the early Christian Church read Christ this way.

It is easy to rationalize. We must use force or be enslaved. We must use force to limit the spread of evil. Cogent arguments, these, when a Hitler appears or a "Vietnam" rears its ugly head. This rationalization is deadly if Einstein was right in asserting war would cease forever if two per cent of the population would resolutely refuse to fight.

The Vietnam situation is just another in a long line of (inevitable) conflicts. If you travel as I have in Thailand where the remote village boundaries are being transgressed and villagers are being coerced to accept Communism—you feel we must war to stop this enslavement; these violations of individual choice.

All too soon it will seem as though Communism represents the choice of the inhabitants. Maybe it will—but only after coerced indoctrination. What's right about that! So we kill to stop it! We square off and get involved in ideological or nationalistic conflict?

I have now come to another alternative—it will be a long while before we can live in an unarmed world. But the use of arms must be an international matter under the direction of the United Nations. The United Nations with full support from the great powers can and must police the world, guaranteeing boundaries and maintaining peace.

The transition from national intervention to international police action is the way in which a Christian can live with his conscience and keep the peace.

Our government, in concert with others, should move to this end as quickly as possible.

Good Pick for Commerce**HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made an excellent choice in naming Mr. C. R. Smith to be Secretary of Commerce. Under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial contained in last Sunday's Nashville Tennessean:

GOOD PICK FOR COMMERCE

President Johnson has named Mr. C. R. Smith, chairman of the board of American Airlines, to his cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. He will become the fourth to hold the office under Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Smith is a familiar figure to Nashvillians. He has many friends here and has visited the city many times. He has spoken to various civic groups here in the past.

The airline executive succeeds Mr. Alexander Trowbridge, who has resigned for health reasons. Mr. Trowbridge suffered a heart attack in 1966 and was hospitalized in January of this year with a circulatory ailment. Doctors had advised him against continuing such an arduous job.

In Mr. Smith, the President is getting a dynamic, tough-minded man who has ideas and determination. He became head of American Airlines in 1934 at the age of 35 and under his guidance it became the second largest domestic airline. It would have become Number 1 had not United merged with Capital.

Mr. Smith was a key figure during World War II in the Air Force program which developed the Air Transport Command into a worldwide transportation network. He rose to a major general and won a number of decorations for his achievements. In 1961 he won the Billy Mitchell Award for contributions to aviation progress.

Mr. Smith's career has included such diversified jobs as banking, office manager of a cotton mill, state government, advertising and being assistant treasurer of the Texas-Louisiana Power Company. The new Commerce Secretary has also served on the Business Advisory Council, a private industry group, which works closely with the Commerce Department.

The new Secretary is a plain-spoken man who likes to cut to the heart of problems without delay. If the past is any indication, it won't take him long to thoroughly familiarize himself with all aspects of his new job.

Mr. Johnson has made a good choice.

Citizens for Public Prayer**HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, there are many good causes which reach the Congress. Most of them find their way to the floor of one or both Houses and are there decided. One such good cause, more than 5 years after it started, has still failed to reach the floor in either House for a normal vote. I refer to the effort to write a Peoples' Amendment for Public Prayer into the Constitution. Hundreds of bills have been introduced in both Senate and House to reverse the tragic precedents of the two prayer-ban decisions. On the House side, despite hearings in the spring of 1964, the Judiciary Committee has still reported out no bill. On the Senate side, Senate Joint Resolution 1, introduced by 42 Senators in the very first day of the 1967 session, remains inactive in the Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee. Meanwhile, polls continue to indicate that some 80 percent of the American people favor a return of prayer to their public classrooms. It is clear that the issue of eliminating the prayer-ban precedents—good as it is in itself—cannot win through unless and until the American people everywhere roll up their sleeves and fight it out with good, old-fashioned political savvy.

One of the major national organizations supporting a restorative prayer amendment is Citizens for Public Prayer. It is entirely nonsectarian and nonpartisan. Each year CPP publishes an Action Memorandum to assist Americans who may not understand the working of things political and may suppose that good causes triumph on their own merits. I am most happy to make this memorandum available to the Members and to the Nation. It pulls no punches. It talks straight. I hope that all who read it will be galvanized into the kind of action from which alone we can win in 1968 this great fight for public reverence. For my part, I pledge again my full and fighting support in the effort.

The memorandum follows:

CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC PRAYER

Unless you act loud, long, strong now public reverence, already threatened, could be lost forever in these United States.

One way to start would be to have these pages mimeographed and then send them to every name on your Christmas Card list. If public reverence really matters to you, this is a wonderful way to prove it.

1. This is no panic button pushing. This is no extremism. These are the hard facts: The two tragic prayer-ban decisions by the United States Supreme Court (1962, 1963) place a fatal equation which says that public reverence, even if free, non-denominational and non-institutional, is establishment. It is, therefore, subject to denial under the first clause of the First Amendment and no assertion of "free exercise" under the second clause can save it. With such an equation in place, as Mr. Lincoln remarked of the Dred Scott decision a century ago, "not even the shadow of a starved pigeon" can occupy the same place! In other words, the issue here is not one of Church and State, but one of religion in our public life. So long as these two decisions remain in force, every aspect of public reverence among us is adversely affected. As Rev. D. Elton Trueblood, professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, put it—"This is a ruling which affects deeply the whole of American life and represents a radical change in the cultural pattern in many parts of the Nation."

Despite continued evidence of massive public support, hundreds of bills and three committee hearings, nearly six years after the first prayer-ban decision, not one single normal floor vote on a prayer amendment proposal has been taken in either house. This is an almost incredible, extremely serious reflection on the democratic process.

Evidence multiplies that the prayer-ban decisions cloud the whole area of public reverence and are being used as precedents in other decisions and local actions in this area. The fight is thus not for school prayer only, but for public reverence as such.

2. What is involved here is not a tampering with the First Amendment, which has indeed served the nation well in terms of its original sense and traditional interpretation. Senate Joint Resolution #1, signed by 42 Senators from both parties, proposes addition in these words, to restore that sense and clarity that interpretation:

Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in non-denominational prayer.

3. Support for such an amendment has come, among others, from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, legislatures in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maryland, Louisiana, the National Association of Evangelicals, the National Conference of Governors, the National Conference of Mayors, the National Council of Catholic Youth, Dr. Billy Graham, Bishop Fulton Sheen, the National Junior Chamber of Commerce. In the spring of 1967, the "Good Housekeeping" poll showed upwards of 80% of the American people in favor of prayer in public schools.

4. Citizens for Public Prayer is an entirely non-partisan, non-sectarian association of citizens concerned for public reverence and supporting a clarifying prayer amendment. We have no other purpose of any kind. Nor do we have a formally staffed and funded national headquarters.

We will help you with advice and materials if you write us enclosing a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Mostly, you must go it alone. Organize a local chapter of Citizens for Public Prayer. Use your own initiative. Pile-drive this issue whenever and wherever you can. Do not be dissuaded by the voices of doubt and negativity around you. There are many aspects to the issue of public reverence, but do not be confused. The central facts are clear. Here are the key addresses:

Rev. Robert G. Howes, Washington Representative, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20017.

Professor Charles E. Rice, New York Representative, Fordham University School of Law, Lincoln Center, New York, New York.

Mr. Chester Doyle, Middle Atlantic Representative, 5th Street, Berwick, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Carl Griffin, Jr., New England Representative, Box 1776, Rutland, Massachusetts.

Sheets of "Back Public Prayer" stickers for use on your correspondence are available from the D.C. and Massachusetts addresses at \$.50 the sheet. Enclose with your order a large, self-addressed, stamped envelope. Sale of these stickers is our only source of income. Please help!

5. What you can do where you are to help in the prayer amendment drive:

a. Establish a local unit of Citizens for Public Prayer. Publicize this constantly.

b. Introduce formal resolutions backing a prayer amendment (see 2 above) into all civic, social, political, religious and veteran groups to which you belong. See that these resolutions are publicized and communicated to your local state and national political representatives. Demand a reply as to how the resolutions will or will not be activated.

c. Ask your religious leaders to back a clarifying prayer amendment and to give evidence of such backing in their sermons, church publications, etc.

d. Put the subject of a prayer amendment into all radio-TV talk programs you can reach.

e. Ask candidates for your vote (particularly in school board races) at all levels—local, state and national—to tell you explicitly how they feel on the question of a clarifying prayer amendment.

6. What you can do in Washington to help in the prayer amendment drive:

a. Write your congressmen (and senators). Ask them to support, explicitly, a prayer amendment proposal. Remind them that what is sought here is not enactment of such an amendment by Congress (this is, in any case, impossible) but simply congressional authorization for you to decide the issue through your state legislature. A congressman who refuses to vote such an authorization is in fact thwarting the democratic process. Do not settle for an ambiguous form letter reply. If a congressman clearly disagrees with you, write again and argue. If a congressman says he agrees with you, then write again and ask for copies of his talks in Congress and outside backing school prayer. If a congressman is vague and gives you an indistinct answer, write again and respectfully request a special answer to your question.

b. Ask your congressman (and senators) to include a question on the prayer amendment issue in any poll he may take of his home district (or state). The response to such polls gives us important ammunition in our fight for amendment.

c. It is particularly urgent that all candidates for national office this fall, and all candidates in state and congressional elections, be placed on record for a prayer amendment. Remind them how the whole question of public reverence in pursuit of our good traditions in this republic is involved in the prayer amendment fight, plus the right of parents to determine the type of education they wish their tax dollars to provide for their children. If a candidate needs help in writing an address on this subject, give him our name and location—tell him that if he sends us a self-addressed, stamped envelope, we will furnish him with material he can use. If a candidate tells you he is for a prayer amendment, thank him but respectfully ask him to prove his support. And inform him that you would like to have a copy of his remarks on this subject to send

to us, and for your own personal use. In other words, do not settle for vague promises of support. Be from Missouri—use the Show Me tactic!

Here, to sum it all up, is part of an address our Washington, D.C. Representative delivered in New York City a few months ago:

"Move out, Spread your wings, Bombard your relatives and friends everywhere. Duplicate our material. Build bonfires wherever you can under political and religious leaders who have not so far committed themselves or who have committed themselves against us. And not just with one match! A bonfire is a continuous, blazing, insistent thing that stops only when it has consumed the material in it totally. We must rest content only when our spokesmen in Washington a) agree with us and b) give evidence of such agreement by their repeated reference to our cause in their congressional and home addresses and reports. Remember—ask your congressmen to include a question on school prayer in all their district polls. We must rest content only when, by insistent correspondence and personal contact, we have convinced our religious leaders a) to agree with us and b) to give evidence of such agreement by their repeated reference to our cause in their sermons, news media and pastoral action. The key words are pile driver, bull dog. The key phrase is Keep Your Eye on the Ball. The key people are God and Us. The key comparison is that we must be as alive in our effort for this civil right as are our neighbors in their effort for other civil rights. What a tragedy it would be for America if the fight for human equality were won in the same generation which, by its apathy and astigmatism, lost the fight for God as a real presence in its public assembly. What a tragedy if we attain the brotherhood of man and deny our children and ourselves the civil right to declare reverently the fatherhood of God in our public places!"

Without your help, loud, long and strong, the fight to restore the civil right of public reverence will be lost. Shall we bring less zeal to our cause than Mrs. Madalyn Murray O'Hare brings to hers?

An Imaginative Approach to Local Businesses in Our Central Cities

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our central cities are vast and complex, and there is no single program which will cure all the ills arising in the field of housing, education, employment, and health services. However, one important element in any long-range solution to our urban problems is the development of viable business activity on the part of residents of our central cities, and particularly, of minority group members.

Some minority group members, however, have not been a part of the American industrial and economic revolution which has pushed our national business efficiency to record heights. Negro businessmen, for example, face a constant struggle to survive economically. There is a program underway in the District of Columbia aimed at helping minority group businesses to form trade associations in order to improve their business operations. Great benefits can be at-

tained through group purchasing, insurance, credit procedures, and advertising. The project is operated by Howard University, with assistance from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Already, a neighborhood drycleaning association has been formed, and group buying of garment hangers and plastic bags has resulted in savings to some members of as much as 60 percent. Meetings have been held with other businessmen to form similar trade associations for businessmen in auto repair, day nurseries, and restaurants. This program holds the promise of greater strength and stability in the economies of our central cities, as well as upgrading the business practices of minority group businessmen, through organization and cooperation for common economic goals. I am pleased to bring this program to the attention of all Members.

Reds in Defense Plants

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to include in the RECORD the following forthright editorial from the Arizona Farmer Ranchman, which is published in San Diego, Calif., by Elliott L. Cushman:

REDS IN DEFENSE PLANTS

So it's unlawful to refuse to hire Communists in U.S. factories, even in plants that are making highly secret weapons and materiel for the defense of the nation, our liberties, civilization itself. Our precious Supreme Court says so, in a recent decision that has generated more indignation than all its other atrocities put together.

There used to be a quaint superstition that an employer had some discretion in the selection of his hired help, but that has gone the way of other outmoded theories under pressure from unions, Red agents, and the Supreme Court. He may not turn away an applicant just because he has no security clearance, even if there is FBI testimony that the job seeker is a spy. Even if he knows that Communism is criminal insanity, and certainly no one would want a criminal lunatic throwing monkey wrenches or sabots into the machinery and making nightly reports to Moscow or Peking. Nobody but the Supreme Court.

Well, we have an idea. Surely there is no law naming the factory department to which a new employee shall be assigned. So, just assign him to an empty room with no reading matter except the works of Karl Marx and Mao Tse Tung. Let him spend his eight hours a day and his forty hours a week there, with a strict rule forbidding him to step outside during "working" hours.

Yes, he will have to be paid a beginner's wages, whatever they may be at that plant. But Congress can pass an act authorizing the factory to add those wages to the contract price of any defense products then being fabricated. That will be only a trifling addition to the war's cost. Preservation of our military secrets from enemies bent on our destruction will be worth far more.

And maybe those spies will get so bored and frustrated that they will leave America in disgust for the paradises of Russia and Red China. Maybe even the Supreme Court—but no, that would be hoping for the impossible.

Frank Mendell Retires

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Frank H. Mendell retired from his job of State conservationist of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Iowa on February 2, 1968. He has devoted 34 years of his very productive lifetime to conservation in its broadest sense. The landscape of Iowa bears widespread living evidence of the impact of the conservation program on the land under his direction. The beautifully curving terraced, strip-cropped, and contoured fields with their green grassed waterways give the farmlands of Iowa a pleasing look. The wildlife areas, farm ponds, tree plantings, shelterbelts all help to bring about the state of harmony between man and the land.

As State conservationist for the past three decades, he directed a program carried out in Iowa by a statewide organization of dedicated and competent professional technicians trained in the fields of agronomy, soil science, civil and agricultural engineering, economics, and wildlife and forestry. He worked with, cooperated with, and enlisted the help of many agencies, groups, organizations, and individuals in making the progress that has been made in conservation in Iowa to date.

He has given untiringly of his knowledge, energy, and know-how to advance the cause of soil and water conservation and to stimulate and enlist the help and interest of rural and urban people in the importance of soil conservation. He organized the resources of the Soil Conservation Service to get conservation accomplishments on the land effectively and efficiently to secure the greatest possible return for the investments made in the soil and water conservation program.

In addition to his contributions to conservation in the normal course of his work, Mr. Mendell has devoted a considerable amount of his personal time and energy to the development and enhancement of the conservation program. He secured a public awareness of the needed conservation program through his tireless and devoted work with many organizations, conservation talks, and State conservation field days and plowing matches. He has been active in many organizations including the Iowa Farm Safety Council, the Men's Garden Club, Iowa Conservation Education Council, Des Moines Chamber of Commerce, Boy Scouts of America, and the Izaak Walton League.

Mr. Mendell joined the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in May 1934 as an agronomist on the Tarkio Demonstration Project at Shenandoah, Iowa. In 1935 he became project manager of the Grand River watershed demonstration project at Greenfield, Iowa. In May 1937 he became State conservationist of Iowa to head all activities of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in the State and has held that position until his retirement.

Activities of the U.S. Soil Conserva-

tion Service in Iowa under Mr. Mendell's direction included the regular conservation operations program in cooperation with Iowa's 100 soil conservation districts, the Little Sioux flood prevention project, the 46 watershed protection projects now underway in the State, and technical responsibility of the Service for permanent type practices under which the Federal Government cost-shares with farmers under the agricultural conservation program. He also represented the U.S. Department of Agriculture on the coordinating committee for the Upper Mississippi River Basin comprehensive study now underway and nearing completion and served as chairman of the field advisory committee and agriculture advisory committee for the basin study.

Mr. Mendell is a charter member of the Soil Conservation Society of America and is serving as president of that organization this year.

Mr. Mendell was born at Dows, Iowa. He is a graduate of Iowa State University at Ames where he received a bachelor's degree in agronomy followed by a master's degree in soils.

He has been honored on many occasions for his work in his professional field. He received the superior service award of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, outstanding performance award from the Soil Conservation Service, elected fellow member of the Soil Conservation Society of America, president's citation from the society, recognition plaque from the Iowa Soil Conservation Committee, lifetime honorary member of the Iowa Association of Soil Conservation District Commissioners, Gamma Sigma Delta certificate, award of merit from the Iowa Farm Safety Council, election to the Iowa Conservation Hall of Fame, 25-year service award from the National Farm Institute, and the honorary All-American Plowman award.

Frank Mendell is a pioneer in soil and water conservation in the truest sense.

Errors in OEO Report

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, a report of Federal program impact on the local community for fiscal year 1967, was released recently by the information center of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In an effort to communicate with my constituents, I have used the information contained in this report. It is shocking indeed, how much of it I have found inaccurate.

For example, the report shows that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration spent \$41,267,711, for research and development in Calvert County, Md. In seeking confirmation of this information from the agency itself, we found that the agency did not spend any money in fiscal year 1967 in Calvert County. We have checked other reported expenditures of NASA in other counties

of the First Congressional District of Maryland and found that in every case the figures reported by the information center of the Office of Economic Opportunity was substantially in error.

The question now is as to the validity of the whole report.

Obviously, it is impossible for one congressional office and staff to audit such a report. I do think this matter should be of concern to the Congress. If we are going to do a good job in the exercise of our responsibility for congressional oversight of the over 370 programs administered by the various agencies of the Federal Government, the very least we should have is accurate information.

Mr. Speaker, I call this matter to the attention of not only the Congress itself, but also to the Office of Economic Opportunity, who is responsible for the document containing these serious errors of reporting.

Mr. Speaker, this situation must be corrected.

Doctors and Medicare

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, since the adoption of the medicare program in 1965, great strides have been made in caring for our elderly citizens who had previously gone without adequate medical attention due to their lack of funds.

The February 24 issue of the Saturday Evening Post features an article by Dr. David Jay Scott of the Jersey Shore Medical Center, Neptune, N.J. Dr. Scott describes the great service being rendered by medicare. It is good to see that of those who originally opposed the plan, many have now realized how beneficial it can be to both the doctors and the patients they serve.

I insert Dr. Scott's frank and informative article in the RECORD at this time:

SPEAKING OUT: WE DOCTORS WERE WRONG ABOUT MEDICARE

(By David Jay Scott, M.D.)

Not long ago I received a letter from a physicians' group exhorting me to join their organization against "evil schemes such as Medicare." Letters like this still arrive frequently, and they never fail to puzzle and upset me. I can't understand how anyone in his right mind can refer to Medicare today as "evil." To me, it has turned out to be about as evil as the Flying Nun.

Like most doctors, I was against Medicare when it was proposed, and I still have reservations about it. Before the measure was passed by Congress in 1965, I resisted it. I agreed with the great mass of literature published by the American Medical Association and other doctors' groups, all of which insisted that Medicare would mean socialized medicine and a fundamental loss of freedom not only for the doctors of America but also for the millions of citizens over the age of 65.

I anticipated Government fee-fixing and interference with free-enterprise medicine, a mountain of red tape and long delays in getting paid for my services, and a stampede of elderly patients demanding unnecessary treatment. I believed that Medicare would

mean the end of effective medical teaching, because of the loss of elderly ward patients, and that postgraduate education would also suffer.

I still feel there are built-in hazards in Medicare, but I must say that after a year and a half of the program, my eyes have been opened and I view the results with both pleasure and surprise. From what I can see in my private practice, there is considerably more good than bad in Medicare. Few, if any, of the dire predictions have come to pass. I don't feel socialized, mechanized or victimized, and as far as I can tell, neither do any of my fellow physicians.

Most doctors, in fact, are happy as clams over Medicare, even though they won't admit it—or don't dare to admit it. Their incomes have increased because Medicare partially pays them for what used to be charity work. For practically all patients, too, it has been a boon. The average elderly person is now getting a level of care that previously was available only to the rich.

But most important of all, there are definite signs that Medicare is helping to improve the entire standard of health in the United States. Currently, for example, there are an estimated two million diabetics in this country, one half of them undiagnosed. With 20 million elderly citizens now able to avail themselves of regular medical attention, more and more diabetics are being discovered by routine tests and are being treated before the disease takes its toll. It's safe to predict that because of Medicare the number of undiagnosed diabetic people in the United States will soon be significantly reduced.

It's the same with the treatment of stroke. Previously, the average patient paralyzed by a cerebral hemorrhage or thrombosis was sent home to be cared for by his family after his initial treatment in a hospital. He could not normally afford the expensive special nursing care, physiotherapy and speech therapy necessary to restore crippled arms and legs and vocal cords to full use. The doctor lost track of the patient's day-to-day progress and had to rely on family reports for information. A frequent result of this lack of special attention was a dreadful condition known popularly as "claw hand." The muscles of an affected arm would contract the arm permanently into a grotesque hook-like position. The condition was irreparable, and it scarred the patient, both physically and psychologically, for the rest of his life.

Today, because of Medicare, we're seeing less and less of "claw hand." When a stroke victim leaves the hospital, he gets months of care and physiotherapy in a Government-approved convalescent center.

This sort of improved care for the elderly is yielding unexpected benefits, one of which is a boom in the study of geriatrics. Treating the aged has never been a popular specialty, but now, with Medicare, more doctors are being forced to become geriatricians, and scholarship in this once-limited field is bound to expand. And as doctors learn more about the long-term aspects of diseases—by studying the elderly—they are better able to treat these diseases when they strike the young.

Many doctors still refuse to acknowledge these benefits. Others now grudgingly admit that the program has been satisfactory medically, but they are still diehards about the economics of it. At a party recently, I listened to a physician proclaim that as long as he lived he would never involve himself in Medicare's "morass of red tape and delays." Instead, like most physicians, he continues to insist that his patients pay him directly and then collect from the Government on their own.

I must admit I had the same misgivings when Medicare went into effect on July 1, 1966, but with my comparatively new practice, in an area of New Jersey where there

are many elderly people retired on small incomes, I soon found it more practical to bill the Government myself.

To my amazement I discovered that I get paid faster by Medicare (14 days) than I do by doctor-approved insurance programs (3-5 weeks). Even the forms are less complicated. I can fill out a Medicare form in half the time it takes me to struggle through that Blue Shield form. If someone asked me to devise a simpler form than Medicare's, just so doctors would stop complaining, I couldn't do it. The present form asks just seven essential questions.

The private insurance plans, particularly the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, seem to involve endless correspondence over "incorrect claim forms." Months go by with forms being returned, resubmitted, re-filed, etc., because of some silly oversight in form filling. I thought that similar confusions would occur with Medicare, but I have never had a form returned by them.

When I report this to the diehards, they refuse to believe me or even to look at the form, which they consider to be "an instrument of socialism." They also refuse to believe that a physician can benefit financially from the program. At a medical meeting, one doctor told me that he hasn't made a cent out of Medicare and doesn't intend to. Since he has what we call a "cream-puff practice," with only rich patients, I'm sure this is true.

To me, as a young doctor, however, Medicare has meant the difference between years of struggling and paid-up bills. In the past, physicians beginning practice all had to scrape out a living by taking other doctors' cast-off patients (which usually included non-paying deadbeats, hypocondriacs and pests), by working the emergency room or other part-time jobs in a hospital, by doing physical examinations for insurance companies and by running their butts off on house calls. My colleagues have told me they were in the red for years. Some say they couldn't take a day off for two years, and it was unheard of for a young doctor to be able to afford a vacation.

With Medicare all that struggle is history (except perhaps for the pediatrician). The young doctor almost immediately gets his share of patients formerly treated as charity cases, and his fees are partially guaranteed by the Government. In my first year Medicare patients made up more than 50 percent of my total practice. And my older colleagues are still shaking their heads in bewilderment over the fact that my wife and I were able to take a two-week vacation in the first year.

Most puzzling of all is the diehards' conviction that Medicare is also bad for the finances of their patients.

Part A of Medicare gives free hospital care (after the first \$40) to all Americans over the age of 65. Part B pays 80 percent of doctors' bills (after the first \$50) for all Americans over 65 who pay a \$3-a-month premium to the Government. True, even these small payments required of the patient have worked occasional hardship in some instances, but generally the law has been a financial lifesaver not only for the patients but also for their families.

One case of mine, for example, involved a woman who had a severe abdominal illness. She and her husband were living on Social Security and on the small nest egg they had saved up for emergencies. When she became ill, she quickly ran up the following medical bills: hospital, \$4,000; surgeon, \$700; anesthetists, \$200; internist, \$500—for a total of \$5,400. Were it not for Medicare (plus another small insurance policy that paid the 20 percent doctors' fees and the deductibles not covered by Medicare), their life savings would have been severely depleted. As it turned out, their entire expense for the illness was exactly four dollars—for renting a television set during the wife's last days in the hospital.

My most touching Medicare case was a 65-year-old woman who had lived in poverty and had been a clinic patient all her life. Recently, when she came to the Jersey Shore Medical Center and was admitted to my service, she entered a new world. Because she was now covered by Medicare, she was entitled to a semiprivate room, which she shared with the wife of a millionaire. She enjoyed the other woman's flowers, and she chatted happily with her roommate's visitors. She was tended by four top specialists and consultants whom I requested to assist me. When we first examined her, she did not recognize us as physicians because we were wearing business suits. A doctor to her meant an intern or a resident. "If you're really doctors," she said, "where are your white coats?"

One of the most widespread objections to Medicare before it was enacted was that the program would eliminate poor patients from the wards and thus reduce the teaching capabilities of hospitals, which use ward cases in the training of interns and medical students. The diehards still hammer at this point, and of all their arguments, I think it is the most fallacious.

For one thing, taking the elderly out of the wards has merely freed those beds for non-Medicare patients. The wards continue to be filled to capacity. But more important, rather than reducing medical teaching, Medicare actually has extended it—into doctors' offices and the smaller hospitals.

When I took my residency training at Metropolitan Hospital in New York City and at the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital, I was aware that the highest quality of medicine is practiced in academic institutions. We had the most expensive diagnostic equipment—and we were learning all the time. But I was told that the outside world was different—that the patients' finances would inhibit both the quality of the medicine I would practice and my continuing education.

But it hasn't worked out that way. With assured income from Medicare patients, smaller hospitals can now afford extended-care facilities and will soon be able to afford, for the first time, some of the same expensive equipment that only the big academic institutions could buy.

With the cost barrier removed by Medicare, we've already made new discoveries in our continued-learning process. Because we're no longer inhibited about ordering tests, we've found out, for example, that there's a considerable amount of thyroid heart disease among elderly people. They don't have the obvious thyroid symptoms. They just report that they're "a little nervous and draggy." Doctors used to tell them, "It's just age," and then the patient would go away and slip into heart failure. Now, because Medicare has promoted more widespread use of what we call the PBI test, we know that the textbooks, which say that thyroid heart disease is rare, are wrong. So we give the patient iodine and the symptoms clear up. Who knows how many heart problems we've averted?

These, then, are the major benefits of Medicare. What are its deficiencies? First, there is the distinct threat of Government control—laymen making judgments on medical issues, price-fixing, an unbending bureaucracy—which would inevitably lead to the decay of American medicine.

Secondly, Government's foot in the door can destroy a cherished tradition: the doctor-patient relationship. It is not generally appreciated, but when a patient signs a Medicare form, he is authorizing release of all information to those persons who will act on it. Many things are between doctor and patient and are not for public scrutiny. The patient loses this right of privacy with Medicare.

The third deficiency is the possibility of overuse of Medicare by the patient. The

hypochondriac threat hasn't developed yet, but if it does, there is nothing in the law that can curb it. A patient, for example, can go to 50 different doctors for the same inconsequential complaint.

So Medicare dangles somewhere between heaven and hell (hell meaning socialization, to the medical profession). My own feeling is that we'll never be consigned to the demons. After all, we've survived many such crises before. In 1933 a medical-society president labeled another Government program "a major step toward communization and collectivization of American medicine." What he was talking about was the Veterans Administration.

Mr. Catastrophe

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, since the days of President Madison, the United States has maintained a policy of sending emergency assistance to disaster victims in foreign countries. In most cases, initial U.S. assistance reaches the stricken country within 24 to 72 hours after an appeal for help is received. This type of foreign aid is an open demonstration of American concern for the well-being of the people of all nations.

When disaster strikes, the U.S. Ambassador in the country is authorized to provide up to \$25,000 from the contingency fund of the Agency for International Development for relief measures. If local resources are not adequate to meet the emergency situation, the AID disaster relief coordinator in Washington is asked to prepare a plan of assistance using the resources of U.S. Government agencies, the Red Cross and other voluntary agencies. He then acts as the control point for all assistance activities during the emergency.

Recently, when earthquakes shook the island of Sicily, the United States rushed to the aid of injured and homeless victims. Time magazine in its January 26, 1968 issue, reported on U.S. assistance during this crisis and the activities of the AID disaster relief coordinator, Stephen R. Tripp. I include that article, entitled "Mr. Catastrophe," for the benefit of our colleagues:

MR. CATASTROPHE

Sicily was still quaking last week as American relief planes lifted off for Palermo. Air Force and Navy transports carried tents, blankets, food, military trucks and antibiotics, a full 72,000 lbs of emergency supplies for the victims of the island's worst disaster since 1908 (see THE WORLD). Within hours of the first flights, U.S. television screens recorded glimpses of their handiwork: snug tent villages erected amidst the rubble, field kitchens turning out hot meals, doctors and medics ministering to the shocked and the injured. No one watched with greater concern than Stephen R. Tripp, 56, a dapper, cheerful State Department officer who has earned the ambivalent title of "Mr. Catastrophe."

Since 1964, Disaster Relief Coordinator Steve Tripp has coped coolly and shrewdly with 213 calamities, ranging from Hurricane Beulah's inundation of northeastern Mexico to the petrolic breakup of the tanker *Torrey Canyon* off Britain last summer. Most of

his problems are caused by floods, though pestilence, famine, war and earthquake rank almost as high. Last year Tripp and his three-man staff (working from a minuscule suite near the White House) funneled \$41.5 million worth of supplies and services to 39 countries—at a rate of nearly one disaster per week. Duplication is frequent, since some poor countries seem to be "disaster prone": last year, for example, India suffered both drought and smallpox, Nicaragua fire and famine.

Bureaucratic Bog-Down. "It's only going to get worse," predicts Tripp. "As the population increases, people are living closer to danger spots—closer to rivers that flood, the edges of islands on the hurricane path, spreading to places not suitable for building, like the *javelas* on the mountainsides of Rio de Janeiro." Because of Latin America's predilection for disaster, Tripp has stockpiled supplies in Panama for quick transit to the area. "We try to act within the first 24 to 72 hours," he says, realizing that the major diplomatic impact—not to mention the humanitarian aspects—of his coordinating function depends on speed in time of crisis. At that, some countries (including Algeria and Outer Mongolia) have chosen to reject American disaster aid out of ideological false pride.

Tripp's office was created only four years ago, after the Yugoslav earthquake at Skopje, which killed 1,011 and revealed an arteriosclerotic lack of coordination in American relief response. Nonetheless, Mr. Catastrophe follows an honorable tradition. In 1812, President James Madison asked Congress for \$50,000 to help Venezuelan earthquake victims, and U.S. aid to allies in distress has been consistent ever since. Tripp's main problem, predictably, is coping with "bureaucratic bog-down"; he often negotiates personally with medical-supply stores to rent iron lungs, and last July he turned Sears, Roebuck & Co. into an Omar the Tentmaker to provide \$1,800,000 worth of "Ted Williams Campers" for 100,000 Jordanians displaced by the Arab-Israeli war. Tripp is an avid outdoorsman and thus an aficionado of tent living by avocation.

Prime Concern. A California-born bureaucrat who spent most of his 35 years in Government employment as a Foreign Service officer (India, Colombia), Tripp is eminently qualified to manipulate the myriad agencies and offices that deal with disaster. In addition to the Pentagon, the Public Health Service, the Weather Bureau, oceanography office, Coast and Geodetic Survey, he also works with the United Nations, the Organization of American States, the International Red Cross and more than 100 other private agencies.

Last week, in his mild but unwavering way, Tripp wheeled the Air Force into computing the cost of its Sicilian airlift at the lowest possible rate; in the midst of a crisis, he often takes over the telephone headset himself for hours at a time to ensure that the job is completed as efficiently as possible. As for his clients, Tripp's prime concern is to keep them together as family units, thus speeding psychological recovery from cataclysm. "We want them to be comfortable," he says, but not too comfortable. We don't want them to stay permanently in the tents."

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 29th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

How May Congress Learn?

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report to my colleagues that there is a very real increase in interest on the part of Members of the House in adapting modern information-handling techniques to many of the problems which confront us as legislators. From time to time I have noted activity in this area, as it has taken place both in governmental and private sector circles, and have urged my farsighted associates to consider the value of computer technology and systems analysis as applied to the legislative and housekeeping functions of the House of Representatives specifically and the Congress as a whole.

Quite recently, I was honored to attend a special seminar conducted by the Brookings Institution for a bipartisan group of House Members on the subject of information support for the Congress. My distinguished colleagues ROBERT McCLODY, of Illinois, and WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, served as cohosts for the session. Much useful discussion was forthcoming as the result of interchange between the legislators in attendance and a group of resource persons: Prof. Martin Greenberger, of the Johns Hopkins University; Paul Armer, of the Rand Corp.; Robert Chartrand, the information sciences specialist of the Legislative Reference Service; Edward Mahoney, Associate Director for ADP, of GAO; Albert Abrams, secretary of the New York State Senate; and George Sadowsky, director of the Brookings computer center. I should particularly like to commend Stephen Horn of the Brookings Institution and a gentleman with extensive experience on Capitol Hill for the splendid way in which he served as moderator.

The importance of providing enhanced support to the individual Members and committees of the Congress cannot be overemphasized, in my opinion. We continue to generate thousands of inquiries on an incredible range of topics and expect the executive branch agencies, private organizations, and the Legislative Reference Service—LRS—to come up with the answers. Oftentimes, we require quick response information on bills which have been introduced, and this need causes the capable American Law Division of LRS to scrutinize a great deal of material that has been collected for publication in the "Digest of Public General Bills."

A heartening sign of progress in this connection is the series of new developments to place the synoptic information on congressional bills and resolutions in computerized form, using keyboard terminals located within the American Law Division. As a result of this activity, information on each bill can be entered into a remote computer, recalled for editing purposes, and eventually used in the preparation of the "Bill Digest." Having captured this information in machineable form, it then will be possible—although this will require a period of

several months during which special retrieval programs are written—for many congressional inquiries to be answered by a computer review of selected machine-readable data.

Much is being written about the requirement for new ways and means of allowing Congress to study and solve the socioeconomic problems of our time. An article which recently appeared in Science magazine entitled "How May Congress Learn?" explores the needs of this body for improved information availability. The author, who is professor of sociology and a member of the institute of war and peace studies at Columbia University, believes that a critical question to be considered today centers about the "mechanisms available to the national legislature to update its knowledge." He further develops this line of exploration from the perspective that societal data inevitably is politically biased, and that dissemination criteria and procedures in large part determine who shall be aware of and benefit from available information.

I commend the contents of this piece to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

HOW MAY CONGRESS LEARN?

(By Amital Etzioni)

An important question arose recently during a congressional hearing about "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" (S. 843), an act in which the United States is to review annually the "health" of American society. The question is: Who will be in charge of providing the data about the changing state of the society and how will it be made available to Congress? Stated more broadly, the issue concerns the mechanisms available to the national legislature to update its knowledge. In seeking an answer to this question, one must take into account: (i) the inevitability that knowledge about society will be politically "colored"; and (ii) that the slant of and the access to knowledge is affected by the distribution of resources used in its production and processing.

POLITICAL ELEMENTS OF KNOWLEDGE

The current debate among social scientists concerning the "objectivity" of social scientific knowledge is not central to our discussion. Even if it were shown that the social sciences could be completely free of value judgments, this would not mean that they are so at the present time. More importantly, the question of how a society (or its decision-making bodies) "learns" does not concern a "pure" scientific exploration but, rather, knowledge as it is applied to actual social situations. Here pragmatic considerations take priority, and these include political considerations.

Since the writings of Immanuel Kant, it has been clearly established that scientific knowledge is always incomplete and tentative. The gap that exists between what we are capable of learning and what we in fact know is unbreachable. And the knowledge we do have must be continually revised. Hence one can never rely on the information one receives as such, even when it is the best available; one must always add interpretations to attempt to close the gap between the knowledge available and that which a rational decision would require. Also, scientific knowledge tends to be contained within comparatively abstract and specialized disciplines; it thus provides a highly fragmented picture of reality. Decision-making, however, requires synthesized knowledge and an inter-disciplinary perspective. Thus, science per se provides only limited help for the decision-maker who must find con-

nections among the facts of numerous disciplines, each incomplete in itself.

In short, the relationship between the social sciences and a societal decisionmaker is not very different from that between the natural sciences and a medical practitioner: Even if either practitioner had mastered all knowledge which the scientific discipline contains, he still would have to interpret, project, and make connections—on the basis of fragmented information and in accordance with the canons of the applied world.

The canons of the applied world, as in the case of medicine, begin with the question, "Does it help?" not, "Is it true?" The precise way in which medicine X works may be unknown, but this is of secondary concern to the practitioner if it cures the illness. Similarly, a societal decisionmaker may select a given course of action according to whether or not it will yield the desired results. His criteria for which action "works" has two elements: (i) Does it have the expected societal consequences? (that is, improve the quality of education); (ii) Is it a political asset or liability? As a rule, the decisionmaker judges new knowledge by both criteria simultaneously and he "trades" among them. He will tend to reject knowledge that improves the accuracy of his vision somewhat, if such revision (such as the view of China) will prove (or seem to prove) highly damaging politically. Hopefully, he accepts major items of new information even if they are somewhat politically damaging. The more difficult it is to evaluate validity (and it is usually quite difficult), the more important political considerations tend to become. This is a major root of the wide conservative bias against social science findings, the conclusions of which tend to point toward liberal policy.

It is in the interaction between knowledge producers and consumers, as between social sciences researchers and societal decisionmakers, that the knowledge is selected and adapted politically. While experts do not deliberately slant their facts to make them acceptable, the variety of interpretations that can be given to the same set of data help the more acceptable ones to be more readily communicated. It is of secondary importance who actually prepares the more politically "digestible" interpretations—the expert himself, a popularizer colleague, a promoter, a staff aid, or the politician himself. Often it is done in collaboration and each provides a degree of interpretation which is then extended by the next one.

Although new knowledge generally filters into societal decision-making processes in this manner, there are significant differences in the degree to which new facts are interpreted and the extent to which politically undigestible facts are screened out. In part, this is a matter of how "hard" the science is, and hence, how demonstrable are its findings. In part, this depends on the nature of the relationship among knowledge producers and between knowledge producers and the decision-makers. This concerns us next.

Pluralism—the production of knowledge at many centers and the available support for this production at many sources—has often been cited as an important condition for increasing the validity of one's knowledge. Invalid theories are more likely to linger longer when one school of thought gains control of all major centers and sources. Similarly, when access to the decision-makers is limited, fewer interpretations (and facts) reach the decision-makers, who are then less aware of the tentative nature of the facts and theories which they have received and of the range of possible alternatives before them.

Pluralism alone is not sufficient; there also must be a roughly equal distribution of resources and access among the sources of information that compete as to who will be the supplier (or among the suppliers) of the decision-makers. If not, the contest may become similar to the confrontation between

a young man from the Legal Aid Society and a battery of corporation lawyers. If the young lawyer's case is particularly good, he may prevail; it is more likely that his brief will be less adequate than that of his opponents. An imbalance of this nature becomes especially significant in societal decision-making where there are numerous "judges" and where the actor capable of presenting the most persuasive briefs to the greatest number of judges is more likely to gain an advantage.¹ [A recent study shows that when RAND made a major new finding of significant interest to the U.S. Air Force, it's own patron, it took 150 briefings, repeated "pulling of strings," circumventing of the lines of command, and a great deal of maneuvering before the finding made its way into the decision-making center.²] Such a strenuous and time-consuming effort could not be undertaken by a member of a university department or a representative of an unaffiliated research center.

At present, it is clear that resources and access in the United States (and many other nations) are far from evenly distributed. The inequities of this distribution reflect the priorities of society. For instance, about half of the federal budget and about half of its R&D expenditure are allotted to defense purposes, mirroring the country's present concern with national security and international military commitments. Other inequities have evolved over the years without having been deliberately planned or decided upon; the great discrepancy between the resources and facilities for the production of knowledge available to the executive and to the legislature, which is of particular importance here, is a case in point.

ENTER CONGRESS

The decline of legislatures in all Western democracies has been noted frequently by contemporary political scientists. This is the result of the rapid increase in the volume of the executive's activities without a concurrent increase in the legislature's capacity to oversee them. Thus, to put it somewhat dramatically, in 1955-6, 96 U.S. Senators had to oversee a 66.2 billion dollar enterprise, while in 1965-6, 100 Senators must oversee a 107 billion dollar enterprise, as well as two additional states.³ A similarly striking example is provided by the knowledge explosion. The executive, by far the largest knowledge consumer in the United States, uses millions of dollars worth of information to guide its vast, intricate network of activities. If legislatures are to examine these operations, their efficiency, and their rationale, they will require manpower and resources far beyond their present supply. The basis of the problem is not, as it is sometimes said, that few members of Congress have scientific degrees; it would be neither practical nor desirable for Congress to rely for the evaluation of social programs and legislation on a member who, in his youth, gained a Ph.D., let us say, in sociology. Instead, the staffs attached to congressional committees are too small, insufficiently trained, and do not have adequate facilities to conduct independent analyses of the facts presented to Congress.

Legislatures, at the present time, rely primarily on three sources for their information:

the executive, partisans (interest groups), and unaffiliated experts. Of these, the executive seems to provide by far the largest amounts of facts and interpretations. And for each fact and interpretation thus supplied which Congress is capable of challenging, scores of others (some of which often provide the context for the one challenged) go by unchallenged. Moreover, Congress has only a limited capacity to review the "inputted" data the executive presents in response to congressional queries. While some Congressmen have acquired a high degree of expertise and knowledge of the areas with which their committees deal (for example, several members of the Armed Services committee), most seem unable to keep pace with new developments and new knowledge. Similarly, while some staff members are experts, many others are lawyers by training and politicians by ambition; they have neither the time nor the facilities, especially computers, to keep abreast of new information.

Partisan groups are the second source of information. The information they supply to Congress is frequently aimed at contesting executive assertions. At the same time, however, this information is highly selective and slanted. The competition among interest groups with a variety of perspectives rarely yields a holistic view of society. And the adversary system allows its participants to determine which issue to focus on, and ignores those parts of the population not represented by interest groups; also, in many areas, interest groups are "specialized" and there are no countervailing groups.⁴ Moreover, the process is not an automatic one; the synthesizing of a multiplicity of segmented and slanted reports into one encompassing and valid report is a far more demanding task than is often implied.

Representatives of universities, unaffiliated research centers, the press, and civic groups provide a third source of information. However, many of these experts are not "unaffiliated" in the full sense and often have special interests or ideologies to present. More importantly, there may be legitimate disagreement among them over facts, and above all, interpretations. But Congress has only a limited capacity to judge between the contested views provided by these various sources. For example, at the recent hearings about "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act," I argued for a separate facility attached to Congress (like the Library of Congress) that would provide for impartial analyses of societal data. My colleague, Philip Hauser, who testified after me, argued that this was not necessary since data provided by the executive was objective, reliable, and dependable.⁵ In this situation, how could Chairman Fred R. Harris and his subcommittee members determine which proposition was valid? Ideally, Senator Harris could ask his staff to check a random set of data presented to congressional committees during the last year. But this would require at least a few men working for a few months, more than the total staff of the subcommittee, and more effort than was allowed for his review of this act. Hence, their judgment, as well as most others, was likely to be made on the basis of "informal" perusals of information already available, on intuition, and political considerations.

It should also be noted that unlike branches of the executive, Congress has few funds to "farm out" research. For example, when NASA sought to stress that its space program had considerable economic "spin-offs," it could grant funds to researchers to

search for corroborative evidence. However, if, after the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences had received the report, press reports had indicated that NASA had overstated its case, the committee could not, even if it desired, "farm out" a sample for independent review by a research organization.

ADAPTATION

The net result is the partial "blinding" of Congress and, in my judgment, the increasing exclusion of the executive's work from democratic supervision. It may be argued that in an age of mass information the "rule" of the expert is inevitable, and that it is just as well that politicians are kept from interfering in administrative processes. Making Congress more effective, it may be said, is making the conservative forces of society more powerful. However, the basis of the problem is that intensive and encompassing societal action requires societal backing (or "consensus") if it is not to be alienating or prohibitively expensive. In the past, the national legislature was a major source of this consensus. Now, since legislatures are provided with insufficient information (while the scope of societal activities is steadily augmenting), their capacity to act effectively is declining. Lack of consensus is a major barrier.

In France, where the legislature is even weaker than in most other Western democracies, an adaptation has evolved: The government experts deal directly with the various interest groups, sharing information with them, learning what their needs and preferences are, and influencing them to back the necessary societal action. The interaction of the experts and the representatives of interest groups generates a measure of extra-parliamentary consensus-formation. (This process is even more visible in the European Economic Community which, in effect, has no legislature, but does have an active bureaucracy.) But these are nondemocratic adaptations, which create an executive bias toward the interest groups and neglect other segments of the public.

CONCLUSION

If the capacity of the legislature to build consensus and oversee the executive is to be restored, a variety of new resources must be assigned to the legislature. Larger staffs are needed for congressmen and especially congressional committees; the additional staff members should have research training and should not be assignable to functions other than those of a congressional research assistant. A major congressional research unit is needed in which information (other than books and documents), especially statistics, IBM decks, and computer tapes could be stored. A unit of this type would be able to provide a congressman or congressional committee with a detailed analysis and evaluation of data submitted to him from other sources. (To some extent, the Library of Congress provides services of this kind, but we suggest that what is needed is a much more extensive, computer-operated and wholly research-oriented unit.) In addition, there should be sufficient funds for congressional committees to "farm out" research tasks. Finally, the informal hearing procedure should be replaced with a more rigorous one, so that witnesses will be more reluctant to give "stretched" interpretations, and more inclined to arm themselves with valid information.

WEMD Receives Associated Press Award

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, radio station WEMD in Easton, Md., was awarded

¹ The relationship between equality of resources and knowledge is further explored in A. Etzioni, *The Active Society* (Free Press, New York, 1968), chap. 9.

² B. L. R. Smith, *The RAND Corporation; Case Study of a Nonprofit Advisory Corporation* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966), chap. 6.

³ *The Budget of the U.S. Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1966* (GPO, Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 490, table 15; *The Budget . . . Ending June 30, 1967* (GPO, Washington, D.C., 1966), table 15.

⁴ G. McConnell, *Private Power and American Democracy* (Knopf, New York, 1966).

⁵ Hearing of the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Research, 90th Congress, July 1967.

a runner-up citation for newstory contributions in the national competition held by the Associated Press. Though not a large station, WEMD is alert to newsworthy incidents and does an outstanding job in reporting the news.

WEMD has also received many awards from the Chesapeake Associated Press Broadcasting Association. In 1964 the station received two superior ratings for editorials and continuing coverage, and an excellent rating for spot news. In 1965 WEMD was awarded a plaque for outstanding news operation, and two first place ratings for sports reporting and in depth reporting. In 1966, the station again received a plaque for outstanding news operation, and three first place ratings for sports reporting, for reporting of the fire and blizzard, and for public affairs—editor's interview.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor WEMD today. The Associated Press awards were well deserved due to the fine news coverage and dedicated service with which that station has served Easton and the surrounding communities on the Eastern Shore.

Vietnam Is Dying

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's churchmen are increasingly speaking out with great courage against the war in Vietnam. A few days ago, a letter came to my office from some American Mennonite missionaries in South Vietnam. It is an open letter titled "Letter From Vietnam to American Christians," and I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

These churchmen are not speaking from a position of noninvolvement, and they cannot be accused of demonstrating half a world away from what is happening. Since 1957 they have been involved in the Vietnam war. They speak with authority because of what they have seen while trying to relieve some of the suffering caused by the war.

They tell us what we already know is more and more evident: "Vietnam is dying."

For whatever justification that is being given for our presence there, these missionaries report that the "basic issues become overshadowed by the war itself and the way it is being conducted."

With unanimous consent, I put this letter before my colleagues hoping they will read it. I think we would all be wise to listen when churchmen of our country are speaking out so forcefully on this moral issue:

LETTER FROM VIETNAM TO AMERICAN CHRISTIANS

DECEMBER 1967.

DEAR AMERICAN CHRISTIANS: We, the Mennonite missionaries in Vietnam, have been engaged in church and service programs in the Saigon area since 1957. In recent years we have seen the suffering of the Vietnamese people increase incredibly. As Christians, we too feel compelled to declare our concern for

the moral issues involved in our country's action here.

It is not our aim to speak as political commentators or final authorities. Even statistics often seem misleading in this divided, confused situation. We wish rather to share our impressions gathered from what we have seen and heard while working with Vietnamese people. For we sense that American Christians are not aware of the feelings and dilemma of the general population here.

THE NATURE OF THE CONFLICT

Perhaps the most crucial issue lies in understanding the nature of this struggle. To speak of supporting a free, independent people in their fight against external communist aggression does not describe the conflict we sense. The more we learn of its historical development and social dimensions, the more troubled we become with this assumption.

A century of Western colonialism, an eight-year battle for independence, a temporary partition of the country, a national election never permitted: these are but a few of the historical facts which lie in the background. From their perspective it is possible for the other side to feel they are fighting a second time for what they won from the French, but were denied through a treaty which was never carried out.

Another decisive factor is social reform for the peasant people, the 80 percent who have the least but suffer the most. They know that many who now are supporting U.S. policy also sided with the French earlier in the war. They associate the Saigon government with maintaining aristocratic and Western interests. And the United States is viewed as preserving the privileged minorities who attract little support.

Thus despite our government's stated intentions, most Vietnamese apparently see America as only replacing France; the feeling of being used still pervades their life and spirit. The growing presence and power of foreigners once more causes the spirit of nationalism to burn brighter among the opposition elements. Even many who earlier favored America's assistance are now fearful of domination and destruction, feeling the "medicine" is worse than the "disease."

THE MEANS TO THE END

But all these basic issues become overshadowed by the war itself and the way it is being conducted. Our leaders acknowledge that the key to victory is winning the loyalty of the country people; yet most of America's energy and resources is expended in massive destruction of their life, property, and social order. We believe that such primary reliance on military force is insuring defeat on the goals being sought.

It is obvious to the Vietnamese that U.S. and Allied forces are causing most of the devastation and disruption. This side has thousands of planes plus warships, tanks, etc., while the VC have none of these. Even most Americans have seen and heard enough of forced evacuations, bombed villages, defoliated fields, burned people, prostitution, inflation, corruption, etc., to sense the cumulative impact of all this in a country more populous than California yet not half as large. As a Vietnamese friend summarized it: "Vietnam is dying."

We do not condone the atrocities and terror of the other side. But can these acts justify a multiplication of them many times over by the Western forces? For three years the U.S. military has capitalized on its overwhelming, superior firepower to destroy guerrilla fighters living among the people. Yet the most apparent result—besides the dead and maimed—is increasing hostility and resistance. As fast as they are killed, others rise up in their places. Victory for our leaders seems dependent on killing off enough people to crush all opposition.

According to the Saigon government, nearly one-fourth of the South Vietnamese

people have been uprooted, many of them forced into inhumane existence. While this removes their support from the guerrillas and creates convenient free-bombing zones, it also is a mortal blow to the whole society. For today millions of Vietnamese are dependent on American handouts even for their daily rice. The assumption that one can build while destroying the very structure he must build upon appears fatal.

THE IMPACT ON OUR WORLD

We are also concerned because the country people being disregarded here represent the tragic plight of many Asians. What are the 250 million people of India who live in breadlines on four dollars a month concluding about America's concern? Our nation's expenditure of billions of dollars and thousands of young lives for destructive purposes will be judged in light of such appalling need. They are asking for justice and progress: we send troops and bombers. To whom will they turn?

Moreover, the world gets the impression that the Christians' God is behind our country's action in Vietnam. They see pictures of church leaders and chaplains with the U.S. troops and hear that our president prays God to bless "our pilots" on their missions of destruction. Since we are generally regarded as a Christian nation, Christianity itself is entangled in America's military ventures and political policies.

This is a call to all Christians to become aware of the image being given to our faith. We sense a continuing rejection of this religion of the wealthy, white, warring West, for which we all bear responsibility. We fear that nations may close their doors and multitudes will be deaf to God's call because of the American Christians' participation in and support of this war.

CONCLUSION

In light of these serious offenses against social justice, human life, and the Christian faith, we therefore plead for:

A true consideration for the interests and needs of the Vietnamese majority.

A change of heart which will not only admit but also accept the consequences of past failures and mistakes against these people.

A change of policy and tactics which will show them that our primary concern is for their own well-being, self-respect, and independence.

A tolerant spirit which would not force others to line up with us, but rather seek to understand their feelings and views.

A fresh demonstration of our confession that in Christ there is no East or West.

JAMES K. STAUFFER.

EVERETT G. METZLER.

LUKE S. MARTIN.

JAMES E. METZLER.

DON M. SENSENIG.

S. LUKE BEIDLER.

The men who signed above are Mennonite missionaries and before going to Vietnam lived at the following places:

James K. Stauffer: Harrisonburg, Virginia.

Everett Metzler: Manheim, Pennsylvania.

Luke Martin: New Holland, Pennsylvania.

James E. Metzler: Harrisonburg, Virginia.

Don M. Sensenig: Akron, Pennsylvania.

S. Luke Beidler: Quakertown, Pennsylvania.

Estonian Independence Day

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, Estonia's independence was the culmination of

200 years' struggle by its gallant people against the oppressive autocracy of Russia's czars. These stouthearted Estonians, numbering barely more than one million, had never bowed their heads to their powerful overlords after their forced subjugation to the Russians after 1710. During all that time they struggled hard for their freedom, but they had to await until 1918 for its attainment.

In 1917, when Russia's decrepit autocratic regime was overthrown, Estonians asserted their right and proclaimed their national independence on February 24, 1918. They then set up their own democratic government and were remarkably successful in making their war-ravaged country a happy land of peace and prosperity. But they were allowed to enjoy their freedom in peace for only two decades, for at the very beginning of the last war they were attacked and overwhelmed by the Red Army, and in mid-1940 Estonia became part of the Soviet Union. From then on Estonians have not known freedom, and today they are not even allowed to observe their independence day. But we in the free world duly mark the observance of the 50th anniversary of that memorable event and echo their genuine patriotic sentiment.

Ware Bros. Co. Opens New Printing Plant in King of Prussia, Pa.

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, in the Philadelphia area we residents are justly proud of the many business firms which have been in continuous operation for more than 100 years.

We are proud, also, that while these firms may be old in history and tradition, they do not hesitate to take bold new steps to keep pace with the business world of today. Such a firm is the Ware Bros. Co., a printing concern that was founded in 1865 and has just moved to an ultramodern new office and plant building in King of Prussia, Pa., built at a cost of over \$1 million.

The Ware Bros. Co., under the leadership since 1944 of President Samuel L. Veitch, has become a leading manufacturer of books in the Delaware Valley and a prime supplier of lithographic and web offset printing services.

From 1944 to 1968 its sales have grown from \$250,000 to \$4 million annually; its employees from 15 to nearly 200. In its new plant, which has 70,000 square feet of space, Ware Bros. Co. expects to continue and accelerate this exceptional pattern of growth.

The new Ware Bros. Co. plant, Mr. Speaker, makes a fine addition to the booming modern industrial complex at King of Prussia. It will also mean a greater contribution to the economic vitality of the entire Delaware Valley region.

Topical Comment: Vanishing Gold—United States Must Solve the Outflow Problem

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD. I urge my colleagues of the House to seriously consider the establishment of a strategic stockpile reserve of gold.

As we debate the removal of gold as a backing to our currency, simultaneous action should recognize this urgent requirement as expertly detailed in the Los Angeles Times of February 8, 1968, in a column by Stefan T. Possony.

I commend this article to the Members:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 8, 1968]

TOPICAL COMMENT: VANISHING GOLD—UNITED STATES MUST SOLVE THE OUTFLOW PROBLEM

(By Stefan T. Possony)

(NOTE.—Dr. Stefan T. Possony is director of the international political studies program at the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. His books include "A Century of Conflict" and "Lenin, the Compulsive Revolutionary.")

Money is the nerve of war. This fact was known to Cicero, Tacitus, Plutarch and Thucydides, and probably to the "operations analysts" of pre-historical times. An advisor told Louis XII of France that to make war he needed "money, more money, always money."

Machiavelli dissented and quoted Solon as saying to Croesus: "War is waged with iron and not with gold." Stalin agreed. According to him, war and revolution require "arms, arms, and arms again." But we are discovering that American world strategy, as presently conceived presupposes something like an inexhaustible gold treasure.

With a gross national product of nearly \$800 billion, the United States should be able to finance its defense. Unfortunately, since 1949, when we adopted our present strategy and when our gold stock reached its maximum of \$24.5 billion, we have lost more than \$12 billion in gold. This happened despite our consistently favorable trade balance and \$55 billion worth of military sales. Assuming the rules of the game remain unchanged, our last ounce of gold should pass into foreign hands by 1980, at the latest.

There are some who contend gold is no longer important. Yet the dollar is the main international currency. Our economic strength, which is the real foundation of our military power, presupposes interdependence with the rest of the world. This interdependence will work only as long as the dollar remains sound, and the dollar will remain a world currency only as long as foreigners are able to cash it for gold. Throughout history, gold has been the only real international money. This is still true today.

During 1967, the pound was devalued, primarily because of weaknesses in the British economy. But the closing of the Suez Canal in 1967 added the incremental pressure which made devaluation inevitable.

It always has been American policy to insist upon open international waterways. A temporary closing of the Suez Canal may have been unavoidable because of the Arab-Israeli war, but we have obviously lacked the power (or the will) to ensure prompt reopening. As long as the Suez Canal remains closed and some of the oil-producing Arab

states refuse to deposit their oil income in London, the pound will be under pressure. The attack on the pound is designed to "get" the dollar. It has already cost us a large amount of gold.

Economic decline is forcing the United Kingdom to withdraw its forces from the areas east of Suez. This withdrawal exposes such crucial positions as Malaysia, Singapore and possibly Hong Kong to Communist conquest and may vitiate our ultimate success in Vietnam.

More important still, the oil fields around the Persian Gulf, which are vital to the economy of Europe, will be undefended when the British withdraw. If these oil fields fall, the U.S.S.R. may achieve control over the major energy resource of the European economy, and may end up holding most of the world's gold. Hence the United States will have to assume the responsibilities of which Britain is divesting itself. This augmentation of our strategic tasks will accelerate the gold drain.

The British cancelled their \$1 billion order for the F-111 which was to become the RAF's new bomber. Thus, we are losing important foreign income and probably must pay more for our own F-111 procurement. It is unlikely that we will compensate for the loss of British airpower.

Our gold shortage is forcing us to withdraw 35,000 soldiers from Germany, a 14% reduction of U.S. military strength at the world's most dangerous border. In case of trouble, the forces which will be returned home can be flown to Europe within two weeks. Whether the arrangement will work is highly questionable. In brief, NATO may cease to be an effective deterrent force.

We will have to place radars, and possibly ABMs, in the southern hemisphere to protect America against the new threat of the Soviet fractional orbital bombardment system.

As presently conducted, the Vietnamese war, which has already devoured substantial amounts of gold, probably will continue for some time. Each day is weakening our gold position further. Once the war is concluded, the rehabilitation of Vietnam will have to be paid for, partly in gold. If we are to make good on our promise to provide \$1 billion to develop the Mekong River Valley, we will have to spend gold again.

Future limited wars, which are virtually inevitable, will make additional demands on our dwindling gold stock.

The brutal fact is that weapons are becoming more expensive and our strategic responsibilities are growing. Hence our gold expenditures will rise and not decline.

We cannot pay out gold till the last ounce, or else we will be helpless in emergencies. We cannot retrench economically without isolating ourselves and upsetting the European economy, thus opening the floodgates to a new world crisis. We cannot contract militarily without increasing the probability of war.

We have no choice but to adopt a substantially more effective strategy. But this calls for an early solution to the gold problem. The United States had better heed the poignant Turkish proverb which says: "If you have money you are wise, if you don't you are a fool."

Public Reverence

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for over 6 years now, participation in prayer in the public schools has been denied to our

children. Since the first in the series of prayer decisions was handed down by the Supreme Court in 1962, more and more of our schools have been forced to discard the practice of asking for God's help and leadership at the beginning of each school day, even when such a practice would not be of a mandatory—but rather of a voluntary—nature.

But we who feel it is the right of every individual to pray anywhere at any time have not been still. I have joined with my Republican colleague in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, in sponsoring a bipartisan amendment to the Constitution to permit voluntary participation in nondenominational prayer in public schools. We are not alone in this fight. Surveys show that almost 80 percent of the American public would like to see this practice restored to our children. Many members of the clergy have been particularly active in the drive to see the right of prayer restored, or at least to give the American people a chance to express their feelings on this issue in a meaningful manner. One of the most diligent participants in this fight is the Reverend Robert G. Howes, associate professor and chairman of city and regional planning at the Catholic University of America, in Washington, D.C. In addition, he is the Washington representative of the Citizens for Public Prayer, a nationwide organization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues a thought-provoking article on the subject of public prayer submitted by Reverend Howes to the February 1968 edition of the National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin. I am sure it will be found to be a clear, complete, and logical view of the public feeling on this issue.

The article follows:

CHALLENGE TO THE DEMOCRACY—PUBLIC REVERENCE

(By Rev. Robert G. Howes)

(NOTE.—Father Howes is Associate Professor and Chairman of City and Regional Planning at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. He is the representative in Washington of Citizens for Public Prayer, a national federation of citizens' groups backing a restorative prayer amendment.)

When the U.S. Supreme Court interprets the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution in a manner which radically contradicts the consistent practice of the majority of the states, it does no singular, minimal thing. Whatever the particular practice, that interpretation immediately becomes a precedent affecting the whole future of religion in our public life. As such it must deeply concern not only whose practice is denied but also those who are involved in any way with religion as subject to and supportive of public policy.

On June 25, 1962, the Supreme Court interpreted the First Amendment as barring the following prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we ask Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The prayer had been composed by a committee of religious leaders. It was made available by the State of New York for an entirely voluntary recitation by pupils and teachers in its public schools. Justice Stewart, in dissent, noted: "The Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. . . . What is relevant to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England or in 18th century America, but the

history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our government."

On June 17, 1963 the Supreme Court widened this interpretation to ban the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools of Maryland and Pennsylvania. Once again, no teacher had been required to lead prayer, no pupil to join in reciting it. Specific provision was made for abstention on the part of those who did not wish to participate. There are many pleasant phrases in the two majority decisions. Most of them are collateral remarks, *obiter dicta*, that is remarks incidental to the real deciding reason. One could, and some did, assemble such remarks and claim that the court had done nothing more serious than to rule out a residual unfairness, leaving public religion itself wholly intact.

There are, however, other *obiter dicta* which are less sanguine. For instance, in the first decision Justice Douglas enumerates various instances of government accommodation to religion. Bishop James Pike, appearing before a Senate committee in 1962, called such reasonable accommodation "the great American middle way." Justice Douglas says "our system at the federal and state levels is presently honeycombed" with accommodation. "Nevertheless," he continues, "I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." In fact, the deed of the decisions, what the then Harvard Law School Dean Erwin Griswold called "the absolute and . . . extreme" reasoning of the court, is dangerously basic. Henry P. Van Dusen, then President of Union Theological Seminary, wrote: "The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdictions is inescapable, prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances."¹

Fordham University Law School Professor Charles E. Rice said: "The school prayer decisions, if followed, predictably will have the effect of raising agnosticism to the rank of the official public religion of the United States. The Court has now cast aside the historical affirmation by government in this country of the essential truth of theism, has embarked upon a search for 'neutrality,' a search incapable of success, and has substituted agnosticism for the theistic affirmation to which a small minority has objected so strongly. And for its action the Court can point to no durable justification beyond its own inflated rhetoric and a tortured historical interpretation."²

The *Boston Pilot* editorialized:

"ALL PUBLIC LIFE AFFECTED"

"The Supreme Court in the Lord's prayer and Bible ruling has continued along a path unhappily familiar to all from its earlier decisions. The same tedious arguments emphasizing the 'establishment of religion' clause are brought forth to support a position which turns its back on the total American tradition and outlaws the present practices of 39 states. . . . Let us suppose that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are excluded from the American public schools for precisely the reasons given by the Supreme Court. What is the next step? Clearly, all other expression of religion in public life must now be deleted. . . ."

To suggest that pleasant phrases en route to decision can override the deed of the decisions themselves is to ignore the heart of the matter. That heart clearly is the equation by the Supreme Court of "establishment" with public reverence, whether free or not,

whether institutional and sectarian or not. Even to question such an equation, the court said in its second decision, is "of value only as academic exercises!" The situation is, in short, as it was a century ago when Abraham Lincoln commented on the Dred Scott decision: "When all the words, the collateral matter was cleared away from it, all the chaff was fanned out of it, it was a bare absurdity. . . . The Dred Scott decision covers the whole ground, and while it occupies it, there is no room for the shadow of a starved pigeon to occupy the same ground."³

Five years have passed since the first prayer ban. In those years, several significant things have happened.

(1) Literally hundreds of bills were introduced in both the House and Senate calling for a clarifying amendment to restore the First Amendment to its pre-ban interpretation and to forestall a further widening of the court's logic. There were 117 such bills on the House side alone in the spring of 1964. Senate Joint Resolution Number 1 of the 90th Congress was signed by 42 senators of both parties. It proposed a restorative constitutional amendment which would read:

"Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer."

(2) Catholic response to the prayer bans was openly mixed, though there is no possible doubt that Catholics were in great numbers part of the massive pro-amendment majority across the nation. The National Council of Youth officially recorded itself as opposed to the prayer bans and called upon all of its local units to work for reversal. Otherwise, where Catholic apathy and even support of the decisions showed itself, it has been suggested that an underlying cause was self-interest: "It may be that some of it is motivated by the thought that if public education can be completely secularized (so that, as it has been said, 'religion' in such quarters becomes 'a dirty word'), then there will be an increased public demand for sectarian education which can combine religion with general education. This could then be an argument in favor of parochial schools, and as public schools decline, the argument for public support of parochial schools can be advanced in one guise or another."⁴

I hope this estimate is inaccurate. I fear it may be, in at least a partial sense, accurate. Our bishops wrote that "religion is our chief national asset," and as such what happens to it anywhere at law must affect it everywhere. I am afraid some of us have simply failed to make the vital connection between what occurred in the prayer ban decisions and those aspects of the First Amendment which preoccupy us more immediately. Too many Catholics have simply failed to appreciate that any fundamental interpretation of the First Amendment by the Supreme Court must over a period of time operate in all areas of religion and public policy, including the area of government aid to non-public schools under religious auspices.

(3) Eleven of the 13 justices who passed on the New York prayer issue prior to its arrival at the Supreme Court ruled it constitutional. The attorneys general of 19 states submitted a "friend of the court" brief to the Supreme Court, prior to the first decision, which said in part:

"Our founding fathers, together with the great and God-fearing leaders of the last century and a half, would be profoundly shocked were they to have been told in their day that in this year of our Lord . . . a voluntary nondenominational acknowledgment of a Supreme Being and a petition for His blessings

¹ The New York Times, July 7, 1963.

² The Supreme Court and Public Prayer (New York, 1964), p. 21.

³ June 21, 1963. The Boston Pilot is the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.

⁴ Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 16, 1859; Galesburg, Ill., Oct. 13, 1858.

⁵ Griswold, Erwin N. Utah Law Review, Vol. 3, No. 8 (Summer 1963).

recited by American children in their classrooms is being seriously attacked as a violation of the Constitution of the United States."

It was clear from Congressional reaction that a massive mail concurring with such judgments was hitting Capitol Hill. "King-size" was how Senator Dirksen described it. Resolutions endorsing what came to be called the Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer came from the National Conference of Governors, the National Conference of Mayors, legislatures of several states, the National Jaycees, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and from such men as Billy Graham, Cardinal Cushing, the late Cardinal Spellman and Bishop Fulton Sheen. Sampling after sampling confirmed the will of the nation. The Gallup Poll in September 1963 recorded a three-to-one majority for reversing the court in its prayer decisions. In October 1964 the Harris Poll put the figure at 82 percent for amendment. Congressional home district polls backed the national sampling. Again and again there was no subject on which more of a congressman's constituents were united than on the need for a prayer amendment, and no subject in which "don't know" ran lower, or majorities ran consistently higher. At each hearing on prayer amendment proposals, thousands of pro-amendment petitions were presented. About 40,000 petitions were introduced on the very first day of the House hearings (1964) by Congressman Fallon of Maryland. To the Senate hearings (1966), we introduced in behalf of amendment 35,000 petitions from Pennsylvania, 30,000 from New York and 50,000 from the Midwest. In the spring of 1967 *Good Housekeeping* magazine came up again with an 80-plus percentage for amendment.

(4) Despite all this, not one single normal floor vote has been held in five-and-a-half years in either house of Congress on even the technicality of proposing a prayer amendment to the nation. And hearings in this critical matter were forced in the House Judiciary Committee only after a discharge petition to bypass Chairman Emanuel Celler, who was bitterly negative, had nearly succeeded.

(5) In the wake of the prayer ban decisions, things have not stood still. A number of trends have developed. Two are of major importance. First, a trend toward a kind of fearful indecision on the part of public authority. School boards everywhere were from the start anxiously uncertain about whether and how religion was to survive in the public classroom. In some instances, boards have defied the court, but this is, patently, no solution to the problem. In a few instances, boards have tried to substitute various procedures, such as God sandwiched between Thoreau and Ben Franklin for morning assembly reading. These instances, however, remain so rare that each one is the subject of national notice. In most cases the net result has been one of the following: a) to rule religion out entirely; b) to emasculate religion before it is permitted in the school, thus reducing it to the merest art, history or literature; c) to decide any particular question involving religion in the classroom in favor of parents who might conceivably object to it along lines indicated in the prayer ban record. Secondly, there has been a trend toward enlargement of the prayer ban to affect other practices of public reverence. Courts and some attorneys general have relied on prayer ban decisions to strike down kindergarten prayers and such substitutes as the singing of patriotic anthems. In the fall of 1966 the Supreme Court relied significantly on the decisions to knock out aid for church-related colleges in Maryland.

Meanwhile, it was again and again made clear by such opponents of religion in public life as Madalyn Murray O'Haire that the

prayer ban would be used as a launching pad for further attacks on all surviving instances of public reverence. It is, of course, impossible to predict with precision just how far the court will go toward accommodating these attacks, but its defenses against them must be seriously weakened by the majority reasoning in the prayer ban cases.

Of course, at the very base of the prayer amendment issue stands the issue of parental rights. There is no question that God belongs in the homes and the churches of America. There is no question that a serious re-examination of His presence there is imperative. But religion is not strengthened at the hearth and the sectarian altar by denying it entry to the public classroom. Religion is not strengthened in the heads and hearts of American youth by wiping it off their lips precisely where most of them prepare for citizenship in a reverent society. What is rather indicated is a joint activity, carefully respectful of the right of dissent, which involves church, home and school. In its 1951 Statement of Belief, which recommended school prayer, the New York State Board of Regents said:

"We believe that thus the school will fulfill its high function of supplementing the training of the home, even intensifying in the child that love for God, for parents and for home which is the mark of true character training and the sure guarantee of a country's welfare."

In its *Decree on Education* Vatican II underlined how the principle of subsidiarity applies in public education:

"The Church gives high praise to those civil authorities and civil societies that show regard for the pluralistic character of modern society and take into account the right of religious liberty, by helping families in such a way that in all schools the education of their children can be carried out according to the moral and religious convictions of each family."

It is suggested by those who oppose a prayer amendment that the court banned only "prescribed" prayer and that other types of religious presence in the public classroom stand unaffected, indeed encouraged. There is at the very base of the court's decisions a fatal, secularizing equation. Once this equation has been repealed, there is certainly place for reexamination of the entire gamut of that presence. Various approaches to religion as a force for morality and civic strength can and should be tested. Citizens for Public Prayer fully support such testing, but at the right time. So long as the prayer ban remains, however, there can be no compromise. Generally, those who ask substitutes for the brotherhood of prayer call for a moment of silent meditation, classes in comparative religion or the rendition of God strictly in paintings, dates and poetry. Each substitution has its weakness. Collectively, they are totally inadequate to the need of the situation.

Let's take meditation first. It is most significant that the same day the Massachusetts legislature sanctioned meditation in the public schools of the state it petitioned Congress in support of a prayer amendment. A quiet God is better than no God. But a quiet God cannot provide that experience in pluralism which a spoken God encourages. One great advantage of the brotherhood of prayer consists, precisely, in the fact that through it children from various religious backgrounds are taught that although they go freely to their separate churches and synagogues over the weekend, still they can freely find and pronounce together common words of uniting reverence each day during the week. Besides, meditation is extremely difficult even for adults. To suppose that grade school youngsters can meditate properly is a delusion.

As for classes in comparative religion, it may be that once the prayer ban is repealed

we can move along these lines. But such classes will require teachers who have the wisdom of Solomon, and are objective enough to relate one religion to another without bias. And should these teachers fail even slightly, offended parents will rise to challenge them in the courts, just as parents who objected to the earlier prayer did.

In regard to religion as art, history and literature, it is true that under these aspects it belongs in many classes, so that children of a reverent people may review their inheritance. But what a tragedy it would be if God could come into school only as a footnote in classes otherwise preoccupied and minus any factor of reverence whatsoever! Religion is more than dates and pretty pictures and nice phrases. Religion is reverence. Any proposal which drains it of its prayerful blood is anemic to start with. In short, none of the suggested substitutes is, at least in its present state of refinement, adequate. None would in any way remove the tragic precedent of the two prayer ban decisions. Finally, the closer any one of them came to being a real collective reverence, the more likely it is that it would be challenged and struck down by courts under the compulsion of prayer ban logic.

MAJORITY-MINORITY PROBLEM

There is another item in the prayer amendment debate which must be pondered. This is the item of majority-minority relationships in a democracy. It has two facets. The first is: How should society accommodate in its practices a majority will against which there is marshaled a loud minority will? The second is: In the public classroom how should the dissent from prayer and the desire for prayer be handled with justice all around? In regard to the first question, it must at the outset be agreed that 50 percent plus one does not of itself make a thing right. Democracy must never be a matter of a bull-headed majority tyrannizing over a cowed minority. Neither must it ever be an oligarchy in which a minuscule elite, somehow wiser, forces its preference on an unwilling majority. This latter state becomes what *The Boston Pilot* has called a "tyranny of the few." One thing is clear: As in all such controversial situations, a dissenting minority must be assured to the maximum reasonable extent its right of silence and abstention. To permit a minority's preference to dominate public practice, however, thus denying to an overwhelming majority its will, is an intolerable travesty of democracy. In this case, a strong argument can be mounted in support of the traditional, pre-ban interpretation of the First Amendment. Even Justice Brennan, siding with the majority in the second prayer ban decision, concedes that its factual position is far from conclusive: "On our precise problem, the historical record is at best ambiguous, and statements can readily be found to support either side of the proposition."

But even if the court's reading of the history and the semantics were accurate, the case for a clarifying amendment would still stand. No people in a free society are required to be prisoners of words which, in that hypothesis, do not say what the people wish them to say and do not permit practices which the people overwhelmingly wish to provide for themselves and for their children. As in the flag salute situation, what is required of a wise judiciary is not a decision rendering the majority silent before an intolerant minority but one that allows the greatest prudential accommodation for dissent while the majority will prevails. The second facet of majority-minority relationships here can be expressed in a question: Is school prayer an unconscionable intrusion on the rights of the dissenting child and his parents? It must be repeated that in the three prayer ban states, school prayer had been entirely voluntary for both teacher and pupil. Tolerance is, and must continue to be,

⁶ *United States Supreme Court, October term 1961, Document #468.*

a two-way street. So long as he is respected in his right to be different, the dissenting child must learn to respect the right of the majority of his fellow students who wish to pray together. Dean Griswold's treatment of this critical matter is excellent:

"Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? . . . No compulsion is put upon him (i.e. the dissenting child). He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and respect what they feel is significant to them. Is not this a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the minority group?"

A related question is often posed. Whose prayer? The answer is simple. Once the civil right of public reverence is restored in the public school, the American people again will select, with a minimum of mistakes and a maximum of good common sense, a reasonably nondenominational prayer. To suppose that any group of Americans with a sectarian majority would be so callous of its neighbors as to insist on a sectarian prayer in their public schools is to fly in the face of the great bulk of American experience. But even should, in a rare instance, such a prayer be proposed, recourse for remedy would still be open with the courts. What is clearly urgent in this entire issue of majority-minority rights is a reasonable pluralism, the kind of adjustment and prudent accommodation which mature men make with their neighbors in any complex matter in which a common decision is required. With such a responsible pluralism, the solution to difficulties such as wording a proper amendment and coming up with consensus prayers is easy. Without it, we become quickly a jungle of selfish predatory religious groups, careless of neighbors and haggling over every approach to that harmony which has so long been the major motif of our people.

A few words of prayer by children in a public place will not alone change the world. The brotherhood of prayer remains an important part of an important pattern. Clearly, however, much more than this is at stake in the fight to write a Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer. The whole matter of a reasonable and reasoned pluralism is involved here. So is the survival intact of all practices of public reverence. So is every other controversial aspect of church-state relationship. So, finally, is the very workability of the democracy itself. It is simply incredible that there are still Catholics concerned with democracy, education and pluralism who cannot, or will not, understand these things. John Donne wrote that "no man is an island." It can be said with equal force that no decision of the U.S. Supreme Court fundamentally interpreting the First Amendment against the expressed will of the nation is an island—a minimal, a singular thing. Remedial action now, loud and long, is emphatically indicated. Seldom has the alternative to such action been put more strongly than by Father Joseph Costanzo, S.J., professor of historical jurisprudence at Fordham University:

"American believers are losing by default. They have taken their spiritual heritage for granted. They have allowed a creeping gradualism of secularism, under one specious pretext or another, to take over their public schools. A vociferous and highly organized pressure group is exercising its own form of indirect coercive pressure upon the American community."

A Continuing Need

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when some are questioning the need to maintain a strong and effective North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Christian Science Monitor has written an interesting editorial entitled "A Continuing Need." It refers to what it calls a "remarkable and succinct" statement of policy on NATO by a British officer, Gen. Sir John Hackett, Commander of NATO's Northern Army Group.

I include this timely reminder of the continuing importance of militarily strong NATO to the security of the Western World in the RECORD:

A CONTINUING NEED

A British general has made as remarkable and succinct a statement of policy on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as we have seen in a long time. It is, in fact, remarkable for more than its content. First, it comes from a serving British officer, Gen. Sir John Hackett, Commander of NATO's Northern Army Group. (As he explains, he exercises operational command from München-Gladbach in West Germany over "a Belgian, a Dutch, a German, and a British Corps and a Canadian Brigade Group.") And second, General Hackett's statement is in the form of a letter to *The Times*, of London.

In Britain, serving officers do not make public policy statements. A British commander in the field would not, for example, make public speeches such as those made by General Westmoreland when home from Vietnam for consultations in the United States last November. Obviously, then, General Hackett's unusual letter must have been prompted by unusual circumstances.

He says that he wrote it "with the knowledge and approval of the NATO command to which my own is subordinate." So perhaps it can be assumed that NATO's Supreme Command feels it necessary at this time to restate the case against permitting erosion of the organization either in the wake of France's defection, or consequent upon Britain's military retrenchment, or simply because 1969 is the year when the organization's initial span might be considered to lapse.

Briefly, General Hackett argues that what NATO is "engaged upon here in Europe is peace-keeping by military stabilization." He says that it is unfortunate that the stability in East-West relations in Europe—which is of course a direct consequence of the establishment of NATO—is so often described as "détente." His apparent concern is lest use of the word produce apathy and a facile assumption that a continued NATO presence on the Western side of the dividing line is no longer needed.

General Hackett maintains: (1) that "the present relatively low level of political stability in Central and Eastern Europe could diminish sufficiently far for a military emergency to develop"; (2) that the Soviet military purpose, understandably, is "to keep a military force in being in this area of sufficient size and capability to ensure that if a military emergency should develop the subsequent course of events would be guided in a manner solely to the interest of the U.S.S.R."; and (3) that the Western response to this must be (a) to maintain "suitably located" a force able to ensure that in case of military emergency the Soviet force be unable to guide events solely in the interest

of the U.S.S.R., and (b) to guarantee that West Germany's legitimate defense needs be met in a military system in which West Germans do not themselves dominate.

It would be hard to put things better.

Important Tribunal

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, beginning today, the crimes of international communism will be placed on display in a unique patriotic exercise in Georgetown University's Hall of Nations.

The Georgetown exercise is a mock legal proceeding to place world communism on trial before a court of world public opinion. And this "trial" has drawn the cooperation of such organizations as the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba; the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; the Council Against Communist Aggression; Young Americans for Freedom; Twin Circle, the National Catholic Press; the National Captive Nations Committee; Citizens for Freedom, Inc.; and the Free Pacific Association.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, the event I have described has drawn considerable editorial approval throughout the country. And, at this time, I include three recent newspaper articles—one entitled "Important Tribunal," from the *Arizona Republic*; one entitled "Youth Group To Try Soviets for War Crimes," from the *San Diego Tribune*, and another entitled "World Reds Facing 'Trial' in February," from the *Chicago Tribune*:

[From the *Arizona Republic*, Jan. 19, 1968]

IMPORTANT TRIBUNAL

For downright bad taste and paranoia, nothing surpassed last year's "war crimes trial" which the international leftist community put on in Stockholm.

The "trial," under the sponsorship of the senile Bertrand Russell, was a crude propaganda show with all the objectivity and dispassion of a lynching. Instead of causing revulsion against U.S. policy in Vietnam, the "trial" caused revulsion against Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre, and the other participants.

But now a distinguished group of scholars is preparing to hold an international Tribunal to try communism for crimes against humanity. Only this Tribunal promises to respect those rules of jurisprudence which the Stockholm leftists so eagerly trampled under foot.

The tribunal, to be held in Washington Feb. 19-21, will be composed of eminent world jurists from Eastern Europe, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. Witnesses will include experts on communism as well as witnesses who have lived under communism (some of whom will submit depositions). Attorneys for the prosecution and defense will participate.

Among the witnesses will be Yeshiva University's Dr. Joseph Dunner, who will testify on the status of the Jewish community in Russia today . . . Dr. Herminio Portell-Vila, Cuban diplomat and journalist . . . Prof. Stefan T. Possony, academic authority on communism . . . journalist Eugene Lyons, longtime foreign correspondent in the U.S.S.R.

¹ Op. cit.

² This Nation Under God (*New York*, 1964), pp. 131-32.

Among the prosecuting attorneys will be C. Dickerman Williams of New York City, who has written many distinguished treatises on the law (including a brilliant analysis of the Fifth Amendment), and Dr. William Roberts, director of Catholic University's Institute of International Law and Relations.

The Tribunal is of course merely a device for calling attention to the numerous crimes of communism. But it is an appropriate (and, hopefully, effective) way.

For too long the propaganda advantage has rested wholly with the Communists, who have agitated for and financed all the many crude propaganda efforts designed to prove that the U.S. is guilty of aggression. In most cases, the ball was carried by star-struck leftists, like Bertrand Russell, but there was never any question who owned the ball.

Now the propaganda pitch is being turned against the Communists. They will scream to high heavens, of course, and they will be joined by those liberals who don't like to hear anything nasty about Communists.

Nevertheless, the Tribunal is desirable if only to put into the record the story of Communist bestiality. And it is desirable that this record be compiled by a distinguished international group which, unlike the Stockholm mob, will respect the rules of jurisprudence.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune, Jan. 18, 1968]

YOUTH GROUP TO TRY SOVIETS FOR WAR CRIMES

(By Gordon C. Murray)

While the Free World has joined the Socialist camp in meting out punishment to Nazi criminals against humanity, it has been backward about flogging the Communists with the same whip.

This is strange because the crimes committed under the two philosophies differ mainly in degree, with the Reds outdoing the Nazis in every category.

Furthermore, the Communists are a clear and present danger that is not only huge but growing, and is not only external but also internal. The Nazis, for all the fuss raised about their current potential in Germany, can't qualify as even peanut-sized.

The American and British leftists perennially trekking to the Continent do not make obeisance before the corroded altars of national socialism in Munich. They seek the headier hop pervading spectacles like the mock trials of U.S. "war criminals" in Sweden.

In 1967 these featured the Kremlin's obliging if unware front man, philosopher Bertrand Russell, who was backed ("propped up" might be a better term) by one Ralph Schoeneman. The latter has been described as a Princeton graduate in his early 30s whose hatred of his native land was never concealed.

But now we have a new twist. The Young Americans for Freedom, an anti-Communist organization, has handed a summons to the Soviet embassy to appear before a Court of Public Opinion in Washington, D.C., on Feb. 19 "to answer to the attached indictment for war crimes."

The YAF intends to "dramatize, in explicit detail, the unparalleled horrors committed by international communism during the past 50 years."

These included, the summons states, genocide of some 30 million people, 15 million slave laborers imprisoned annually, and religious persecution of all faiths. Also, the summons says, the Reds have violated every major agreement made with the Free World.

Fred Schlafly, a lawyer and authority on communism, will play the prosecutor. The highly regarded author, William Henry Chamberlain, will be a witness.

YAF's supporters include such distinguished Americans as California's Gov. Ron-

ald Reagan, Texas Sen. John Tower, South Carolina's Sen. Strom Thurmond and actor John Wayne.

YAF's Red Trial should be a great show. The nation's press, TV and radio have been given advance notice. Let's hope the performance both merits and gets full coverage.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune]

WORLD REDS FACING "TRIAL" IN FEBRUARY

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—A group calling itself the World Court of Public Opinion said today that it will try international communism for crimes against humanity at a "historic trial" here next month.

The setting will be sort of a right wing version of Bertrand Russell's self-styled war crimes tribunals last month in Denmark and last year in Sweden that found the United States guilty of aggression and genocide in Viet Nam.

"A distinguished international tribunal, composed of eminent world purists from eastern Europe, southeast Asia, and Latin America, as well as the United States, will receive testimony of witnesses in the Hall of Nations at Georgetown university," said the announcement. "The trial will bring together some of the most knowledgeable and honored experts on communism in the world."

TESTIFY OR SUBMIT

"Witnesses who have lived under communism will also testify or submit depositions," the statement said.

The trial, which will be open to the public, will be held Feb. 19-21. The statement listed the coordinators as Young Americans for Freedom and Twin Circle-National Catholic Press.

Witnesses will include Joseph Dunner, of Yeshiva university, New York City, who will testify on the status of the Jewish community in Russia today; Herminio Portell-Villa, an anti-Castro Cuban; Stefan T. Possony, an authority on communism with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford university; The Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, a clergyman in Rumania until 1964; Phillip Abbot Luce, a former member of the Progressive party, the Peking-oriented branch of the Communist party in the United States; and Herbert Philbrick, former counterspy for the FBI.

NAME THREE PROSECUTORS

Prosecuting attorneys will include C. Dickerman Williams, New York City; William Roberts, director, Institute of International Law and Relations, Catholic university, Washington; and Fred Schlafly, Chicago.

A spokesman for the court said the indictment, which includes the Communist parties of Russia, Red China, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, North Viet Nam, Cuba, and the United States, was served collectively at the Russian embassy here last Nov. 7.

The Russell tribunal met at Roskilde near Copenhagen. It found the United States guilty on all charges, including genocide, the use of forbidden weapons, maltreatment and killing of prisoners, violence, and forced movement of prisoners. It also found the Americans guilty of aggression against Laos and Cambodia.

GUILTY OF AGGRESSION

At the Stockholm trial last May the tribunal, sponsored by the British philosopher, Bertrand Russell, found the United States guilty of aggression in Viet Nam.

The Russell tribunal had no official standing. Neither will the Court of Public Opinion. Among those aiding Russell were Jean-Paul Sartre, French philosopher; Vladimir Dedijer, Yugoslav historian, who was chairman; and Laurent Schwartz, a French professor.

To Smoke or Not To Smoke—That Is Still the Question

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the controversy surrounding the question of smoking and health continues to confuse the American public.

True magazine performed a distinct public service by publishing in its January issue a story which brings the smoking and health controversy into clearer focus. Written by an author of note, Stanley Frank, the article clears some of the smoke that has polluted or obscured many of the true facts concerning this burning question.

Stanley Frank, in his article, asks the question: "Are cigarettes really 'hazardous to your health?'" He then proceeds to answer his own question by asserting "nobody knows."

In summarizing an excellent article, Mr. Frank says:

At the moment, all we can say for sure is that the cause of cancer is not known and that there is absolutely no proof that smoking causes human cancer.

For the benefit of all interested in the continuing dialog connecting smoking and health, I would like to have the article written by Stanley Frank for the January issue of True magazine printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

TO SMOKE OR NOT TO SMOKE—THAT IS STILL THE QUESTION

(By Stanley Frank)

If there is one fact about tobacco that has been more clearly established than any other over the past few years, it is this: Americans like to smoke cigarettes. When the Surgeon General of the United States issued his report in January, 1964, indicting cigarettes as the chief cause of lung cancer, it figured that smoking would decline, tobacco prices would drop and cigarette company stocks would do poorly on the exchanges.

Surprisingly, none of that occurred. As a matter of fact, what actually happened was the opposite of what one might have expected. Sales jumped from 497.4 billion cigarettes in 1964 to 522.5 billion in 1966. The price of flue-cured tobacco in the wholesale market rose from 58.5 cents a pound to 66.9 cents over the same period. And the per share price of American Tobacco Co., for example, a giant cigarette producer, around \$28 in January, 1964, was up to \$33 three years later.

Maybe cigarettes cause cancer and maybe they don't. In any case, it's clear that Americans were not convinced or, if they were, they were willing to take their chances. As a result, the tobacco business prospered.

Then, last summer, the industry received another shot in the arm. An obscure New Jersey chemist named Robert L. Strickman announced that he had developed a new filter material that would remove two-thirds of the tar and nicotine in cigarette smoke that current filters do not catch. His filter, he said, would not destroy the tobacco taste. And Strickman had some impressive sponsors for his claim. His partner in the filter enterprise is no less an institution than Columbia University.

Strickman's filter is not yet on the market so it's too early to make a final judgment on it. But a number of critics were clearly un-

impressed by the original fanfare. Among these were spokesmen for the American Cancer Society and the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research. They complained that Columbia's sponsorship of the new filter would undermine their efforts to keep people from smoking.

But it looks like Americans will go on smoking more and more cigarettes each year whatever the merits of the new filter may be. Which, of course, does not mean that smokers are not worried about possible dangers to health. What are these dangers? How real are they? The answer to that is that they may not be so real as we have been led to believe. There is, in fact, a good deal of scientific doubt about the Surgeon General's conclusion that smoking causes cancer.

"Acceptance of this theory is not only unscientific but dangerous, since it will lead to complacency concerning the etiology [cause] of this disease and might well prevent fruitful investigation along other lines," declared Dr. Thomas J. Moran, a pathologist for 26 years and a supervisor of training diagnosticians for the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society.

It was not only the conclusions but also the effects of the report that were criticized. "I am convinced that in our country a harmful psychological atmosphere has already been created by otherwise well-meaning warnings and advertisements," said Dr. Joseph Wolfe, a founder of the U.S. Committee of the World Medical Association. "As a result, a great many people, particularly those who are impressionable, have been traumatized with fear of disease which has resulted in a prevalence of unwarranted anxieties and neuroses. The effect is harmful and, in my opinion, does more damage than good."

Nevertheless, after Surgeon General Luther Terry's report asserted that "cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action," the Senate and House Committees on Commerce held hearings for 16 days in 1965 to consider proposed legislation. Surprisingly, 39 of the 49 medical authorities and statisticians who testified disagreed vigorously with the report and charged its findings were distorted. Only two of the dissenting experts were connected with the tobacco industry.

The purpose of the hearings was to determine whether the Federal Trade Commission should be given authority to regulate cigarette advertising. England restricted TV ads in 1962 and officers of the U.S. cancer, heart and tuberculosis associations urged Congress to impose a ban here and to tighten restrictions on newspaper and magazine ads.

Congress wouldn't go along. All it would agree to do was to require cigarette packages to be labeled with an ambiguous warning that "smoking may be hazardous." After the Surgeon General's strong indictment, this struck many as a very mild phrase.

Some people charged that political wheeling and dealing was responsible for Congress's seeming inadequate action. Tobacco growing states do, indeed, wield a good deal of power in Congress. More than 90 percent of the tobacco grown in this country is produced by six states, North Carolina, Kentucky, Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee and Georgia. But the fact is that only two of the Senate Committee's 18 members were from those states and only seven of the 33 members of the House Committee.

So, while political logrolling could have had something to do with the mild stand that Congress took, it seems more reasonable to assume that the Congressmen were simply unimpressed by the anti-cigarette testimony. This could be due to the fact that the overwhelming weight of expert testimony during the hearings underscored four salient points:

1. The cause of cancer is unknown. It is an established principle that a factor thought to be responsible for a disease must be found in all cases of it—and cancer strikes a dozen sites in the body not remotely associated with smoking (the stomach, prostate, urinary tract, etc.). It is suspected there may be 150 different causes of cancer.

2. Ten percent of all lung-cancer victims never have smoked, proof that tobacco is not the sole cause of the disease. Conversely, 95 percent of heavy cigarette smokers do not contract it.

3. Long exposure to concentrated cigarette smoke never has produced lung cancer in an experimental animal—and researchers have been trying for 35 years. Doctor Terry conceded that "the chronic toxicity of nicotine is very low and probably does not represent an important health hazard." The tars, or chemical compounds, in burning tobacco have caused skin cancers only on strains of mice so susceptible to the disease that the same effect has been obtained with sugar, beef and vegetable oil.

4. Statistics alone link cigarette with lung cancer, a correlation that is not accepted as scientific proof of cause and effect. This was admitted in the opening of the report by the Surgeon General's Committee: "The Committee was aware that the mere establishment of a statistical association between the use of tobacco and a disease is not enough. The casual significance of the use of tobacco in relation to the disease is the crucial question." Yet they disregarded their own ground rules and condemned cigarettes on the basis of seven statistical studies made by groups whose objectivity and sampling techniques were open to doubt.

The Committee's findings have been sharply criticized by Dr. Joseph Berkson of the Mayo Clinic. *The Cancer Bulletin*, an official publication of the American Cancer Society, has referred to him as "the acknowledged dean of American medical statisticians."

"All relevant available facts considered, I think it very doubtful that smoking causes lung cancer," Doctor Berkson says. "Since 1964, when the statistical investigations on smoking and lung cancer were proclaimed, the U.S. Public Health Service has allocated almost a billion dollars for cancer research. How much has been expended for the experimental investigation of this particular problem of smoking and lung cancer? So far as I know, little or none."

"Albert Einstein remarked that if you want to know what a scientist really believes, don't listen to what he says but observe what he is working on. I suspect the reason the scientists of the Public Health Institutes are not working on this problem is that they don't see any research gold in 'them thar hills.' Anyone who isolated from tobacco smoke a substance that could be shown, to the satisfaction of scientists generally, to be the cause of lung cancer, let alone all the other cancers that smoking is supposed to induce, would earn not one but a brace of Nobel prizes."

If there is one man in the field with a loftier reputation than Doctor Berkson he is England's Sir Ronald Fisher, a pioneer in developing statistical methods for biological research.

"The increase in lung cancer over recent decades gives not the least evidence of being due to increasing consumption of tobacco," he declares. Sir Ronald suggests that air pollution and genetic patterns—inherited physical characteristics—may be the prime causes of cancer. As we shall see presently, the statistical association between these factors and the disease is stronger than the connection with cigarettes, but the Surgeon General's report glossed over those important clues.

Since the argument against cigarettes rests largely on statistics, it is illuminating

to examine some of the inconsistencies and contradictions in the figures. For example:

Lung cancer is rare in women. The male vs. female ratio today is 6:1; in 1930 it was 1.5:1. There has been a tremendous increase in women smokers during the last generation, but their death rate from lung cancer has remained almost steady. This clearly suggests a sexual factor that makes men more susceptible to the disease.

Cancer of the trachea—windpipe—is very rare. Yet this is the area that gets the greatest exposure to tobacco smoke.

When lung cancer appears, in the overwhelming majority of cases it is in the lower part of the lung which never is reached by smoke. A study made recently by the Los Angeles County Hospital, dating back to 1927, showed that cancer of the lung tubes, which get the heaviest dosage of smoke, has been stabilized in recent years.

If smoking causes lung cancer, heavy consumers of cigarettes should contract it earlier than nonsmokers. They don't. The peak for the onset of the disease is between 57 and 62—for chain smokers and people who never have used tobacco. Further, there is no proof that the chances of getting cancer are reduced by giving up smoking.

Inhaling should induce lung cancer if cigarettes are hazardous. Not a scrap of evidence has been found to corroborate the theory. A British survey actually showed there were fewer cancer victims among steady inhalers than nonsmokers.

British men smoke only half as many cigarettes per capita as Americans, but they have double the incidence of lung cancer—a differential of four to one. Why? More air pollution in England? A genetic factor?

The most potent cancer-inducing agent in tobacco smoke is believed to be benzopyrene. Although the amount of it is infinitesimal, there is four times as much in cigar smoke and 10 times as much in pipe smoke than in cigarettes. Yet cigars and pipes are said to be safer than cigarettes. According to the statistics, pipe smokers have lower mortality rates than men who gave up the habit. What does this prove—the danger of quitting?

Since 1914, cigarette consumption in the United States has increased 200-fold, but the incidence of lung cancer has not increased nearly that much in spite of better diagnostic methods and a greater awareness of the disease. The current mortality rate of 26.6 per 100,000 population would be vastly greater if cigarettes were guilty as charged.

Commenting on the discrepancies in the report, Prof. K. Alexander Brownlee of the University of Chicago told both Congressional committees it was "a splendid example of the technique of flatly denying the existence of an inconvenient fact if you cannot explain it away." Among other figures calculated to frighten the public, the report claimed the death rate for lung cancer is nearly 1,000 times higher for cigarette smokers than for nonsmokers. That assertion was refuted by Dr. Ferdinand C. Helwig, clinical professor of pathology at the University of Kansas who has studied 30,000 cancer cases. "I do not believe that cancer is caused by smoking cigarettes," he said. Dr. Thomas H. Burford, chief of chest surgery at the Washington University School of Medicine, was more emphatic: "I do not believe that lung cancer is caused by cigarette smoking and I do not believe that smoking is responsible for any shortening of life."

The Surgeon General's advisory committee had many reservations about the conclusions reached by Doctor Terry in the report. Shortly after it was published one member, Dr. John B. Hickam, told the North Carolina Heart Association: "The more we looked at the statistics, the more difficult it was to understand. The picture is not at all as clear as the numbers appear at first."

Doctor Terry was in a tough spot. Like a district attorney confronted with a shrill

clamor to solve a scandalous murder, the heat was on him to bring in a suspect in the fight against cancer, the leading killer after heart disease in this country. People wanted some concrete results for the millions spent annually on research, and prominent laymen with a lot of political clout were on the executive boards of national health organizations which had pointed the finger at cigarettes.

Besides, Doctor Terry and his associates had a mass of material which did seem to indicate that cigarettes were a menace. The figures showed that the mortality rate for male cigarette smokers from all causes was 70 percent higher than for nonsmokers. It was 70 percent higher for heart diseases, 500 percent higher for chronic bronchitis and emphysema (deterioration of the air cells in the lungs) and that ominous 1,000 percent higher for lung cancer.

However, it is difficult to understand Doctor Terry's abrupt dismissal of other possible causes of lung cancer. Scores of surveys have shown that the mortality from the disease in rural areas is less than half the rate in urban communities, for smokers as well as nonsmokers. Many experts attribute this variation to air pollution in industrial centers, and it hardly is a new theory. In 1775 a London surgeon, Percival Potts, reported a high incidence of cancer among chimney sweeps. In recent years campaigns to reduce air pollution have been spurred by the strong suspicions that components in coal and gas fumes are cancer-inducing agents. Experiments with animals also suggest that the overcrowding typical of living conditions in cities produces stresses that contribute to cancer.

These important leads were mentioned only in one sentence buried in the report: "The least that can be said is that the intensity of urbanization or industrialization may have a residual influence on lung cancer mortality." But why was so much attention focused on cigarettes to the exclusion of other pertinent areas of investigation? Doctor Terry was like the surly waiter who snapped at a customer asking where the men's room was, "This is not my station."

Since the time tobacco was introduced to Europe from the American colonies 450 years ago, smoking has become an addiction throughout the world. The habit seems to satisfy a need and have some therapeutic value. There is no other explanation for the enormous popularity of smoking despite efforts to curb it. There never was a kid who didn't feel nauseated after sneaking the first forbidden puff on a cigarette, yet that unpleasant experience does not deter most adults from smoking eventually.

There is growing support among cancer specialists and psychologists for the genotype theory advanced 30 years ago by Sir Ronald Fisher. He maintains that an individual's peculiar constitution creates a craving for tobacco and the same chemistry makes him more susceptible to lung cancer than a nonsmoker. The kicker, though, is that a heavy smoker is more likely to get cancer if he is deprived of cigarettes which serve the important function of relieving his tensions. This revolutionary concept from a man of Fisher's stature merited attention, but the Surgeon General's report gave it the once-over-lightly treatment:

"The significant beneficial effects of smoking occur primarily in the area of mental health, and the habit originates in a search for contentment. Since no means of measuring the quality of these benefits is apparent, the Committee finds no basis for a judgment which would weigh benefits against hazards of smoking as it may apply to the general population." In other words, since the benefits could not be measured, they were not considered.

A similar situation came up when heart specialists testified on the relationship be-

tween smoking and coronary attacks. Dr. Henry Russek, former director of cardiovascular research and now a consultant at the U.S. Public Health Hospital on Staten Island, New York, told both Congressional committees: "After years of study it is my present belief that coronary disease is not caused by the consumption of tobacco. . . . Emotional stress associated with occupational activity appears far more significant than heredity, dietary fat, tobacco, obesity or physical inactivity in the development of heart attacks."

Such opinions have been published regularly in medical literature during the last decade. Again, the report overrode the experts: "Although the causative role of cigarette smoking in deaths from coronary disease is not proven, the Committee considers it more prudent from the public health viewpoint to assume that the established association has causative meaning than to suspend judgment until no uncertainty remains."

Psychiatrists who have studied the prevalence and persistence of the smoking habit are agreed it is a carry-over from the first pleasure of infancy, the oral satisfaction of sucking. After an infant is weaned he continues to test every new object by putting it in his mouth, then in childhood resorts to thumb-sucking when he is frustrated or tired. Pulling on tobacco serves much the same purpose for an adult. Everyone smokes more when he is under tension, and there is reason to suspect that emotional stress is a contributory factor in cancer.

Some clues to this approach were reviewed by Dr. Bernice C. Sachs, then president of the American Medical Women's Association and an authority on psychosomatic medicine. "With every emotion—and man has some kind of emotion every minute—changes take place in muscles, blood vessels, in the viscera, in the endocrine glands. . . . There seems to be a correlation between cancer and certain types of psychological situations." Many doctors here and abroad have reported that patients developed symptoms of cancer soon after a severe emotional shock such as the death of a close relative, sudden financial insecurity or divorce.

Everyone does not suffer a violent reaction to such crises, of course, but the mounting tensions of daily life can be compared to the tiles in a mosaic. Separately, each irritation is insignificant; put together, they form a pattern of constant stress. Although it seems farfetched, there may be a connection between the high divorce rate and cancer. Marriage is the normal condition for an adult. It is a fact that the mortality rates from all causes are much lower for married men and women than for single and divorced people, in that order. No sweeping conclusions can be drawn from this one detail, but it may be that the health of unattached and divorced adults is affected by frustrated sex drives and unhappiness stemming from a feeling of rejection.

The chemistry of stress is a young science, but there are tentative explanations of why some people are hooked on smoking while others never cultivate the habit. Some fascinating material corroborating Fisher's genotype theory that heavy smokers need tobacco to cope with nervous tension has been assembled by Dr. H. J. Eysenck, professor of psychiatry at Maudsley Hospital in London. He has found that smokers and nonsmokers tend to conform to distinct personality traits. There are more extroverts and neurotics among smokers, but they are more vigorous and aggressive. It is no coincidence that smoking is a symbol of virility and power. New father's pass out cigars; tycoons and political bosses usually are depicted puffing on big heaters. Smokers as a rule are bigger, heavier and more athletic than nonsmokers. They marry and have children earlier than the abstainers. They drink more coffee, whisky and beer than nonsmokers, who favor tea, wine and milk.

Practically every smoker tries at one time or another to break the habit. Some succeed; the majority suffer such acute discomfort that they go back to tobacco. Does this mean that those who stick it out have more will power? "Not at all," says Doctor Russek. "The man who cannot quit simply is unable to handle stress as well as the other fellow. They are two distinctly different types. It is not a scientific observation to say that a smoker is more liable to get lung cancer, a coronary or any other disease than a nonsmoker. There are too many variables involved in such a comparison."

One factor that may be decisive in lung cancer is the genetic pattern an individual inherits. It is not facetious to say that the best protection is to have parents who live to a ripe old age—and whose antecedents go back to a country with a low incidence of the disease. The mortality rates, especially for men, differ so sharply around the world and the variations crop up so consistently among descendants of emigrants that attention is focusing on heredity as the key to the mystery.

Americans are the heaviest cigarette smokers in the world partly because we can afford them. Despite the federal, state and local taxes slapped on our brands—without them a pack would cost 12 cents—smokes in foreign countries are usually much higher in price. Our per capita consumption is substantially greater than that of England, Finland and Holland, but we have a much lower mortality rate from lung cancer. The rate is the same as ours in Canada, Australia and Denmark although we smoke much more than the men in those countries.

Cigarettes obviously do not have the same effect—if any—on health in every country. For example, New Zealanders are very heavy smokers, but the death rate there from lung cancer for native-born men is half the rate for immigrants from England. Cigarette sales in Russia and Poland are increasing as fast as here, but Dr. A. B. Savitski of the USSR's Academy of Medical Science reported recently that the number of lung cancer cases is "astonishingly small and hardly changes from year to year." Cancer of the upper throat was a widespread problem in China and Formosa long before cigarettes were introduced. Three generations later, American-born Chinese still have a very high incidence of it despite their adoption of our food and health customs.

All this suggests that each individual inherits a genetic pattern which largely determines whether or not he will maintain an intricate balance between various tissues and organs. When that balance breaks down, cancer cells grow with such speed and tenacity that they quickly stifle vital organs. A dramatic example of the potential "immortality" of a cancer cell are the masses of cancerous tissue in laboratories throughout the world. They were taken from one mouse in Austria in 1900. The mouse could not have lived more than 45 months, but after 1,000 transplants its cancer cells are as young and vigorous biologically as ever.

Lung cancer is complicated by so many intangibles that it is almost impossible to attribute it solely to cigarettes or any other single cause. The Surgeon General's report was criticized on that score by Dr. Israel Rappaport, a man with impressive credentials as a physician and a former professor at Columbia University's School of Medicine. Among other achievements in 1928 he initiated at Bellevue Hospital in New York a research project in pulmonary diseases which brought Nobel prizes in 1956 to two younger associates who carried on his work.

"The often-used argument that preventive action may be justified before the cause of a disease is established hardly applies in this case," Doctor Rappaport declared. "The assumed possible link between cigarette smok-

ing and chronic lung disease cannot be compared with the link which exists, say, between an infection, the agent of which still is unknown, and a definite disease. Where we are dealing with a definite disease clearly linked to an infection we need not wait for determination of the particular infectious agent. In chronic lung disease we have an ill-defined disease indefinitely linked to a number of undetermined agents. Action against any particular one of the possible agents is illogical, unjustified, unreasonable and purposeless."

The first statistical studies purporting to associate cigarettes with lung cancer appeared in the 1930's, prompting Congress to consider legislation to curb smoking. It was dropped in 1937 after medical authorities challenged the validity of the findings. In 1954 the tobacco industry set up a research council to investigate the relationship between smoking and health. As of 1964, the council had given 731 grants totaling \$7,450,000 to independent scientists in medical schools and hospitals. Since then the industry has awarded another million for research, but no one working on these, or any other, projects throughout the world has isolated a substance in cigarettes or tobacco smoke that is a proven lung cancer-inducing agent.

The data that was the source of the conclusions in the Surgeon General's report was criticized by many competent witnesses. It was drawn from questionnaires sent to seven groups of men who, the advisory committee admitted, did not represent a true cross section of the population. Volunteers for the American Cancer Society polled two groups, who comprised more than half the 1,123,000 subjects in the study. Three surveys were made of American and Canadian war veterans who once passed physical exams a high percentage of the general population failed; they were, therefore, in better than average health. The remaining groups were British doctors and California workers in nine occupations suspected of high cancer risk.

The main difficulties in the studies was the large number of men (30 percent) who did not answer the questionnaires. Prof. Alexander Brownlee, a top statistician, asserted that the nonresponses were "seriously high" and added, "It is notorious that these defects can, and usually do, produce serious bias." Brownlee probably alluded to the American Cancer Society's volunteers who handpicked 10 subjects each and, in their crusading fervor, might have weighted the survey with known lung cancer victims.

The gravest distortion in the report was the assertion that deaths from lung cancer have been rising at an "extraordinary" rate since 1930. "Statistics showing a tremendous increase in lung cancer during the past 30 years are misleading," Dr. Milton R. Rosenblatt, chief of medical clinics in New York's Metropolitan Hospital, told the House Committee. "The increase is only apparent and is the result of greater skill in the detection of the disease. All the techniques currently used to diagnose lung cancer were either discovered or perfected during the past three decades."

"It must be emphasized that during the years when national mortality statistics showed a very low incidence of lung cancer there were physicians who challenged their accuracy. More than 50 years ago, the first American textbook on lung cancer ridiculed the low census figures. In 1930, when the official number of lung cancer deaths was reported at less than 3,000 for the entire United States, one doctor in Philadelphia specializing in bronchoscopic diagnosis" (the famous Chevalier Jackson) "had records of almost 500 cases."

After tracing the steady drop in the percentage of certified deaths during the last

generation, Doctor Rosenblatt added: "The progressive decline in the increase of lung cancer in the United States occurred during the same period that cigarette consumption multiplied 200 times. If cigarette smoking produced lung cancer, directly or indirectly, the tremendous rise in cigarette consumption would have resulted in a sustained or greater rate of increase. The fact that the opposite has occurred indicates that there has been a relatively fixed prevalence of lung cancer in the population. The studies of an eminent statistician of the National Cancer Institute showed that the trend of the increase was not in the direction of an epidemic but toward stabilization similar to other cancers in which diagnostic procedures have been standardized for long periods of time."

An interesting hypothesis that a man who is a lung cancer victim at 60 might have lived on borrowed time for a half a century is advanced by Dr. Joseph Berkson. Tuberculosis once was a terrible scourge in this country. In 1900, the mortality rate per 100,000 was 201.9; now it is 3.9. "A significant proportion of those who would have died from tuberculosis in childhood or youth now die of cancer of the lung," Berkson speculates. "There has been, so to speak, a survival of unfit respiratory systems."

Some authorities argue that cancer is primarily a disease of aging. They say that anyone lucky enough to escape other maladies will eventually die of cancer if no cure is found for it. Thus, with the general life-span increasing, more and more people will succumb to it.

Others maintain that cancer is due to emotional stress, to genetic makeup, to air pollution or to personality factors. And certainly there is some evidence that lung cancer may be caused by cigarette smoking. But proof? It simply doesn't exist. Heavy and prolonged doses of tobacco smoke never have produced lung cancer in an experimental animal.

Maybe Doctor Strickman's new filter will solve the health problem, if it exists, for America's 70 million smokers. Maybe not. At the moment, all we can say for sure is that the cause of cancer is not known and that there is absolutely no proof that smoking causes human cancer.

Live Oak Womens Club Shares Concern Over Crime Rate

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the horrible specter of crime and disrespect for law and order in this land of ours is gnawing at the heart of America.

Never before in our history have we been faced with such tragic situations as we find when American citizens in many cities are afraid to walk along the sidewalks in front of their homes after dark.

This menace cannot be tolerated.

Recently, I received a very important resolution from the members of the Womens Club of Live Oak, Fla.

As I read this petition, I had the feeling that these were the Americans who really speak for our Nation.

Here is their resolution:

We, the members of the Womens Club of Live Oak, Florida, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to have criminal laws amended and strengthened to give law enforcement officers more

leeway and freedom in arresting and prosecuting criminals, or persons outside the law, since it is impossible for them to operate effectively and do their duty in protecting the people, under the recent restrictions imposed on them by the Supreme Court interpretations of the U.S. Constitution.

This bespeaks the concern of America for the crimes of violence perpetrated by vicious hoodlums released on bail for other horrible crimes.

Those in the law enforcement profession need help in enforcing the law. We seem intent in this Nation on making it more difficult to solve crime—rather than giving these men reasonable tools to work with.

I think it would be well if you gave more thought to what these ladies from one community have had to say.

Wave, Old Glory

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in every generation there are those whose lives are touched with the ability to inspire their fellow man. This talent may be great or small, but we are the richer for all of it.

Such a person is Mrs. L. B. Gregg, Box 8826, Jackson, Miss., whose comments and poem, "Wave, Old Glory" are deserving and timely, and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

Recently, as we drove home to Jackson from Anniston, Alabama, I saw an American flag, waving proudly against a bright September sky. As I watched, my heart was stirred—not because it was a piece of sacred cloth. Far from it! I was reminded of what it has symbolized throughout this nation, since the time of its first existence. Woven deep into the colors of Old Glory is a "star-spangled" message of Freedom. When freedom meant more than marches, riots, and making demands. Freedom was the right to worship God as we please, the right to choose our own way of life. Freedom was the opportunity to work hard for what we expected to gain from this great nation of ours.

Brave men took pride in defending this freedom. They would not have dared to burn a flag, nor desecrate its honor in any way.

Oh! That more flags might be hoisted to remind us, to help bring this nation to its knees, and to its senses, before it is everlastingly too late.

It was with these thoughts in mind, that I was inspired to write the following poem:

"WAVE, OLD GLORY

"Wave, Old Glory, proudly fly!
O'er a dark and troubled land.
Reaching toward a flawless sky,
Wave thy colors—Oh, so grand!

"You once meant freedom to our land,
'Twas for this cause you were made.
Now, 'tis hard to understand,
How this cause has been betrayed.

"Valiant men have fought for thee,
Thru many wars, hard and long.
Across the land, from sea to sea,
Remind the world of freedom's song.

"We watch you wave, in admiration,
May your message never die!
Let freedom reign in our nation,
Wave, Old Glory, proudly fly!"

Strength in the Air: The F-105 Thunderchief and the KC-135 Stratotanker

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to South Vietnam I was greatly impressed with the scale of our effort, the impact of the vast stores of American equipment and supplies, and the courage and determination of the young men who have been asked to fight. I found, however, that for all the skilled manpower and equipment at our command, insufficient public attention was given to the proficiency and guts of those who help maintain our strength in the air.

It is in this phase of the conflict more than in any other that we have fully risen to the challenge. This is due to the proven success of our weapons system and the teams of skilled men who operate and maintain them. If I may indulge the House for a moment, I should like to discuss two of the most successful of these aircraft.

I speak now of the F-105 Thunderchief fighter and the KC-135 Stratotanker.

Though neither of these planes are manufactured in my congressional district, as a conscientious member of the House Committee on Armed Services I cannot but help give due praise and recognition to the men who fly and maintain these aircraft and to the companies which have made this great contribution to our defense posture.

The F-105, manufactured by Republic Aviation Corp.—now a division of Fairchild-Hiller—is powered by a Pratt & Whitney J75-P-19W turbojet engine. Its speed, range, load capacity and functional—operational—ceiling make it one of the best tactical fighters operational in the world today.

The F-105 can deliver a maximum load of 12,000 pounds of conventional explosives, or a nuclear payload. This airplane is able to work as an interceptor, light to medium bomber, or to engage in close air support for ground forces.

Having sophisticated navigation and radar systems, it is also an all-weather fighter and has the ability to operate at very low altitudes. As a heavily armed 1,400 mile-per-hour aircraft it is, by its very nature, one of the most versatile weapons of its type to be found anywhere.

I certainly feel that we among the public-at-large have every reason to be grateful to the men of Republic Aviation and their subcontractors for doing such a fine job on our airplane. I know that the men who fly it, and those to whom they give air cover, appreciate this fact in a much more immediate sense than we.

The men of Republic, those of the 355th Tactical Fighter Wing, and others who fly and maintain this airplane have done an outstanding job.

The Boeing Co.'s KC-135 Stratotanker also plays a vital role in the air war, particularly in the north, refueling U.S.

Air Force aircraft in dramatic strikes over North Vietnam, the KC-135 operates as a "flying filling station" for both jet bombers and fighters.

Its jet power gives it the capacity for high-speed, high-altitude refueling. Having a speed of over 600 miles-per-hour, it has a range of over 5,000 miles for refueling missions, and can deliver some 3 tons of fuel a minute to recipient aircraft.

This particular airplane has been proven as the workhorse of the American airfleet, enhancing the range and flexibility of our aircraft. Indeed, it has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars in aircraft which would have been lost for lack of fuel, in airbases we have not had to build, and in permitting aircraft task specialization because we have known that we could depend on the KC-135 to expand the range of specialty weapons systems.

Again, in my judgment, we must extend heartfelt congratulations to the Boeing Co., the producers of this airplane, to the men of Detachment I of the 4258th Strategic Wing, SAC, and to the others who fly and maintain it.

All those I have mentioned have excelled in their unified task. Because of them this Nation is more secure. Yet the fact that I have singled out only two aircraft here today merely means they are essential parts of our total military capability. It carries with it in no way the connotation that others should be relegated to a place of lesser honor in the public's mind. To the contrary, our support and specific recognition of these men embodies within it significant appreciation of all those who have been asked to serve our Nation, whether they be in civilian or military life.

The Stakes in Congress

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a large number of Americans, including many Members of this House, are disappointed with the record of the first session of this Congress. It is still possible that the record of the 90th Congress will show meaningful achievement and progress, but only if we meet national challenges that cannot wait, with responsible action. The people we have been elected to represent have every right to expect no less. An editorial published in a recent issue of the AFL-CIO News reminds us, as we should be reminded, that the stakes in the 90th Congress are mostly on the line in this second session. I recommend this editorial to all of our colleagues, and under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STAKES IN CONGRESS

The second session of the 90th Congress shapes up as a new round in the battle by liberal-progressive forces to stave off the continuing attack by the Dixiecrat-GOP coalition to roll back the gains of earlier years.

The success of the coalition was the key

factor in the first session and its victory in the House on 37 of 51 rollcalls does not indicate a slackening of its efforts in the second session.

The fight must be pressed, however, mobilizing all possible resources, for the stakes are too high to allow the conservative coalition to have its way by default.

The record of the 90th Congress will be a key factor in the 1968 elections. That record must be established as clearly and firmly as possible so that the voters in November are aware of those who voted to push forward to meet the domestic and foreign problems of our times.

The Draft—Time for Congressional Debate

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 1966, I sponsored a student forum on the Selective Service Act at Lynbrook High School in my district. Many high school, college, and graduate school students participated and gave their views on proposed amendments to the present draft law. Other interested constituents and representatives of civic organizations also participated.

On April 11, 1968, Gen. Lewis Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, will address Long Island residents at Lawrence High School. The subject will be the "Impact of the Draft on Students." The public meeting is being sponsored by Temple Sinai of Lawrence, with numerous other religious, civic, and communal organizations invited to participate.

The meeting will provide an opportunity for citizens to become better acquainted with the Selective Service System and the recent regulations governing graduate school students. There will be no debate—members of the local draft board will be present to counsel and advise registrants on specific draft problems.

I have supported in the past the concept of a lottery system so that so far as possible, the draft would apply to all young men in an equitable manner. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 1, page 144. Under a national lottery system, students would be deferred but such deferments would not be an exemption from service. Students whose numbers are selected would be required to serve upon graduation.

Recently, the Newsday, a Long Island daily, carried an interesting and thoughtful editorial on February 19, 1968, entitled: "Universal Public Service." The editorial proposes an alternative which merits the consideration of my colleagues. I insert the full text at this point in the RECORD:

[From Newsday, Feb. 19, 1968]

UNIVERSAL PUBLIC SERVICE

The youthful idealism that is part of the American character has been demonstrated in every era and in every corner of the world. By their enlistments in the Peace Corps and the armed forces, young American men and women continue to demonstrate how deeply

the idea of service is ingrained in the nation's tradition. At a time when the U.S. needs the talents of all of its young people, this tradition should be strengthened and extended through the creation of a program of universal public service.

The call to the colors should be broadened. One good teacher can do more to prevent a riot than a platoon of men can do to quell it. But we know only how to mobilize the platoon, not the teacher. Duty is viewed narrowly. The draft applies only to military service because this is a traditional notion of duty, of service to country. In recent years, the young men and women who have served in the Peace Corps, Volunteers in Service to America and Teachers Corps have helped expand that notion. They, too, contribute to national defense.

Poverty is the No. 1 national problem. It persists, and the fruits of this persistence are bitter: burning cities and soaring crime rates. It represents a real threat to the security of the nation. Two years ago Defense Secretary McNamara said: "Poverty in America makes our nation less secure." And he advanced a fair and practical way to mobilize against this threat. He suggested having "every young person in the United States give two years of service to his country—whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer development work at home or abroad."

Why not? There is enough work to be done, and all of it has a direct bearing on the national security. Why continue to respond only to the military threat? Teachers and teachers' aides are desperately needed in city schools throughout the nation. By expanding the Teachers Corps through a national service draft, new talent could be funneled to these schools.

Other young men could aid in police work through a police cadet corps that would free the professional law enforcement officers from clerical chores and get them on the streets where they are most needed. Such a corps would also provide a pool of young men who might later be recruited into the ranks of city police forces. The Peace Corps abroad and its domestic counterpart, VISTA, could absorb thousands of draftees.

The present military draft rejects those who cannot meet the basic educational and physical requirements. Why not give these young people a second chance to enter the mainstream of American life by drafting them into a national job training corps? They could best serve the nation by spending two years equipping themselves to become self-supporting citizens.

The idea of asking some young men to contribute two years in the service of their country is well established in the military draft. To extend this principle to all young men—and perhaps women—is a natural step, especially since the purpose is essentially the same: the defense of the nation. Some would continue to serve in the military; for the others, the opportunities to serve in other ways are almost unlimited.

For all, there would be rewards. Anthropologist Margaret Mead is one of those who advocate a system of universal national service. Said Dr. Mead: "Universal, national service would provide an opportunity for young adults to establish an identity and a sense of self-respect and responsibility as individuals before making career choices or establishing homes . . . to experience the satisfaction of services performed on behalf of the nation and of other fellow citizens. . . ."

Defending the security of a nation is not wholly a military function. It is time we mobilized to give all young people the opportunity to serve in the defense of their country.

Mr. Speaker, also on February 19, 1968, the Long Island Press, the other daily newspaper with wide circulation in Nas-

sau County, printed an editorial, "The Draft Hassle," which points up not an alternative to the draft but some of the inequities which have developed in its administration.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I include the full text of the editorial for the information of our colleagues:

[From the Long Island Press, Feb. 19, 1968]

THE DRAFT HASSLE

The administration's abolition of graduate school and occupational draft deferments is so unwise one might wonder if the President didn't do it to spur Congress into the reforms it so far refuses to enact.

The occupational deferments, for instance, are not actually ended. As Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts pointed out, "they are now subject to 4,000 separate acts or rules laid down by 4,000 separate draft boards."

Ending deferments for all graduate students, except those in medicine, dentistry and allied fields, removes one source of inequity—taking those students rich enough to use post-graduate work as a draft haven—but it also deals a severe, perhaps crippling, blow to the nation's educational system.

The new ruling—which does not change the practice of drafting the oldest eligible males ahead of younger eligibles—is a financial wallop to universities.

The graduate schools would also be rapidly drained of large numbers of advanced students, depleting the universities of the main source of their instructors. Furthermore, it drains highly trained personnel for our other long-range manpower needs, including teachers at all levels.

Harvard President Nathan Pusey warned that this approach would be "a disaster." He suggested a system whereby each group from 19 through 25 would provide a given proportion of men for the draft pool, to soften the impact on graduate schools. But this was regarded by the White House as unworkable.

The workable answer is still the same as it has been since last year, when the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recommended sweeping reform of the entire system, including drafting 19-year-olds by lot.

There can never be a happy solution when some young men must serve while others do not. But it is time for Congress to realize that even if all the reforms of the President's commission are not adopted, the "oldest first" system must be replaced with some random selection method that would at least begin to approach equity—and would avert the grave damage to the nation's educational and manpower structure.

Mr. Speaker, another serious problem raised by the new draft regulations relates to the shortage of lawyers in all branches of the service. The long series of U.S. Supreme Court decisions starting with the opinion of the Court in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), have not yet been applied to military courts martial.

The right to representation by counsel in military cases including special courts martial, remains a constitutional question for consideration by the Supreme Court of the United States and for action, if necessary, by the Congress.

Should the Supreme Court determine that the guarantees of the fifth and sixth amendments apply to military courts martial or should Congress determine that these rights should be extended to military cases, then the need for additional attorneys and an expansion of the Judge Advocate General Corps would be

necessary. That is why consideration should be given to deferment for law school students—not exemptions—deferments so that they may be able to serve in a capacity in which they will be qualified upon graduation and admission to the bar. Such deferments can be conditioned upon entering the service upon admission if otherwise qualified.

This is an example of another inequity. I am sure there are others.

I want to stress that I believe Congress should review the draft status of all graduate students to determine whether all students in graduate school should be allowed to complete their studies on condition that they be required to serve immediately upon graduation, if otherwise qualified, or whether a form of lottery system should be applied to all who are eligible for the draft including graduate school students.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress last year extended the Selective Service Act without major changes. Now is the time for constructive congressional debate on the draft and for congressional action to assure an equitable system which does not discriminate against one class and give a preference to another. I urge my colleagues to join me in a call for such a debate at the earliest possible moment. It is time for the Congress to act.

Miami's Civil Service Cadets

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the problems of employment and the effects of unemployment are serious threats to the efficiency of any government, city, State, or Federal. Much has been done to cut down these threats, but much is left to do. I am anxious to bring to the attention of my colleagues one attempt being made to relieve some of the pressures of unemployment and to encourage the growth of municipal responsibility.

Last year, a program called Miami's Civil Service Cadets was formulated by the city manager of Miami, Fla., Mr. M. L. Reese. Training and Safety Director Albert J. Sziarto administered the program. The results of this pilot summer career development program have been most heartening and significant. The following article from the publication *Nation's Cities* outlines the motives, goals, and results of this fine endeavor by Miami to aid and improve their city and their citizens:

MIAMI'S CIVIL SERVICE CADETS—A DUAL-PURPOSE PROGRAM OF EMPLOYMENT AND CIVIC EDUCATION IS PAYING OFF

Take 110 school-age youths without jobs or money, expose them to detailed operations of modern municipal government, spend \$34,450.83 on special education for them, and you have a picture of how Miami made solid manpower progress last summer.

Civil Service Cadets, a 1967 pilot summer career development program, was a new idea that worked well and helped Miami move ahead significantly in sensitive areas of municipal responsibility.

City Manager M. L. Reese formulated the program, then consulted community leaders from the Urban League, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Catholic Welfare Bureau, EOPI (the Federally-oriented anti-poverty program), Florida State Employment Service, and other groups directly concerned with employment and the primary effects of unemployment.

Training and Safety Director Albert J. Szarto administered the program. The City Commission approved a budget of \$47,148, of which he turned back \$12,697.17. Main budget item was wages for 100 young men, 17½ to 20, for seven 40-hour weeks at \$1.40 per hour.

Results pleased nearly everyone connected with the pilot program. Other Miami leaders became interested. In November, Mayor Stephen P. Clark met with local, state, and federal officials to map a community-wide "volunteer job training program for youth."

The objective is more part-time jobs for students, now, and an expanding program toward full-time summer jobs for thousands of high school and college youths, with simultaneous acceleration of Miami's overall employment.

"Exposure" was the key word in Reese's plan. The city manager insisted that cadets be regarded as prospective Civil Service employees, but without preferential treatment by reason of this "exposure" to essential services performed by the city. He emphasized to supervisors that they should show the cadets not only how city government works but also the "why" of operational details.

Outlining the pilot program, the city manager said: "This is not so much a training program as it is an introduction to city government. It is not our intent to get inexpensive labor, nor that these individuals are going to be given a holiday. They will be as busy as we can keep them, exposing them to a great variety of city jobs."

"We are not so naive as to think we can train people by this process for Civil Service jobs. The best we can hope to do is to expose them and give them an appetite for Civil Service."

City of Miami officials agree that this hope is being realized. Eleven per cent of those completing the cadet program immediately applied for permanent jobs and about the same number indicated their intentions toward Civil Service when they complete their education.

Szarto tried to maintain cadet enrollment at 100, and 93 completed the program.

When 100 pre-screened candidates were sent to the inaugural meeting by the cooperating agencies, 48 were considered high school drop-outs. At the end, 85 expressed firm intentions of continuing their education, in high school and/or college. Only three who had not completed high school indicated they would not return to school.

Eleven registered at Miami-Dade Junior College during the final week of the pilot program.

Post-program interviews and a written questionnaire answered by the 93 "graduates" offer interesting observations on the cadets' own evaluation of the program.

Following, in descending order, are the "most impressive" department standings, as judged by the cadets: Sanitation 28, Fire 27, Police 16, Water and Sewers 10, Communications 7, Building 5, Property Maintenance 5, Public Works 5, Neighborhood Rehabilitation 4, Motor Pool and Garage 2, Operations (Streets, Bridges and Storm Sewers) 0.

Listing the departments with the least appeal, the cadets came up with the following composite rating: Police 24, Motor Pool and Garage 17, Operations 14, Public Works 8, Fire 8, Water and Sewers 6, Sanitation 4, Building 1, Property Maintenance 0, Communications 0.

Szarto said one cadet remarked on his

evaluation questionnaire: "I have learned things about my city that the average taxpayer does not know, and never will."

Among such volunteered comment, Szarto gave the following "shortest and strongest" quotation: "It made us better citizens."

"That's good," said Mayor Clark, whose sentiment is being echoed figuratively in follow-up action throughout the area, led by the city of Miami.

Foreign Aid

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, after reviewing President Johnson's foreign aid message, I am well satisfied that the foreign assistance program which he proposes for fiscal year 1969 is cut to minimum requirements without sacrificing the effectiveness of the overall effort.

The foundations for the 1969 program are sound. First, U.S. assistance will supplement development programs, but the major effort must come from the countries themselves; second, every developed nation must contribute to the assistance effort, and this assistance must be effi-

[Federal Spending Facts Bulletin No. 240, from the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D.C., Feb. 8, 1968]

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1969—A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF ITS HIGHLIGHTS

THE BUDGET PICTURE IN BRIEF—SELECTED YEARS, 1958-69

[In billions]

	Fiscal years					
	1958	1960	1965	1967	1968	1969
The unified budget:						
Receipts.....	\$79.6	\$92.5	\$116.9	\$149.6	\$155.8	\$178.1
Outlays.....	82.7	92.3	118.0	158.4	175.6	186.1
Surplus (+) or deficit (-).....	-3.1	+2	-1.1	-8.8	-19.8	-8.0
The administrative budget:						
Receipts.....	68.6	77.8	93.1	115.8	118.6	135.6
Expenditures.....	71.4	76.5	96.5	125.7	137.2	147.4
Surplus (+) or deficit (-).....	-2.8	+1.2	-3.4	-9.9	-18.6	-11.8
Public debt at yearend.....	276.4	286.5	317.9	326.7	351.6	363.5

Among the more significant facts and conclusions that can be drawn from analysis of President Johnson's budget for the fiscal year 1969 are the following:

1. Despite the warnings by the President and other Administration leaders of the prevailing dangers of more inflation and even higher interest rates at home and a threat to the dollar abroad, the President has proposed yet another expansionary budget. Even with the inclusion of \$10.5 billion of proposed new income tax and user charge revenues, there still remains a deficit of \$8.0 billion in the new unified budget and \$11.8 billion in the administrative budget.

2. While the Budget Message asserts the application of spending restraints and "rigorous screening of priorities", budget plans call for a spending increase of \$10.4 billion in the unified budget and \$10.2 billion in the administrative budget. Somewhat more than half of the increase in the latter budget is accounted for by a rise of \$3.2 billion in defense, \$0.9 billion in higher interest costs and a \$1.3 billion decline in participation sales of loan assets which are reflected in the administrative budget as negative expenditures. The remaining \$4.8 billion 1969 spending increase is accounted for by \$1.6

ciently coordinated; third, neighboring nations must cooperate to develop shared resources; fourth, priority will be given to agriculture, health and education, the most critical areas of need in the developing countries; fifth, AID activities will make a positive contribution to the balance of payments situation; and, sixth, the aid program will be administered efficiently.

I believe that these guidelines will establish a foreign aid program which is worthy of the support of all Americans.

Analysis of the Federal Budget

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to and include as part of my remarks the annual analysis of the Federal budget prepared by Eugene F. Rinta for the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Mr. Rinta's analysis will be helpful to all who are sincerely interested in the reduction of Federal spending.

The analysis follows:

billion Federal pay increases and \$3.2 billion net increases in nondefense programs.

3. The spending plans in the budget point to significantly higher expenditures after 1969 although the rate of increase will be less than in recent years. With both new spending authority and obligations incurred substantially exceeding expenditures in each of the five years 1965 through 1969, further sizeable spending increases can be expected after 1969.

4. Unless peace is restored in Vietnam, budget balance is improbable before 1971 at the earliest, even with enactment of the proposed new taxes. While normal revenue growth by 1970 could equal the \$8.0 billion 1969 unified budget deficit, the expenditure growth inherent in the budget plans will consume the revenue increase and thus preclude reduction of the deficit in 1970. The same applies to 1971 unless termination of war permits a reduction in the costs of defense.

5. As a result of a string of nine consecutive deficits in the administrative budget since 1960, the public debt has risen from \$286.5 billion on June 30, 1960, to an estimated \$363.5 billion by June 30, 1969. Without either the proposed new income tax and

user charge revenues or more rigorous expenditure restraints than have been applied in the budget, the public debt by the end of fiscal 1969 would be over \$376 billion—an increase of \$90 billion in nine years.

THE NEW UNIFIED BUDGET

In response to recommendations of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts, the new unified budget concept was adopted by the Administration for presentation of the 1969 budget. While there are a number of important differences in the unified budget and the old administrative budget, the principal differences affecting the budget surplus or deficit involve the treatment of trust funds and sales of participation certificates in loan assets held by the Government.

Receipts of the social security, highway, and other trust funds add \$43.9 billion to receipts of the unified budget in 1969 as compared to the administrative budget. Similarly, expenditures from the trust funds add \$36.6 billion to unified budget expenditures as compared to administrative budget expenditures. These figures for trust fund receipts and expenditures are after adjustment for intragovernmental transactions in both budget concepts.

Participation certificate sales are counted in the administrative budget concept as negative expenditures and thus reduce both expenditures and the deficit. In the unified budget these sales are more appropriately considered a means of financing, like other borrowing, and have no effect on expenditures or receipts.

In the unified budget lending outlays are

separately identified from other outlays and are shown as net amounts for all lending programs. All outlays other than lending are characterized as expenditures and lending as net lending. The combination of the two are called outlays. In the administrative budget there is no differentiation between lending and other spending in the expenditure figures. Also, some loan activities are reflected in expenditures on a net basis while others are shown in gross amounts with interest and repayments recorded as receipts.

The unified budget is clearly an improvement over the administrative budget, particularly in its coverage. Its presentation could be improved, however, by a clear separation of trust fund transactions from regular Federal fund transactions as is done in the 1969 budget document between regular expenditures and lending outlays. The separation between Federal fund and trust fund programs is made in the detailed listing of agency and program funding but not in the various summary tables. Thus the data are not readily subject to separate analysis of spending changes in the two types of funds by functional categories.

COMPARISON OF SPENDING BY FUNCTION FOR 1969 AND PRIOR YEARS

The purposes for which President Johnson proposes to spend \$186.1 billion in the 1969 fiscal year beginning next July 1 are shown in the table that follows. For comparative purposes the table shows the expenditures for the same functions in the current year and in 1965 and 1960. The table also shows by functions the new spending authority proposed for 1969.

UNIFIED BUDGET

(In millions)

	Outlays				Proposed new spending authority, 1969
	Actual, 1960	Actual, 1965	Estimated, 1968	Planned, 1969	
Expenditures:					
National defense.....	\$45,848	\$49,586	\$76,491	\$79,792	\$82,317
International affairs and finance.....	3,310	4,196	4,330	4,478	4,700
Space research and technology.....	401	5,091	4,804	4,574	4,369
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	2,893	4,032	4,412	4,474	5,131
Natural resources.....	1,084	2,140	2,416	2,483	2,271
Commerce and transportation.....	4,643	7,043	7,695	7,996	8,776
Housing and community development.....	21	116	142	142	2,833
Health, labor, and welfare.....	19,105	28,143	46,396	51,945	60,413
Education.....	659	1,309	4,157	4,364	4,585
Veterans benefits and services.....	5,063	5,634	6,798	7,131	7,515
Interest.....	8,299	10,358	13,535	14,400	14,400
General government.....	1,332	2,231	2,618	2,827	2,600
Allowance for pay increases.....				100	1,600
Allowance for contingencies.....				350	550
Undistributed adjustments.....	-2,272	-3,164	-4,591	-5,049	-5,049
Total expenditures.....	90,385	116,715	169,856	182,797	197,105
Net lending:					
National defense.....	-7	-3	-2	-4	-
International affairs and finance.....	-235	-21	716	675	608
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	457	777	899	1,135	1,225
Natural resources.....	11	16	16	7	4
Commerce and transportation.....	27	275	158	125	232
Housing and community development.....	1,078	-147	3,257	1,355	2,135
Health, labor, and welfare.....		19	21	-538	-538
Education.....	204	229	384	335	687
Veterans benefits and services.....	363	88	370	211	302
General government.....	-15	16	-40	-37	-36
Total net lending.....	1,882	1,249	5,779	3,265	4,618
Total outlays.....	92,268	117,966	175,635	186,062	201,723

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR CHANGES IN SPENDING

A comparison of budgeted spending totals in 1969 with current estimates for 1968 shows a net overall increase of \$10.4 billion in the unified budget. This total results from an increase of \$12.9 billion in regular expenditures and a decrease of \$2.5 billion in net lending. In comparison with 1965, which was the first full budget year of the Johnson Administration, total outlays are up \$68.1 billion, or 57.7 percent. In relation to the 1960 spending total of \$92.3 billion, the \$186.1 billion 1969 total represents an increase of \$93.8 billion, or 101.6 percent.

National defense spending rose moderately from \$45.9 billion in 1960 to \$49.6 billion in 1965. Since 1965, however, defense costs have risen sharply because of the Vietnam war. Outlays are estimated at \$76.5 billion in 1968, with a further increase to \$79.8 billion budgeted for 1969. The request of \$82.3 billion new spending authority for 1969 indicates a further increase in defense outlays is ahead. Special Vietnam costs account for \$5.8 billion in 1966, \$20.1 billion in 1967, \$24.5 billion in 1968, and \$25.8 billion in 1969.

Interest costs have been rising substantially in recent years because of both a rapidly

rising debt and unusually high interest rates. Net interest costs, after deducting interest received by the Treasury, are estimated at \$14.4 billion in 1969 as compared to \$13.5 billion in 1968, \$10.4 billion in 1965 and \$8.3 billion in 1960. Interest on the public debt will cost an estimated \$15.2 billion in 1969. This compares with \$14.35 billion in 1968, \$11.3 billion in 1965, and \$9.2 billion in 1960. From the end of fiscal 1965 to yearend 1969 the public debt is expected to rise \$45.7 billion, or 14.4 percent. Over the same four-year period interest on the public debt will rise \$3.9 billion and 34.5 percent.

International affairs, including net lending, is budgeted at \$5.2 billion in 1969 for an increase of \$0.1 billion over 1968. Direct economic assistance outlays are expected to rise to \$2.3 billion in 1969 as compared to \$2.2 billion in 1968; but a much larger increase in new spending authority is proposed, with the 1969 request being \$2.5 billion as compared to \$1.9 billion voted by Congress for 1968. In addition, the 1969 request includes \$766 million new authority to help fund three international financial institutions for an increase of \$362 million over 1968.

Domestic nondefense programs account for the remainder of the budget except for a portion of a \$1.6 billion allowance covering pay increases effective July 1, 1968 for civilian and military personnel. Assuming that about \$0.5 billion of the scheduled pay increases are applicable to domestic nondefense programs, the 1969 total of outlays for these programs will be \$90.6 billion. This total includes \$88.0 billion of regular expenditures and \$2.6 billion of net lending.

The \$90.6 billion 1969 total outlays for domestic nondefense programs (excluding interest) is an increase of \$5.4 billion over 1968. This increase is the net result of an increase of \$7.9 billion in regular expenditures and a decrease of \$2.5 billion in net lending. In comparison with 1965, the outlays for domestic nondefense programs are up \$33.6 billion, or 58.9 percent, in four years. The increase since 1960 is \$53.3 billion and 142.9 percent.

(Note: The above comparisons of outlays by years do not include any estimated functional allocation of the amounts of undistributed adjustments shown in the table on page 3. These amounts include government contributions for employee retirement and interest received by trust funds which are deducted from program expenditures in determining net budget expenditures under the new unified budget concept.)

The growth of domestic nondefense spending in the major functional categories is shown in the table that follows. For comparative purposes the table also shows the growth in defense, interest, and international programs.

Outlays by function	Increase (billions)		Percentage increase	
	1960-65	1965-69	1960-65	1965-69
Space research and technology.....	\$4.7	-\$0.5	1,170	-10
Agriculture programs.....	1.5	.8	44	17
Natural resources.....	1.1	.3	97	15
Commerce and transportation.....	2.6	.8	57	11
Housing and community development.....	-1.1	2.8	-103	2,784
Health, labor, and welfare.....	9.1	23.2	47	83
Education.....	.7	3.2	78	206
Veterans programs.....	.3	1.6	5	28
General government.....	.9	.5	71	24
Total domestic nondefense.....	19.7	133.6	53	159
National defense.....	3.7	30.2	8	61
International programs.....	1.1	1.0	36	23
Interest, net.....	2.1	4.0	25	39

¹ Includes for 1969 allocated portion of allowance for pay increases and entire allowance for contingencies.

Following are examples of some of the more significant increases in individual non-defense programs from current estimates for 1968 to budgeted amounts for 1969:

[In millions]

	Increases in 1969 Expenditures	Appropriations
FEDERAL FUNDS		
Economic opportunity program.....	\$144	\$428
Domestic economic development.....	45	36
Social and Rehabilitation Service-welfare.....	749	808
Supplementary medical insurance.....	81	81
Urban renewal programs.....	211	400
Urban mass transportation.....	50	65
Model cities programs.....	225	288
Civil supersonic aircraft development.....	251	81
Total of above items.....	1,756	2,187
TRUST FUNDS		
Old-age and survivors insurance.....	2,917	3,183
Disability insurance.....	350	817
Hospital insurance.....	495	741
Supplementary medical insurance.....	211	336
Total of above trust fund items.....	3,973	5,077

BUDGET PROVIDES FURTHER EXPENDITURE GROWTH

The trend in Federal spending can be determined by comparing the annual amounts of new obligational authority and obligations incurred with actual expenditures. The new obligational authority provided by Congress (mainly appropriations) is the authority on which funds are committed for expenditure in carrying out the activities the Government has been authorized to perform. Obligations incurred are the commitments made for personnel costs, goods and services and construction to be acquired under contract, grants-in-aid, various benefits, etc. Expenditures are the actual payments made in liquidation of the obligations incurred.

A comparison of new obligational authority, obligations incurred, and expenditures in recent years shows that there has been a substantial lag in actual expenditure of funds as compared to the provision and commitment of appropriations for expenditure. This situation continues in the 1969 budget plans. The five-year record beginning with fiscal 1965 is shown in the table that follows. Since figures on obligational authority and obligations incurred under the unified budget are available only back to 1967, the figures for 1965 and 1966 are from the old administrative budget.

[In billions]

Fiscal year	New obligational authority	Obligations incurred	Expenditures or outlays
1965 actual.....	\$106.6	\$104.6	\$96.5
1966 actual.....	126.4	120.5	107.0
1967 actual.....	182.6	168.2	158.4
1968 estimates.....	186.5	178.9	175.6
1969 estimates.....	201.7	194.6	186.1
Total.....	803.8	766.8	723.6

These figures clearly point to substantially higher expenditures in the period beyond 1969. In each of the five years new obligational authority exceeds obligations incurred for a cumulative difference of \$37 billion. Thus the uncommitted spending authority has been built up by this amount less such amounts as may have expired. Also, in each of the five years obligations incurred exceed expenditures for a cumulative difference of over \$43 billion. Assuming continuation of the Vietnam war and total defense expenditures at about the current or slightly higher levels, further annual expenditure increases in the \$8-10 billion range can be expected. The only prospect for halting such further spending increases would be through rigorous cutting of new spending requests and

reduction of existing spending authority wherever feasible.

ECONOMIES IN PROPOSED PROGRAM REDUCTIONS AND REFORMS EXAGGERATED

In his Budget Message the President cites two kinds of measures for reduction of spending in 1969. One is the curtailment or stretch-out of certain programs to hold obligations below the 1968 "appropriated levels." The other involves modification of programs, many of which require legislation.

The program curtailments are applicable only to 1969 activities. They involve \$1.6 billion of obligations and an unstated but obviously smaller reduction in 1969 expenditures. The Budget Message gives the impression on cursory reading that the program reductions in 1969 are from 1968 program levels. A careful reading, however, indicates that, in general, the reductions are from levels which would have been possible in 1968 on the basis of program appropriations provided by Congress, but without taking into account the effect of the special budget reduction measure, H.J. Res. 888, which Congress enacted in December.

When the 1969 program levels (obligations) are related to the 1968 levels now budgeted for the programs in which \$1.6 billion reductions are claimed, the total reduction is much smaller. Following are a few examples of the reductions in 1969 as related to existing program levels:

The original 1968 budget proposed \$300 million appropriations for farm operating loans, and obligations in that amount were planned. Congress approved the full \$300 million request, but in compliance with H.J. Res. 888 planned obligations in 1968 have been reduced by the Administration to \$275 million. A level of \$250 million is budgeted for 1969 for a reduction of \$25 million, but a reduction of \$50 million is claimed in the Budget Message.

The 1968 budget planned an obligations level of \$515 million for REA loans based on an appropriation request of \$435 million plus unobligated funds from 1967. Congress approved the appropriation request, but 1968 obligations were cut by the Administration to \$470 million to meet the requirements of H.J. Res. 888. Obligations in 1969 are budgeted at this same \$470 million level, so there is no reduction planned in the existing program level. Yet a cut of \$45 million (\$515 million less \$470 million) is claimed.

An obligations level of \$440 million was planned in the 1968 budget for college facility construction grants. Congress approved \$10 million more than the appropriation request of \$390 million, so the obligations level could have been increased to \$450 million except for reductions made under H.J. Res. 888 which reduced the level to \$307 million. The planned obligations level for 1969 is \$226 million for a cut of \$81 million from the existing program level; however, a 1969 reduction of \$224 million (\$450 million less \$226 million) is claimed.

An analysis of all the reductions of this type listed in the Budget Message indicates that the actual cuts in 1969 from the current program levels total less than \$0.9 billion instead of \$1.6 billion. About one-half of the total reduction is in the space program.

The "program reforms" listed in the Budget Message are estimated to reduce the "budgetary burden" by \$1.2 billion in 1969 and by \$1.4 billion in 1970. Included in the reforms are some which have been proposed repeatedly over the last decade or more, including proposals of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy as well as President Johnson. But Congress has not seen fit to approve them.

One reform calls for limiting the agricultural conservation program to practices with long-term benefits and a reduction of the program level from \$220 million to \$100 million for a budget cut of \$120 million. Another would more strictly define the condi-

tions under which school aid to federally impacted areas is granted. This would save \$100 million a year beginning in 1970. While an excellent case can be made for these reforms, Congress has so far shown no inclination to adopt them.

New user charges in the form of excise taxes are proposed to provide revenues that would help to finance costs of Federal programs related to airway services, waterways, and highways. The new revenues amounting to about \$0.3 billion a year would be recorded as receipts rather than offsets against expenditures. These user tax proposals have also been rejected a number of times in recent years.

One proposed reform from which no savings are expected in 1969 or 1970 could provide substantial long-term savings. This reform calls for an increase in the interest rate for evaluating water resources projects to take into account the real cost of long-term Treasury borrowing. With project evaluation being made at realistic interest rates, many projects which are now found economically feasible would not qualify under the new rates.

THE TAX PROPOSALS IN THE BUDGET

The principal new revenue measure in the budget is the temporary 10 percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes which the President proposed and Congress rejected last year. As now proposed, the surcharge would become effective January 1, 1968 for corporations and April 1, 1968 for individuals, and would expire June 30, 1969. The surcharge on corporations would produce \$970 million additional revenues in 1968 and \$2,880 million in 1969. New revenues from the surcharge on individuals are estimated at \$930 million in 1968 and \$6,920 million in 1969.

Two further accelerations in corporation tax payments, effective in fiscal 1968, are proposed. Corporations would be required to pay 80 percent of their finally determined annual tax liabilities in their payments of estimated tax instead of 70 percent as under existing law. This would provide a one-shot revenue increase of \$400 million in 1968. The other acceleration would eliminate over a five-year period the present exemption of the first \$100,000 of corporate tax liability from the requirement of current payment of estimated tax. This proposal would increase revenues by \$400 million in both 1968 and 1969.

Extension until July 1, 1969 of the present excise tax rates of 7 percent on automobiles and 10 percent on telephone service is proposed. Under present law the automobile tax is scheduled to decline to 2 percent on April 1, 1968, and to 1 percent on January 1, 1969, while the telephone tax is scheduled to be reduced to 1 percent on April 1, 1968 and to be repealed on January 1, 1969. Added revenues from extension of the present rates of these excises are estimated at \$306 million in fiscal 1968 and \$2,660 million in 1969.

Proposed user charge excises effective in fiscal 1969 would add \$40 million revenues in 1969 from aviation services, \$7 million from inland waterways transportation, \$239 million from higher taxes on diesel fuel and heavy trucks, and \$11 million from other sources, for a total of \$297 millions from new user excises.

DEFICITS AND DEBT

With estimated outlays of \$186.1 billion and projected receipts of \$178.1 billion, a deficit of \$8.0 billion is expected in 1969 under the unified budget concept. This follows an anticipated deficit of \$19.8 billion in 1968 under the same budget concept. Both deficits are based on the assumption that Congress will enact the surcharge and other new revenue measures as proposed. These deficits, however, do not measure the effect

of fiscal operations on the public debt because of the inclusion of trust fund income and outgo in their computation. The excess of trust fund receipts over expenditures reduces the unified budget deficit but has no effect on the public debt as presently defined. The excess trust fund receipts are pledged for trust fund program purposes and cannot be used for reducing the debt.

Under the unified budget concept, the effect of fiscal operations on the public debt is reflected by the difference in net receipts and net outlays of Federal funds. Estimates for 1968 show net outlays of \$139.4 billion and net receipts of \$116.0 billion for a deficit of \$23.4 billion in Federal fund operations. Net Federal fund outlays in 1969 are estimated at \$148.3 billion and net Federal fund receipts at \$133.3 billion for a deficit of \$15.0 billion. These Federal fund deficits compare with estimated deficits under the old administrative budget concept of \$18.6 billion in 1968 and \$11.8 billion in 1969. The Federal fund deficits are much larger than the administrative budget deficits because proceeds from participation sales are recorded as negative expenditures in the administrative budget while being considered borrowing in the unified budget.

Further substantial deficits appear probable in 1970 and 1971, even with the proposed tax increases, unless peace is restored in Vietnam. The large excess of obligational authority and obligations incurred over expenditures under the 1969 budget plans, as well as in the prior four years, points to substantial spending increases in 1970 and 1971. At an annual rate of spending increase in the magnitude of \$8-10 billion, additional revenues from economic growth will be consumed by spending and will not be available for deficit reduction.

Aside from a termination of war, the only hope of getting off the bleak treadmill of big deficits and rapidly growing debt is a far more rigorous application of spending priorities than has been made in the Johnson budget for 1969. It is up to both the Administration and the Congress if the fiscal outlook is to be significantly improved.

EUGENE F. RINTA,
Research Director.

A Summary of the First Session, 90th Congress

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud and feel privileged to have the honor of serving the Seventh Congressional District, Queens County, N.Y. I am forever thankful to the people of my district for having given me the privilege to represent them.

At the end of each session, since I came to Congress almost 8 years ago, I have summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Each session has been a lengthy one, and my only regret has been that the lengthy sessions reduced the time I would have spent in my district personally discussing and obtaining the views and attending to the needs of my constituents. The mid-December adjournment of the first session of this Congress has necessitated my carrying this report into the early part of the second session.

While I cannot possibly include every

bill, I do try to include those of widespread interest or importance in my district. The number of significant bills passed in the first session has been considerably less, and the number of hours lost from political maneuvering were more than in any Congress in recent years. A coalition formed a formidable enough block of votes to cause the unnecessary delay of almost any measure that came before the House. I do not complain about a Member's vote being different from mine on some measures and believe every Member should vote his conscience, but I deplore political maneuvering for the sole purpose of delaying the Congress in working its will.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Public Law 90-201 requires the 14,000 meatpacking and processing plants which are not now subject to Federal inspection to come up to Federal standards within 2 years, but an additional year can be given under certain circumstances; gives the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture authority to make periodic observations in nonfederally inspected plants and to put such a plant under Federal inspection if it is determined that the plant is endangering the public health; prohibits false labeling of meat and meat products containing nonmeat and inferior material; requires imported meat to meet U.S. Federal standards and without the 2-year delay given nonfederally inspected plants in the United States; and protects against meat rendering plants being used in human food.

Public Law 90-189 sets Federal safety standards to protect consumers in buying clothing, bedding, and other flammable fabrics which have been responsible for an estimated 3,000 deaths each year.

Public Law 90-146 creates a National Commission on Product Safety to study and recommend action to protect consumers from unsafe products for household use.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND HEALTH

Public Law 90-248 provides increased social security benefits for 23.7 million persons now on social security. Minimum payments rise from \$44 monthly to \$55 and maximum payments from \$142 to \$160.50 for those individuals now on the rolls.

The effective date of these benefits will be reflected in checks received in early March. It also increases amount recipient can earn from \$1,500 to \$1,680 without reduction in benefits, and provides that \$1 in benefits can be kept without a reduction for each \$2 of earnings between \$1,680 and \$2,880. The limit on earnings without a dollar-for-dollar reduction formerly was \$1,800. It also makes it easier for young totally disabled workers to qualify for benefits, and increases benefits for the dependents of deceased workers.

There are many inequities in the social security program which I hope the committee will consider and the Congress will correct in this second session of this Congress.

Public Law 90-31 extends and expands the Community Mental Health Center Act passed in the last Congress.

Public Law 90-99 extends for 2 years the authorization for Federal matching

grants to States for vocational rehabilitation programs; establishes a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults; authorizes projects for rehabilitation services for children of migratory farm workers.

Public Law 90-174 amends the Public Health Service Act to authorize Federal assistance to State and local governments in planning and developing comprehensive health programs.

Public Law 90-170 extends for 2 years the authorization for Federal assistance in construction of centers for the mentally retarded; includes provision for 3-year program of research and training in physical education and recreation for mentally retarded children.

Public Law 90-91 extends the food stamp program for another 2 years.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Public Law 90-222 continues the anti-poverty program for another 2 years with maximum authorization at about the same level as last year.

EDUCATION

Public Law 90-35 extends the Higher Education Act, passed in 1965, and authorizes \$1.1 billion for 3 years. Grants are made to State commissions which distribute the money.

Public Law 90-247 extends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed by the last Congress. The program provides funds to increase educational opportunities.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Public Law 90-198 extends the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for an additional 5 years.

Public Law 90-202 makes it unlawful to exclude applicants between 40 and 65 years of age from employment opportunities.

LABOR

Public Law 90-206 provides a 6-percent pay increase for postal workers and a 4.5-percent increase for other classified Federal employees, both retroactive to October 1, 1967, and is calculated, but does not, I believe, bring Federal employees up to salary level comparable to non-Federal employees in 1969; it also includes provisions to prohibit nepotism in Federal employment; provide free mailing privileges for members of Armed Forces in Vietnam.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Public Law 90-148 authorizes securing injunctions against polluting of the air according to certain air quality standards.

SMALL BUSINESS

Public Law 90-104 increases the authorization for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund and fixes new minimum requirements for small business investment companies.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Public Law 90-7 authorizes the President to provide emergency food aid to India, including 3 million tons of grain.

Public Law 90-175 continues the authorization for the Peace Corps for another year.

Public Law 90-88 authorizes funds for the Inter-American Bank to assist in

social and economic progress in Latin America.

ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS

Public Law 90-40 extends the draft for 4 years; puts 19- and 20-year-old group in highest priority for induction; provides that college students who are deferred will go into the high priority group upon graduation; retains almost complete authority in local draft boards to determine which men are selected. Currently, about one of each five eligible is needed to fill the draft.

Public Law 90-8 appropriates an additional \$12.2 billion for support of U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam, making a total of about \$25 billion for cost of Vietnam for fiscal year 1968. A proposal to prohibit bombing in North Vietnam was defeated in the House by a vote of 372 to 18.

Public Law 90-207 provides a 5.6-percent basic pay increase for servicemen and includes an expense-paid trip home for servicemen injured in Vietnam and on convalescent leave.

Public Law 90-77 provides compensation, pensions, and educational benefits to veterans of Vietnam, widows, and surviving children.

NATIONAL SOLVENCY

Critics continue to talk about the size of our national debt. They fail to men-

tion in their pessimistic propaganda that our economy or gross national product has been advancing and improving over the last 20 years. They also fail to mention that our national debt in 1946 was \$270 billion and today, in 1968, it is approximately \$348.5 billion. In other words, our national debt in 22 years has increased approximately \$78 billion while our gross national product, or our economy generally, has increased approximately \$500 billion. This increase of gross national product means billions more in taxes coming into the Federal, State, and local treasuries. So when your neighbor talks about our Nation's fiscal policy "going to the dogs" you might quote figures of our great business, industrial, and employment expansion during the last 22 years.

Congress still spends most of its time working through money requests, and, since I am one of the Appropriations Committee members, I spend a large share of my time helping decide which requests are justified. The appropriations recap—or maximum that can be spent—for the fiscal year 1968 is as follows:

Total budget requests.....	\$133,273,083,277
Total appropriated by Congress	127,466,380,457
Total reduction by Congress	5,806,702,820

APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

	President's request	Enacted
Bills for fiscal 1968:		
Treasury-Post Office.....	\$7,615,148,000	\$7,545,641,000
District of Columbia:		
Federal payments.....	73,499,000	67,478,200
Federal loan appropriation.....	89,700,000	79,200,000
Interior.....	1,458,218,000	1,382,848,350
Loan and contract authorizations.....	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)
Independent Offices-HUD and NASA.....	15,920,513,700	14,728,373,900
Contract authorization (rent supplements).....	(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)
Labor-HEW.....	113,424,146,000	113,255,356,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	12,347,803,195	12,169,012,500
Legislative.....	276,005,210	275,699,035
Agriculture.....	15,021,097,400	14,952,945,700
Loan authorization.....	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)
Defense.....	71,584,000,000	69,936,620,000
Transportation.....	1,718,618,772	1,581,905,772
Public works.....	4,867,813,000	4,689,938,000
Military construction.....	2,937,000,000	2,093,362,000
Foreign assistance.....	3,818,736,000	2,950,000,000
Supplemental (poverty, Appalachia, etc.).....	2,120,785,000	1,158,000,000
Total, 1968 bills.....	133,273,083,277	127,466,380,457

¹ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent Offices-HUD, \$3,235,000,000 in budget estimates, \$881,000,000 in House bill, \$3,235,000,000 in Senate bill, and \$3,235,000,000 enacted; Labor-HEW, \$15,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill, and enacted; State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, \$150,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill, Senate bill, and enacted; Agriculture, \$800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, \$700,000,000 in Senate bill, and \$750,000,000 enacted. Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$4,085,000,000; total enacted, \$4,250,000,000.

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for grants-in-aid for airports (budget \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000; Senate bill, \$75,000,000; enacted, \$70,000,000).

³ Estimated Dec. 13, 1967.

LOCAL ISSUES

When we think of local problems in the Seventh Congressional District of New York, we immediately think of noise from airplanes, especially jets, flying low over our homes as they land and depart John F. Kennedy International Airport. Since my last report, I have continued my contacts with the Federal Aviation Administration, the Port of New York Authority, and congressional committees having interest in and jurisdiction over legislation in this field. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce commenced hearings on legislation to give the FAA authority to set noise criteria which the plane manufacturers would have to meet

before the plane could be certificated. This is of great importance to all of us as plans go forward in the development of the supersonic plane. I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to give priority consideration to this legislation, of which I am a sponsor, and to report it to the House at the earliest possible date.

In a further effort to secure relief for my constituents who are plagued with jet noise, I have urged all involved agencies to work with utmost speed on the selection of a site and plans for a fourth jetport to serve the New York metropolitan area—Kennedy cannot accommodate the continued increase in air traffic, and

I have opposed a suggestion that additional runways be built in Jamaica Bay to increase Kennedy's capacity.

The catastrophic gas explosion which occurred in my congressional district on January 13, 1967, brought to each of us a deep realization of the inherent anger in this Nation of gas pipelines which crisscross the country and run beneath every large city. I was pleased that the Senate passed the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Bill in the first session of this Congress—the Senate bill is very similar to my bill, H.R. 13936. Again, I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to proceed as speedily as possible on this legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

It has been, and continues to be, my desire to be readily available to any constituent who wishes to talk with me. Whenever time permits, I attend district civic, veterans, and fraternal organization meetings. For the convenience of my constituents, I maintain a full-time district office at 96-11 101st Avenue, Ozone Park, N.Y. 11417; and my Washington office at 1727 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, is always available to my constituency.

A Prayer—A Poem

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every day each of us says or hears prayers, most of which are inspiring. Seldom, however, is a prayer so beautiful that it is, in truth, a poem.

On Friday, February 2, 1968, at a dinner of the New Jersey Democratic Party, held in Newark, the invocation was given by the Very Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Fleming, S.T.L., Ph. D., executive vice president, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. It is indeed a beautiful and inspiring poem. I commend it to the attention of the Members:

INVOCATION

We give you thanks, O Lord, for the thousand hands and hearts
That have gone into the making of this moment.
In this challenging hour of our nation's history,
Bless our courageous President, our beloved Governor,
Our distinguished Senator Kennedy, and all public servants.
May their statesmanship burst like comets across our firmament,
Transforming the weary embers of despair into meteors of incandescent hope.
As we come together tonight in a common effort,
May we never forget for a moment the great heart and spirit of him
Who right down to the crack of a rifle, lived these words:
"God's work must truly be our own—then we can change the world."
The brightest light of our time was snuffed out
And his voice was heard no more in the land.
We pray that the light of his reason, though temporarily extinguished,

Will never go out. To him the Presidency was not a crown
To be worn at twilight,
But the legacy of a man whose future was longer than his past.
May the eternal flame never cease to remind us that we do not stand alone.
If we all can persevere, if we can in every land and office,
Look beyond our own shores and ambitions. Then surely the age will come in which the strong are just,
The weak secure, and the peace preserved. Though there is a time to be born and a time to die,
May we never forget
That we have promises to keep
And miles to go before we sleep.
Then by your grace, may we behold that bright and shining hour,
When we stand on the threshold of the promised land to which he had led us.
With a good conscience our only sure reward,
With history the final judge of our deeds,
May we go forth to lead the land we love,
Praying your blessing and your help, but knowing
That here on earth God's work must truly be our own. Amen.

International Cooperation Between the United States and Brazil

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, an event which holds great promise for the people of Brazil, and which has part of its genesis in my congressional district in Wisconsin, has just come to my attention.

It is the opening of the first regional course in cooperative development at a new cooperative training center in Campinas, Brazil. This center is headed by a Brazilian, Dr. Antonio Gilberto T. Rebeiro, who studied at the International Cooperative Training Center at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. The director of the University of Wisconsin center is Prof. Adlowe L. Larson.

About 40 Brazilians are attending the first course which started February 5, 1968 and will continue until the end of April. They are employees of cooperatives needing technical training, representatives of Brazilian state organizations responsible for developing cooperatives, and staff of the National Government assigned the task of building effective cooperatives.

This new training center represents a productive partnership between the Governments of Brazil and the United States. I believe such joint efforts between the United States and the countries we are aiding is an imperative for success in our foreign aid programs.

Jointly responsible for the new center, both for its inception and as instructors, are representatives of Farmer Cooperative Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the staff of the National Institute of Agricultural Development, an arm of the Brazilian Government.

These specialists felt that specialized training in cooperative operations was a first essential for people who were just

beginning to run their own cooperatives. Leaders and employees of existing or newly formed cooperatives often lack technical background. Government employees also need more indepth cooperative knowledge that they in turn can pass on to others.

This first course is, therefore, devoted to bookkeeping, what managers and directors should know and do, how to market, how to manage, and related subjects on the basics.

I understand this training school will hold continuing courses and that plans are to open similar centers in other parts of Brazil.

Both the United States and Brazilian cooperative specialists saw the need for some intensive cooperative training in Brazil, as it would be impossible to send all those who needed such training to the center in Madison. Furthermore, they felt it was better to do as much of the training in Brazil as possible, but at the same time drawing on the knowledge of Brazilians who had trained at the U.S. center whenever possible.

In addition to Dr. Rebeiro, a number of other Brazilians have also attended the Madison center, with good results from this training showing up. Credit for improvement of a new cooperative formed by 200 farmers to get agricultural supplies reportedly goes largely to a Brazilian Government employee who used knowledge gained at the Madison center to advise cooperative officials on changes needed for more effective operations. In effect, then, a chain reaction of cooperative knowledge is being activated in Brazil, as trainees teach other trainees.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Professor Larson and his staff for making such a valuable contribution to our foreign assistance program for Brazil.

Peace?—On Whose Side?

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Washington Star on Sunday, I came across this letter to the editor.

It is from an Episcopal minister, who in my judgment shows remarkable perception about one of the problems facing our country today.

Under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD for the additional enlightenment of people everywhere. I salute Father Rigg:

PEACE?—ON WHOSE SIDE?

SIR: The miserable exhibition of the 2000 "Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam" advocating peace at almost any price should remind us of the remark by Nikita Khrushchev (while a guest in this country) that they—the Communists—intend to bury us.

Evidently they are being aided and abetted by certain of the clergy—who are even supplying the "coffins" for our mass burial.

Also, we have the charming spectacle of that great peacemaker, Martin Luther King, who makes a career and a very good living

attacking the very system that protects his absurd actions and statements.

As an Episcopal priest I am ashamed and embarrassed by the part some of our clergy are taking in this farce.

It is time that the clergy of this country understand that if we don't fight to protect our existence as free men, we will survive only as slaves.

Rev. PHILIP RIGG.

CROOM, Md.

Small Business Administration Aids Los Angeles Firm

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I know that we are all aware of the rapid expansion in this country of computer technology. The computer has become an essential part of American life in almost every field of endeavor, from direct mail advertising to outer space; from quality control to our atomic submarines; from the payroll office to the schoolroom. And every day new vistas are being opened up in this fast-developing field.

The Small Business Administration is aware of the important role the computer plays in our society.

An outstanding example of SBA's help to the computer industry is the dramatic growth of a Los Angeles, Calif., firm—Logicon, Inc.

Logicon, founded in December 1960 and incorporated in the State of California in April of 1961, is a professional engineering organization composed of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and programmer-analysts.

Due to the lively growth of the computer industry, Logicon's president, Claude F. King, realized that the company would need more working capital if they were to expand quickly enough to accommodate the demand for their services. Unable to obtain long-term financing from banks, King in 1964 approached the Small Business Administration.

SBA made Logicon a working capital loan of \$100,000 during their expansion period.

When the company came to SBA in 1964, their employees numbered 39; their total sales for the previous fiscal year were \$677,000.

In March of 1967, Claude King wrote to SBA in Los Angeles to tell them that as of the end of the fiscal year 1967, their work force had increased to 140—350 percent; sales had risen to \$2,145,000—400 percent.

At that time, King in closing his letter said:

We would like to express our appreciation to you and your associates at the SBA for your cooperation over the past two and one-half years and we are looking forward to continued good relations during the remaining term of the loan.

In June of this year, Logicon found their quarters in Redondo Beach too small and moved to their present loca-

tion in San Pedro, where they have 20,000 square feet of office space—twice the space that they occupied at the Redondo Beach headquarters. They have opened an office in San Diego and an office in Washington, where they presently employ a staff of seven. Plans are being made to set up an operation in Boston.

Today, Logicon has increased to 174 employees, and projected sales for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, are in excess of \$4,000,000.

On November 3, Logicon, Inc., made final payment on the 1964 SBA loan of \$100,000—3 years before maturity.

Surely, this tremendously successful company is a credit to our American free enterprise system.

Just as surely, SBA's investment of faith and hard cash in this small business during a period of critical growth and expansion is a credit to our Federal Government. SBA has helped a company advance and expand to meet the current demands of our burgeoning computer industry. By doing so SBA has: created more jobs in Los Angeles County; contributed to the tax base of Los Angeles County; and, also, contributed to the national defense and aerospace programs.

Senator Karl Mundt To Support Richard Nixon

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the candidacy of former Vice President Richard Nixon received a substantial boost when Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, announced he would head a slate of delegates pledged to the candidacy of Nixon.

Senator MUNDT and Vice President Nixon have been close friends since many years ago. Both served in the House of Representatives before both went to the U.S. Senate.

I insert in the RECORD the announcement and the text of the statement of Senator KARL MUNDT:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D., today announced he had accepted an invitation from former Governor Archie Gubbrud of South Dakota to head a slate of delegates in the June Republican primary election of his state pledged to the candidacy of Richard M. Nixon.

Gubbrud is heading a South Dakota campaign committee supporting Nixon's candidacy and on February 9th wired Mundt asking him to be chairman of the Nixon delegation which will appear on the South Dakota primary ballot on June 4th in the last of the open primaries to be held before the Republican National Convention.

Following is text of telegram to Gubbrud:

"In response to your telegram of February 9th in behalf of the proposed slate of Republican Convention delegates pledged to Richard Nixon's candidacy, I am happy to accept the invitation you extended to serve as chairman of a South Dakota slate of delegates pledged to Dick Nixon in our Presidential primary on June 4th. While normally I have not sought a spot on our Republican delegations to our National Convention and have refrained from trying to influence the pre-convention decision of our voters, I take this ac-

tion now for several reasons among which the following are determining factors:

"In my opinion our Presidential decision this year rates with the most important decisions ever made by an American electorate. In the first place, I believe Nixon gives our Country its best chance for achieving an early and enduring peace and a successful ending of the war in Vietnam. His long and intimate experience in foreign affairs, his steady and sturdy guiding hand if the war is not totally ended by next November, and his constructive suggestions for bringing into focus in this war the economic and diplomatic strength of the United States instead of relying almost entirely on our military capabilities are badly needed in this era of conflict and of international confusion and uncertainty.

"Next, while I personally know and respect all of the Republican leaders mentioned for the Presidency, I feel from my long personal and intimate friendship with Dick Nixon that he, more than any other candidate on either ticket, better understands the problems of rural America, of our small towns and small economic enterprises, and that he will approach their solution with the most sympathetic and constructive programs.

"Finally, I am not at all impressed by the inspired slogan that 'Nixon can't win' which has been utilized by opponents to confuse and divide Republicans. I believe he is an odds-on favorite to carry our ticket to victory and that he gives our party by far its best chance to score a meaningful success next November by winning not only the White House but also a greatly expanded Republican membership in both the House and the Senate. The facts of history, as well as the pertinent factors involved in this campaign, bear out this conclusion.

"It must be remembered that in 1960 against a very attractive and appealing candidate and the compelling TV personality possessed by Jack Kennedy, Nixon came within a hair's breadth of being elected President. His loss by less than 1% and a margin of a mere 111,803 votes out of a total of 68,329,895 ballots clearly indicate that against President Johnson or Eugene McCarthy, Nixon will roll up an inspiring Republican majority. After all, he has campaigned in every state and made friends in all of them while at the same time coming to know the interests and the ideals of every area of the country. He alone has had the highly helpful experience of having participated not only in his own nearly victorious campaign for the Presidency but the two highly successful campaigns won by the Eisenhower-Nixon team in 1952 and 1956. His candidacy will enlist strong components of enthusiastic friends in every area who know him, who respect him, and who want him to be President in order to restore the prestige, the peace, and the progress of our Country which many citizens recall with nostalgia during the peaceful, progressive, and successful 8 years of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration with its record of fiscal sanity.

"If our delegation wins in South Dakota next June, I shall seek a position on the Republican platform committee in which forum I would hope to have some influence in writing a constructive platform which will point the way toward returning to our great American success formula in meeting the current problems of our day and age while at the same time giving special emphasis to the correction of the serious economic problems confronting our farmers, our ranchers, and the small towns and cities of our land. By adding consideration of these problems to new proposals and constructive programs for meeting the serious problems of our urban communities, I believe the Republican Party can present an all-American approach to the over-all solution of those domestic economic and social

problems which continue to plague our Country.

"KARL E. MUNDT,
"U.S. Senator."

Legislation To Aid Italians

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 a series of devastating earthquakes wracked the southwestern tip of the tiny nation of Sicily, turning much of the region into heaps of rubble and leaving thousands of victims destitute and homeless. Since that time, in response to a request for assistance from the Italian Government, the United States has made available emergency supplies and services, in terms of food, equipment, medical personnel, and financial assistance.

But there is yet another way that we can aid these people—we can give them new hope and a new future here in the United States. I am today introducing a bill which would authorize special legislation to permit the immediate entry into the United States of 2,000 natives of Italy and their families who lost their homes and livelihoods as a result of the Sicilian earthquakes.

Use of existing immigration provisions to accomplish this would penalize Italians who have already applied for entry into this country because it would count the number of earthquake victim immigrants against the ceiling on Italian immigration.

My proposed legislation would permit special visas to be issued to these distressed aliens, and the number of immigrants entering under these provisions would not count against the Italian immigration quota.

Mr. Speaker, I know that a number of my colleagues have introduced similar bills, or have expressed interest in doing so. Because of the urgency of the situation, it is my hope that the entire body of the House will take action on this legislation as soon as possible.

The proposed bill follows:

H.R. 14808

A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby authorized to be issued two thousand special immigrant visas to aliens specified in section 2 of this Act seeking to enter the United States as immigrants. The spouse and children of any such alien, if accompanying or following to join, may be issued special immigrant visas notwithstanding such numerical limitation.

SEC. 2. Visas authorized to be issued under section 1 of this Act shall be issued only to natives of Italy who were uprooted by the earthquakes in Sicily subsequent to January 12, 1968, and are unable to return to their usual place of residence in Sicily and are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life.

SEC. 3. Visas authorized to be issued under this Act may be issued by consular officers as

defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of that Act: *Provided*, That each such alien is found to be eligible to be issued an immigrant visa and to be admitted to the United States under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That a visa is not immediately available to such alien at the time of his application for a visa.

SEC. 4. Aliens receiving visas under section 1 of this Act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall apply in the administration of this Act.

National FFA Week

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this is Future Farmers of America Week.

February 17-24 is set aside to emphasize the contributions this great organization of agricultural youth has made, and is making, to leadership training and sound agricultural practices.

I have often said that my own participation and membership in the Future Farmers of America is directly responsible for my having had the opportunity to serve in the Congress and the Florida Legislature.

No higher honor has come to me than being honored by my fellow Floridians in the FFA in having allowed me to serve as their State president. I started as a greenhand, as all of our members do, and became interested in governmental service through this experience.

The friends that I made during my active FFA career helped greatly in my campaigns for public office. I point this out to emphasize that thousands upon thousands of farm youths have had their horizons broadened by this participation which gives them an opportunity to meet their fellow members throughout the State and Nation.

Basic and fundamental to FFA since its founding in 1928 has been a new awareness of advanced technology in farming. The lives of those young men who have had this opportunity has been enriched financially because they have been able to translate this training into action.

FFA gives a young man a sense of values and confidence through the leadership training which is a vital part of its work.

Theme for the observance this year is "Challenging Youth in Agriculture."

Emphasis is being placed on the great opportunities in agribusiness for the youth of today. Agriculture is far more than simply the man who tills the soil. It is a vast enterprise encompassing manufacturing, marketing and the entire galaxy of this Nation's economy.

No nation can be sounder than its agriculture. Basic to every society is the need

to feed its people—and American agriculture is able to do this in abundance.

Modern technology has freed the vast majority of Americans from the back breaking toil of wresting a living from the soil. It was only when we were able to solve this basic problem that America moved to the forefront among the nations of the world.

I like to think, as we observe this week, that the FFA is going to play a vital role in solving this problem for the peoples of the world. Poverty, hunger, and disease go hand in hand and these are the real enemies of mankind.

I would hope and pray that when the problem of providing food in abundance for all of the world is a reality, we will see other lands begin, a new life of peace, and aggression ended.

Few organizations have played as vital a role in the development of sound agriculture as has the FFA. The men who have guided this program are to be commended, for they have given to future farmers through the years a will to succeed.

In truth, they are "challenging youth in agriculture" and this Nation is richer for the FFA having existed.

Even Foreigners Are Cognizant of Need for Modern American Merchant Marine

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need to revitalize the American merchant marine has been emphasized by many of our Nation's most able statesmen, naval authorities and maritime experts. They have uttered countless words of warning on the danger of allowing our merchant fleet to continue its disgraceful decline. And yet, all these warnings seem to have fallen on deaf ears.

Maritime strength is recognized by all leading world powers—and so is maritime weakness.

How can the United States expect to maintain a position of world leadership if it must depend on other nations to carry 82 percent of its own world trade?

How can the United States expect to retain the respect of other great world powers, if it continues to allow foreign-flag ships to take over American trade?

And how can this Nation really expect to be the champion of the free world if it does not have enough ships to even defend its own vital interests?

These are some of the vital questions being asked every day by many knowledgeable Americans. But if what they feel and think does not matter, perhaps it would be more effective to emphasize what other nations think about us.

An excellent article on that very subject appeared in the February 17, 1968, issue of the Baltimore Evening Sun. Written by reporter Louis Granger, it is based on an interview with a German sea captain, who warns that America must revitalize its merchant marine—

both for its economic health and its national defense.

It seems ironic that our foreign maritime competitors should point out our deficiencies and weaknesses, and even express concern over our decline as a maritime power.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this objective and expert foreign criticism will penetrate some of those deaf American ears, and I insert this revealing article into the RECORD. The article follows:

GERMAN URGES UNITED STATES TO REVITALIZE SHIPS

(By Louis Granger)

A German sea captain visiting Baltimore, voicing the same sentiments as nearly the entire United States maritime industry, said this nation must revitalize its merchant fleet.

Capt. Hans Viktor Schlegel who began his maritime career in 1939, said the United States was losing millions of dollars a year through the necessity of transporting American-made cargos in foreign-flag ships.

"America must have more merchant vessels if it wants to continue in its place as a leading maritime nation," he said.

"All you're doing," Captain Schlegel explained, "is paying American dollars to foreign companies to move your goods."

He said a large merchant fleet was important to national security and that "your government must do something soon."

Noting that the United States has approximately half a million men in Vietnam alone, the captain pointed out that during war the only effective way to transport men and weapons was by ship.

A modern national maritime program has been proposed for more than three years. The move to update and modernize the fleet was made to compete with other nations such as Russia and Japan which are building their merchant fleets at a much faster rate and taking trade the United States once had.

For example, 80 per cent of the Soviet Union's merchant fleet is less than ten years old. Approximately 70 per cent of all United States-flag cargo ships is more than twenty years old.

Also, according to the Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, by the end of 1966, the Soviets expected to carry 75 per cent of their trade in Communist ships, while the United States in 1967 was carrying only about 8 per cent of its trade.

Captain Schlegel commands the M.V. Polar Argentina, one of Germany's largest and fastest reefer (refrigerated) merchant vessels.

The 7,600 deadweight-ton ship arrived from Hamburg and unloaded 523 automobiles at Dundalk Marine Terminal. The vessel would normally be used to transport fruit.

During World War II, the captain served on a German destroyer off Norway. He was a petty officer whose main job was to make underwater repairs to the ship.

Students Contribute to School Fund

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the students of Muzzey Junior High School in Lexington, Mass. Recently, these students contributed \$865 to help fund a school in Huawi Bong, Tak

Province, Thailand, and \$135 for a school in Ailuk Atoll, Marshall Islands, Micronesia. These funds, which were raised by the youngsters themselves, were sent to the Peace Corps as part of their school-to-school partnership program.

I think this is a tremendously valuable program. It makes possible the participation of American students in an effort to help build schools in developing countries around the world. In this case, the students' contribution will be used toward the purchase of construction materials. Citizens in the host countries will construct the school with a Peace Corps volunteer providing on-the-job assistance.

But, Mr. Speaker, these students are doing more than giving money and more than helping to build a school. They are making a worthwhile contribution to the building of foundations of understanding and bonds of friendship between the United States and peoples of other countries. I am proud to be able to salute them today.

Oakland County Skaters Shine at Grenoble

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding performance of the U.S. Olympic skating team at Grenoble, France, was an unexpected source of pride for every American.

But it was especially so for those of us who live in the 18th Congressional District of Michigan, the home of Mr. Terry McDermott and Mr. Timothy Wood, both Olympic silver medal winners.

The winning of a silver medal, signifying a second place finish in the Olympics, is by itself an accomplishment worthy of the praise and admiration of the entire world.

But the manner in which both Terry and Tim won those medals was even more impressive.

Neither man was rated a serious contender at the start of the games.

Terry, who won a gold medal in the men's 500 meter speed skating race at Innsbruck, Austria, in the 1964 Olympics, retired from competitive racing shortly afterward. He skated seldom during the 3 years and at 27 years old was given little chance for a comeback.

Tim, a 19-year-old university student, was untied in Olympic competition, although he is the current U.S. men's figure skating champion.

Both men, displaying rare amounts of skill and determination, proved the experts wrong.

Terry, who lives in Birmingham, Mich., mastered the elements as well as himself in winning his medal.

Given little chance of defending his title successfully, he was considered out of the running altogether when he drew last position among the 48 starters in the 500-meter race.

By the time his turn came, the hot

sun had created pools of water over many sections of the rink. Everyone expected the three top medals were as good as won by those who already had completed their races.

But Terry, his head and arms flailing, crossed the finish line in 40.5 seconds to tie for second place.

Someone later asked his coach, Richard Somalski, to account for his miraculous performance. He replied: "It was sheer determination—that guy has more nerve than I ever saw."

The same determination and courage were displayed in Tim's performance.

For a month before the national championships, he trained for 7½ hours every day in addition to keeping up with his studies at John Carroll University. He intensified that schedule when school recessed.

Tim, who lives in Bloomfield Hills, Mich., has shown that kind of determination since he began skating at the age of 7. It earned him the national junior figure-skating championship in 1964, a 13th-place finish in the world figure-skating competition in 1965, and ninth place in 1967.

It is this kind of dedication and courage, Mr. Speaker, which speaks volumes about the character of young Americans and about the future of the Nation they are inheriting. These two fine young men deserve the applause and the appreciation of us all.

Some Help in the Fight Against Pornography

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have written recently complaining of receipt through the mails of unsolicited pornographic material. This is not the first time, of course, because the purveyors of this kind of trash have been active in operating through the mails for a number of years. But the type of material that has been forwarded to me in recent days is the most salacious yet brought to my attention. It has no place being sent into homes through the U.S. mails. In fact, it has no place any place. Where do we stop with the dissemination of this filth? Our courts seem to be saying, more and more every day, that anything goes. The court standard seemingly is that anything can be printed and distributed to the public that does not absolutely outrage our moral standards—and, apparently, nothing these days outrages our moral standards—at least as they are viewed by the courts.

I was heartened to read in yesterday's paper—the book world section of the Washington Post, February 18, 1968, to be exact—the report by William F. Buckley, Jr., entitled "Serious Proposals To Confront the Onslaught of Smut," which gives some hope that the long series of unfortunate court decisions in this area can be at least somewhat re-

versed. Mr. Buckley's review has to do with "Foolish Figleaves? Pornography In—and Out of—Court," a book by Richard H. Kuh.

I cannot help but agree, incidentally, with Mr. Buckley's observation that the book has "an unfortunate title." But title notwithstanding, the book apparently does contain some solid suggestions for drafting of laws that would both meet Supreme Court obscenity tests and still be effective in controlling dissemination of salacious material. The review is well worth reading—as is, hopefully, the book by Mr. Kuh—and I therefore insert it in the RECORD for my colleagues' consideration:

SERIOUS PROPOSALS TO CONFRONT THE ONSLAUGHT OF SMUT

"Foolish Figleaves? Pornography In—and Out of—Court." By Richard H. Kuh. Macmillan. 368 pp. \$7.95.

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A few months ago I wrote to Mayor Yorty of Los Angeles to ask him whether he would do me the favor of imprisoning whoever it was who owned the pornography mill which was sending my 14-year-old son invitations to depravity or, failing that, would he be good enough to administer him a poke in the nose. I heard back from Captain H. A. Nelson of Los Angeles' vice division, informing me that the City of Los Angeles had done its best to cope with the squalid pornographer but that the Supreme Court had made the gentleman immune.

Captain Nelson invited me to visit his department on a trip to Los Angeles and I did so, and got a quick practical education in some of the problems of vice control. The climax of the visit—which I cannot wait to share with you—was a showing of The Film. A film called "O-12" which, the Captain and a legal aide explained to me, was showing in a Los Angeles arcade, 25¢ for three minutes of it, another 25¢ for a further three minutes, and so on, up to \$1.75 by which time, presumably, the producer figured that if you had not attained a high, you weren't even worth taking money from.

Now this film, the official carefully explained, had been witnessed that spring by the members of the Supreme Court, a majority of whom, without rendering an opinion, had pronounced it as not obscene under the law, thus upsetting the lower courts' conviction. In order to be obscene, under the consolidated standards of the Court, it is required to demonstrate that a movie (or a book) meet all of three tests, to wit that it appeals to the prurient interest, that it is patently offensive by reference to community standards, and that it is utterly without redeeming social importance.

I went to the screening room braced to commit a little diplomatic cluck-cluck. I could not readily imagine five old men dismissing as other than obscene something that clearly was obscene, and so I found myself suspecting that the gentlemen of the vice squad had lost their judgment under the weight of their particular portfolio, and that I was about to see close-ups of *La Maja Desnuda* and a couple of Rodin statues. One dollar and seventy-five cents later, that is to say twenty-one minutes later, the lights having come on again, I found myself saying, "to hell with the obscenity problem—what we have is a communications problem." If that movie isn't of prurient interest; if it wasn't patently offensive by the standards of Nero's Rome, let alone Yorty's Los Angeles; if in it Thrasymachus himself could find a straw of social importance, then we had better rethink the laws of reason, beginning with the principle of contradiction.

The experience of seeing "O-12" makes all the more important the publication of a book

squarely addressed to the dilemma of how, simultaneously, to retain the First Amendment, and to immobilize the pornographers of this world. Richard Kuh, the author of *Foolish Figleaves*, is an experienced prosecutor, a graduate of Columbia and the Harvard Law School, and for many years the chief of the Criminal Courts Bureau under Frank Hogan of New York. Here are the special insights of Mr. Kuh:

1) The Supreme Court has time and again said that it does not consider that the First Amendment protects obscenity.

2) The Court has, time and again, indicated that it is prepared to grant special recognition to efforts by the states directed at protecting children.

3) The acknowledged right of the parent to direct the training of his own children is rendered meaningless in the absence of the cooperation of the state.

4) The principal reason why, under the circumstances, the states have consistently failed either to sustain their laws or their laws' applicability in given situations, has been the loose-wordedness of said laws.

Whereupon Kuh accepts the breathtaking challenge of formulating exemplary laws governing children and governing adults, which he more or less guarantees would survive the scrutiny of the courts. If such laws were passed, he assures us, "Appellate tribunals would find their role in reviewing obscenity shrinking . . . Passing on whether an indecency crime has been committed would become only slightly more difficult than determining whether or not such crimes as robbery or assault have been established."

Kuh's laws are based on specificity of detail. Indeed, it is wryly amusing that passages in his proposed law might be classified as pornographic, rendering it illegal, perhaps for the first time in history, to publish the law. But that is an irrelevant objection, the point being that has got away completely from such phrases as "appealing to the prurient interest," "lustfully conceived," the kind of thing that invites eternal wrangling and such dreadful hypocrisy as persons of great probity maintaining with straight faces that *Candy* is other than pornographic.

There is no room here to condense the laws proposed by Kuh; there is room only to observe that they are sharply divergent insofar as they are addressed to the protection of children; that they are sharply consistent in that they could be waived by a child's parents; that they are greatly ingenious, for instance, on the vexing problem of what lawyers call scienter—how does the shipper know, for example, whether the person ordering this particular book is under 18? (Well, according to Mr. Kuh, he can protect himself by stamping in letters across the package: "This package contains material that, by law, may not be sold directly to a minor"); and that they intelligently distinguish between the exploitability of different media for the purpose of lascivious trade. What goes in books may not go in night clubs, what goes in night clubs may not go in movies; what goes in movies may not go in plays. The exceptions are explicit and reasonable, and if anyone truly fears that Kuh's laws would interrupt genuine efforts at self-expression, let him be reassured by the knowledge that under those laws nobody could touch *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, or even LeRoi Jones' *The Toilet*. Here, then, is an altogether serious set of proposals which will not appease the Comstockeans, nor satisfy the First Amendment fanatics, but which intelligently confront the dilemmas posed by the Supreme Court.

It is a dividend of Kuh's book that he passes along a lot of very interesting commentary. For instance, the disgust D. H. Lawrence felt for pornography. The wonderful evolution of the poet John Clardi from against any censorship at all, even by the parent over the reading matter of his children, to the confession, a few years later,

that he had written "pompously," a reversal to which he was driven upon reading *Last Exit to Brooklyn*. There are spicy quotations from Plato and Muggeridge, Aristotle and Katherine Anne Porter. He quotes people of reputation most permissive (for instance, Margaret Mead) against what is the existing situation: namely that anyone, of any age, can get anything, almost anywhere.

I believe that Kuh has made an important contribution to the thought on the subject, and I hope that very soon now his book (what an unfortunate title, by the way) will engage the attention of serious legislators. But whether it does or whether it doesn't, I intend to schedule a private showing. I shall rent myself a 16-millimeter projector, having sent off for a copy of "O-12." I shall then invite the head of the New York Civil Liberties Union, the editor of *Commentary*, and Dwight Macdonald, Max Lerner, and maybe three or four other worldly and permissive gentlemen, and will run through that 21-minute film. I shall not then ask them whether in their judgment the film should be available to children—I know what they are likely to answer, and would not go to such pains to contrive my having to hear them say it again. I shall merely ask them whether by the Supreme Court's own definitions, the film is obscene. Confident that they will agree with me that it is, I shall join my guests in sponsoring a Committee for a New Supreme Court, and will dispatch Mr. Macdonald to Washington, to picket the Justices' chambers.

Travel Tax Bad Plan

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, while no one would expect a call for new taxes to be met with wild enthusiasm, the administration's proposal for the avowed purpose of reducing nonessential travel by private citizens outside the Western Hemisphere has come in for widespread, and I believe justified, criticism, not only on the grounds of unfairness, but of the practicality and consequences of imposing such levies as well. On February 6, 1968, in this Chamber, I particularly sought to point out that the administration should, before adding new burdens on our citizens, attack our balance-of-payments problem more directly at its source, that is, with respect to unnecessary Federal overseas spending in our foreign aid programs.

In an editorial appearing in the *Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot* on Wednesday, February 7, 1968, a number of very persuasive points have been raised in opposition to the President's proposal, which I commend to the attention of the House for their consideration:

TRAVEL TAX BAD PLAN

President Johnson's proposed travel tax on Americans abroad is, unfortunately, more a grandstand, hit-'em-where-it-hurts bit of raw politics than a meaningful attempt to accomplish its purported purpose.

The proposed tax would, according to the Johnsonian theory, help reduce our balance of payments deficit by making travel more expensive. Theoretically, it would deter many would-be travelers, or make them shell out part of their money to Uncle Sam instead of letting them spread it around Europe, Africa, Asia or Australia. (It would still be all right to travel around North, South and Central

America without upsetting the government's red-ink-worriers.)

More appropriately, it should be called a bald tax aimed at enriching the nation's general fund under a smoke-screen.

It would not, for example, limit or restrict in any way the amount of money a traveler could take abroad for such spending as he desired.

Why it is less dangerous to spend all our national travel funds in one part of the world than another is an unfathomable mystery. It still flows out, without any increase in return.

The big problem is that there isn't enough coming back from other parts of the world, not in where it is spent, or whether the Treasury Department collects a spending tax on the outflow.

The only travelers who would really be hurt are those of limited resources, who have scrimped and saved for years to see their, or their parents', native lands or who just wish to make a low-budget tour.

Wealthier individuals can afford the tax without reducing their spending abroad.

The tax, then, is just more troublesome red tape aimed at the little guy who isn't a major campaign contributor.

If President Johnson had a mind to do something meaningful, he could see to it that the foreign aid laws are enforced. For example, the federal government is paying dock rental, stevedore and other labor costs, plus other charges for shipments of free food stuffs to needy nations.

The law forbids this practice, but the government closes its eyes while the Treasury Department illegally pays multi-million-dollar-a-year bills.

If the recipient nations can't offer free dock space and recruit some free labor to make it possible to accept free food, something is really wrong with those governments.

At the same time Johnson asks Congress to slap a tax on everything over \$7 a day spent abroad by the general public, government officials are allowed \$50 a day of tax money—tax-free, of course—for their junkets.

The natural reaction among the protectionist members of Congress is to enact trade tariffs of the type tried and found wanting a generation or two ago. That reaction is no less baldly political, aimed directly at benefiting some special-interest constituent without regard for true national interest.

The Johnson Administration and Congress have become too accustomed to collecting taxes with a large funnel. Individuals who attempt personal financing of this type can be found in bankruptcy court every day of the week, if they elude debtor's prison.

However, adopting the kind of travel tax proposed by Johnson does focus public attention on the balance of payments problem, but at the expense of the people of moderate or low income. The real theory appears to be to make those individuals hurt, and thus feel they're doing their bit for their country.

It is a shoddy, but much-used gambit played by every political entity from the township level to the White House.

The idea deserves to fall flat on its face until long after the government has instituted reforms in its own spending practices abroad.

Gen. Hanford MacNider

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute to the memory of Gen.

Hanford MacNider, of Mason City, Iowa, who died Saturday in Sarasota, Fla., at the age of 78.

General MacNider was one of the most respected men in Iowa. He was an acknowledged leader in commerce, civil affairs, and government.

His record as a war hero in World Wars I and II is well known to all Iowans. In the First World War, only Gen. John Pershing received more medals than General MacNider.

General MacNider was a cofounder of the American Legion, the Nation's largest and oldest veterans' organization, and in 1921, at the age of 31, became national commander.

From 1925 to 1928, he served as Assistant Secretary and Acting Secretary of War. Dwight D. Eisenhower was a member of his staff.

The State of Iowa and this Nation have lost a great leader with General MacNider's death. I only hope that many of the young people in this country will learn about the life of this prominent American. They could profit from his example of outstanding service and bravery to his country.

Ethics

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, as a portion of my remarks, I include for the RECORD a comparison of the provisions of the legislative reorganization bill passed by the Senate with those in similar bills introduced in the House. The following material deals only with provisions of the bills dealing with the subject of congressional ethics:

ETHICS

The supporting language of the Final Report (page 48) for the Joint Committee's recommendation that "The House of Representatives shall create a Committee on Standards and Conduct" says merely:

"The joint committee heard considerable testimony with respect to the problem of the ethical conduct of Members of Congress. It is the opinion of the joint committee that the House of Representatives should create a committee to be concerned with the standards and conduct of Members of the House. The Senate has already created a committee to examine problems in this area and the House might explore profitably the organization and procedures of the Senate Committee prior to implementing this recommendation."

Point 4 of the Supplemental Views of Reps. Curtis, Hall, and Cleveland proposes that the committee be bipartisan (see page 88).

S. 355 AND CURTIS BILL

S. 355 as passed by the Senate contains the language of the original reorganization bill as introduced in the 89th Congress by Senator Monroney and, with necessary technical changes,* reported in the 90th Congress.

The reorganization bill supported by the House Republican Policy Committee was the companion measure introduced in the 89th Congress by Mr. Curtis. The Curtis bill, with

technical changes consistent with the Monroney bill, was re-introduced in the 90th Congress as H.R. 2595. *Previous to adoption by the Senate of amendments to S. 355, the Curtis and Monroney bills differed only with respect to the provisions for an ethics committee in the House.*

Both bills (S. 355—this provisions was not amended by the Senate—and Curtis) establish a standing, evenly bipartisan committee. The Senate bill provides that the chairman must be a member of the majority party; the vice chairman of the minority party. The Curtis bill provides simply that the committee "shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members."

Both bills give the committee subpoena power, authority to sit whether the House is in session, recessed, or adjourned, and jurisdiction as follows: "Ethical standards and conduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives."

As to duties, the Senate bill provides that the committee shall: "(1) recommend to the House . . . by report or resolution, such rules and regulations as the committee determines necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct by Members of the House and by officers and employees of the House, in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities; and (2) report, by majority vote of its entire membership, violations of law to the proper Federal and State authorities."

The Curtis bill provides that the committee shall: "(1) investigate violations of law, violations of rules and regulations of the House, and improper conduct which may reflect upon the House, of individuals in the performance of their duties as Members of the House, or as officers or employees of the House; and, after according to the individuals concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing, to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto; and to report to the House by resolution or otherwise, by a two-thirds vote of the authorized membership of the committee, its recommendations for disciplinary action; and (2) report, by resolution or otherwise, such additional rules and regulations governing conduct by Members, officers, and employees of the House, as the committee deems advisable."

BOLLING

The Bolling bill contains no provision for any variety of ethics committee.

REID

Section 106 of the Reid bill would establish a "Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct." This approach differs markedly from the other bills. See below for more on Reid bill.

PRINT NO. 3

Print No. 3 would establish a standing "Committee on Standards of Official Conduct," composed of six members of the majority party and six members of the minority party, which "shall recommend, from time to time, to the House of Representatives such changes in laws, rules, and regulations as the committee deems necessary to establish and enforce standards of official conduct for Members, officers, and employees of the House. The committee may hold such hearings and take such testimony as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this clause."

In effect, Print No. 3 simply makes permanent the temporary committee established by and for the 90th Congress.

RE PROPOSAL OF MR. REID

Reid's bill provides for a "Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct" to be composed of 14 members—7 Senators appointed by the Vice President, and 7 Congressmen appointed by the Speaker. Contains the usual language re vacancies, number for quorum, etc. The committee shall adopt rules not inconsistent

with rules of the Senate and House, have subpoena power, etc.

The duty of Reid's joint committee shall be: "to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which there may be assured the maintenance, by elected representatives in the Federal Government and the officers and employees of the legislative branch . . . of moral and ethical standards which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. In the conduct of such study and investigation, the joint committee shall, among other things, determine the extent to which existing conflict-of-interest statutes or regulations applicable to the legislative branch . . . or the rules and regulations of the Senate and House should be strengthened."

By August 1, 1968, the joint committee (proposed by Mr. Reid) is to report, together with such additional rules or regulations as it may have determined are necessary, a comprehensive code of ethics for the legislative branch. In formulating such a code, the joint committee is to have considered the following activities by Members, officers, or employees of Congress—

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity;

(2) Disclosures of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealings in their official capacities in matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust, and

(6) Other matters concerning propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members, etc., of Congress.

The Reid bill defines conflict of interest (see at page 19) and provides (subsection h) for adoption of these standards as part of the reorganization act. The joint committee is to enforce other provisions of the new code of ethics, new rules, etc., that Congress may have adopted.

The committee is authorized to hire one full-time staff member to serve as counsel—he must be a practicing member of the legal profession and have distinguished himself in public service. The committee is also authorized to employ consultants, clerical staff, etc., as needed.

The joint committee may investigate allegations of improper conduct either on its own motion or on the basis of charges filed by any Member, officer, or employee of the legislative branch or by any citizen of the U.S.

See also Final Report pages 82-83:

"SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. CASE

"I support the recommendations of this committee. If fully implemented, they should add significantly to the capacity of the Congress to deal effectively with the executive branch and to manage its own workload with increased efficiency.

"At the same time, I must state my regret that the committee largely passed over the problem of congressional ethics. . . .

"Instances of real or fancied betrayal of public trust reported by the press have given color to the view, held by too many Americans, that 'the same thing can be said about any Senator or Congressman.'

"There is a simple and effective way, I believe, in which Congress can rebut that view and protect the public interest in a manner consonant with its elective status. That is by applying the principle of public disclosure to the financial interests of Members and top staffs of the legislative branch and to their dealings with executive agencies at the behest of a party in interest.

"In 1957 Senator Richard Neuberger and I joined in introducing a disclosure bill. In

*And less Senate Recommendations 1 and 2 under "Committee Jurisdiction."

succeeding Congresses Senator Maurine Neuberger, and subsequently, Senators Clark, Hart, and Tydings have joined me in reintroducing the bill. Our bill would, among other things, require each Member of Congress to make an annual report, to be open to the press and public, covering all his sources of income, including gifts of more than nominal value, his assets and liabilities and his transactions in real or personal property....

"We concur in the supplemental views of Senator Case.—Thomas B. Curtis; James C. Cleveland."

President's Popularity Continues To Rise Despite Crises

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the American people fully support President Johnson during these difficult days.

As Mr. Robert Roth of the Philadelphia Bulletin correctly notes, the President's popularity continues to rise in spite of new crises.

Mr. Roth reports that supporters of President Johnson "have been vastly encouraged in recent weeks by signs that the country is beginning to rally around the President and is becoming increasingly inclined to defend him against his foes at home and overseas."

He notes also that those who have vilified the President for so long, have created a countermood among the people that can be summarized by one word—revulsion.

But the fact remains that President Johnson, despite the haters and doubters in our midst, can meet his awesome responsibilities secure in the knowledge that the majority of Americans stand with him.

Under unanimous consent I insert this excellent article into the RECORD:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Jan. 31, 1968]

THE PRESIDENT NEVER HAD IT SO BAD, BUT JOHNSON'S POPULARITY RISES IN SPITE OF NEW CRISES

(By Robert Roth)

WASHINGTON.—It is accepted here as a political fact, sustained both by public opinion polls and the observation of experts, that the popularity of President Johnson is on the rise.

This turn of events is easier to observe than to explain. It is a long while since things have gone right for Mr. Johnson. The costs of the Vietnam war mount—in blood and dollars—and there is no end in sight. Fresh crises reveal new American vulnerability not only in Southeast Asia but everywhere. The dollar is weak. The gold supply is depleted. The balance of payments deficit is an unending headache. The economy is uncertain. The Congress is balky. The country is restless and faces the coming summer with uneasiness and fear.

In short, the President never had it so bad.

BACKERS ARE ENCOURAGED

In spite of all this, the political strategists who have allied themselves with the Johnson cause have been vastly encouraged in recent weeks by signs that the country is

beginning to rally around the President and is becoming increasingly inclined to defend him against his foes both at home and overseas.

This may be due in part to the excesses of vilification indulged in by the more extreme of Johnson enemies. There is a feeling in many places that there are limits of taste and decency beyond which an attack on an American President should not go. When those limits are passed, revulsion sets in.

SENTIMENT FOR UNDERDOG

There also is in the American psyche a deep devotion to the underdog. In politics, as in sports, sentiment rallies to the side of the man who appears to be getting a bad beating and it doesn't matter much whether he deserves it or not.

There also is pronounced conviction among most Americans that when the country has trouble ahead—as it now has so emphatically—both politics and personalities should be forgotten and patriots should stand by their President.

The President has exploited these sentiments with great subtlety and adroitness. Gone are the cockiness, the assertiveness, the braggadocio, the petulance that once characterized his public appearances.

MORE RESTRAINED ATTITUDE

He has of late foregone the luxury of sounding off, more or less in private, against those who differ with him. His stance has been that of a man too busy to bother with that sort of thing.

His speeches have been characterized by a new note of restraint, a de-emphasis of promises and a stress on problems to be faced, and shared. This especially was true of his messages to Congress on the State of the Union and the budget.

Earlier messages of this sort were full of praise for what the Johnson Administration had already done and bright forecasts of what it was about to do. But this time, and for the first time, the President told the country "we cannot do everything we would wish to do."

IMPRESSION OF SINCERITY

This contributed to an impression of sincerity, of believability which Mr. Johnson had hitherto found it almost impossible to achieve. This more than anything else may account for the new acceptance he seems to have found among the people.

The President may not be able to sustain this new posture all the way from now to November. And even if he can, it may avail him little if the Republican opposition can produce a candidate with a fresh vision and a new way out of old troubles. Such an opponent, however, has not yet been found.

A New Low in Abuse

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I reacted with shock and disgust when I saw the horrible caricature of President Johnson on the cover of a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

I suppose the shock value was enough to sell a few magazines, but there is no excuse, in my opinion, for a major magazine to use such poor taste to boost sales.

An editorial from the February 9 edition of the Wichita Falls, Tex., Times entitled "A New Low in Abuse" expresses my feelings in the matter very well. I

commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

A NEW LOW IN ABUSE

Editorial cartoons that appear in newspapers, magazines and other printed publications have a historical background in caricature, satire, hyperbole and distortion, but a new low in gross exaggeration is reached on the cover of the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post with its sketched portrait of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Cartoonists are having a field day with President Johnson, more so, in the opinion of The Times, than with any President of the United States in the last half century. They are exaggerating his features, altering his appearance and changing his physical characteristics in a most grotesque manner. The ludicrousness has reached the point in many published instances of impropriety, of indecency, of unwarranted liberties not only with President Johnson as an individual but also with the high office of the presidency.

Editorial cartoons serve a good purpose in focusing attention upon personalities and crucial issues of people and events in the news. When they become vulgar and obnoxious to the extent that many cartoonists have portrayed President Johnson, however, they exceed the bounds of responsible journalism and can't even be dignified by the term "yellow journalism."

The magazine's disgraceful cover is an abuse of the freedom of the press, an affront to President Johnson, and degradation of the highest and most powerful office in not only the United States but also the world.

Community Action Programs

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and its many and varied programs, have had a tremendous impact on the lives of many Americans.

The extent of this impact was demonstrated to me recently when I received pleas from more than 500 of my constituents, urging me to continue trying to restore funds being cut from community action programs.

This great outpouring of mail was prompted by the announcement that many programs in my district were to be curtailed or eliminated due to a 15-percent cut ordered throughout the Great Lakes region.

This cut, of course, was made necessary by the action of this Congress in failing to approve sufficient funds to carry on existing programs, let alone begin new ones.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I argued and fought for a higher appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity, whose programs have come to mean so much to so many underprivileged Americans. I, and many of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have warned this Congress many times that failure to provide sufficient money would mean disappointment and heartbreak for millions of people now being assisted by such things as the community service centers in Wayne County, Mich.

Our warning was not heeded, and now we are seeing the results. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of Congress could read some of the letters I have received. They were from parents whose children, for the first time, had received proper medical and dental care. They were from people who, for the first time, had been given hope and encouragement to break loose from the bonds of poverty.

And now, Mr. Speaker, these hopes are being dashed. These people, who had been given a glimpse of a better life, have now been told that their dreams must wait.

I do not know what to tell these people. I do not know how to explain to them that this Congress did not consider their problem serious enough, or their dreams important enough, to deserve our attention.

Mr. Speaker, more than 500 of my constituents have expressed their dismay and disappointment to me. I am sure that this represents only a small percentage of those in my district who share this disappointment. And by multiplying this throughout the Nation, we get some idea of the heartbreak and letdown felt by millions of underprivileged Americans.

This Congress must not turn its back to these people, Mr. Speaker. We who have built up their hope cannot let that hope die. If we cannot reverse this action, it will forever mark the record of the 90th Congress as a failure in its ability to recognize clearly defined human needs as well as failing to seize this great opportunity to move our country ahead by helping our citizens escape the cycle of poverty and all of the crippling disabilities it carries with it.

What About Criminal Prosecution in the Napco Affair?

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to learn that the Justice Department last week initiated legal action against Napco Industries, Inc., to recover loans made to that organization in connection with a nearly \$4 million foreign aid program for India. As Members of this this body now know, the Napco-India deal is a scandalous and sorry mess, with the Napco people having bilked the American taxpayers of huge sums of money, delivering to India tons of worthless junk that was represented to be usable machine parts. The Napco affair has hardly reflected credit upon the Agency for International Development, officials of which were certainly guilty of poor judgment in the first instance and failure to supervise and oversee in the second.

As for helping India's economy—which presumably was the purpose for the deal—a shipload of junk machinery is not much of a contribution toward that end. And the whole miserable affair is

something less than a triumph in fostering Indian-American amity.

I particularly wish to salute our colleague, Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa, for his dogged pursuit of the Napco affair. Without his determination to see the scandal uncovered to the light and thoroughly scrutinized, it might have been conveniently forgotten and filed away.

The move by the Justice Department occurs in an atmosphere of continuing scandal and mismanagement in foreign aid operations. The news media in the past several days have carried a number of stories detailing wrongdoings in the Agency for International Development, some of them of flagrant character. Top AID officials have recently been implicated in kickback operations involving Belgian firms. A detailed list of foreign aid abuses was released by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT last week, notably involving Vietnam operations.

It may be that, in an organization as large as the Agency for International Development, some small amount of scandal is inevitable. But the scandal uncovered in recent months is not a little, rather it is a lot. And it does not involve merely "second-stringers," it involves important people at top management and policymaking levels. It would appear that there is need for some thorough housecleaning at AID. I welcome the action commenced by the Justice Department against Napco.

I note, however, that the action is a civil one. There are obvious indications that more than civil wrongs are involved here and I trust that Justice is also pressing for criminal charges growing out of the Napco affair. I do not think that people who set about to bilk some several million dollars from the Government of the United States should be running around loose. More appropriately, they should be in jail. I have written a letter today to the Attorney General, Mr. Ramsey Clark, asking for a report of the activities of Justice to date in connection with the Napco affair, particularly insofar as those activities point toward possible criminal prosecutions.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the article which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, February 17, under the headline "AID Sues Napco Over India Loans." I recommend it to those of my colleagues who may not have seen accounts of the latest developments regarding the odoriferous Napco deal:

AID SUES NAPCO OVER INDIA LOANS

(By John P. MacKenzie)

The Justice Department, as lawyer for the embarrassed Agency for International Development, went to court yesterday and demanded refunds and damages for more than \$3 million in defaulted foreign-aid loans that were supposed to have helped India's auto parts industry.

Charging deceit, false claims and conspiracy, the Government filed a civil suit in Detroit's Federal court against Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis.

The Napco case has caused political discomfort for prominent figures, including Vice President Humphrey, since it came to light last fall. Humphrey's former legislative counsel, Max M. Kampelman, signed the loan agreements for Napco.

Kampelman, a Washington lawyer, declined a comment yesterday, saying it would be especially inappropriate for him "as an attorney for Napco."

A Napco spokesman in Minneapolis said he believed "the issue is now where it should be, in the courts and not in the political arena. We have no doubts that we will prevail in the courts."

Rep. H. R. Gross (R-Iowa), who has sharply criticized AID and the Napco loans, said the suit "points up the lack of administration and loose administration of AID" of the sort that has plagued AID in recent days.

Misconduct charges have resulted in the resignation of four employees of AID's War on Hunger and its director, Herbert J. Waters. AID's Security Director, John G. Bradley, has been suspended after an inquiry into falsified travel vouchers.

Asked at his news conference yesterday about AID irregularities, President Johnson said the Justice Department has the issue under consideration. The State Department's inspector general also is making a "thorough study," the President said.

The civil suit was filed to recover from Napco Industries the proceeds of loans defaulted by Napco Bevel Gear of India, Ltd., a firm established by Indian businessmen to buy Napco's reconditioned manufacturing equipment for an auto parts plant near New Delhi.

To finance the purchases, Napco negotiated a \$2.3 million AID loan in 1962 on behalf of the Indian firm. The suit charged that Napco and its agents conspired to conceal the equipment's true value—near \$909,000 than the \$2.8 million claimed for it—from AID officials.

The suit said Napco suppressed a more accurate appraiser's report of the equipment's value and substituted "a different appraisal" which, the Government confessed, "was the sole such data upon which (AID) relied in approving the said loan."

Napco then "failed to deliver" the promised fully operational equipment and "flagrantly failed" to recondition it, the suit said, but instead "induced, persuaded and deluded the Indian investors" into accepting substandard deliveries.

However, AID advanced two more loans of \$840,000 each in July, 1963, and August, 1964. These loans went directly to the Indian firm for the plant there. One of the Government's five claims against Napco is for \$210,000 to recover Napco's 25 per cent guarantee of the last loan. The plant shut down last April.

Government lawyers did not specify the total refunds and damages they seek, saying the amounts depended upon evidence developed at trial.

Private Enterprise and Big Government: Friend or Foe?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged to read the text of remarks made by Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Special Programs of the Department of Transportation, at symposium for executives held at St. Mary's College in my district. The roles described for Government and for private enterprise in our system were provocatively and thoughtfully described. I include that speech as part of my remarks:

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, AT THE 11TH EXECUTIVES' SYMPOSIUM, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF CALIFORNIA, 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 35 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 break-off 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 its 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 a 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 Longshoremen'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 M. 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 marshlands 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

ski 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?"

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

Whether or not the Horatio Alger stories have had any real basis in fact, I suggest that private enterprise today 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 race or position, can prove himself on the strength of his intelligence and his ingenuity and his willingness to work.

I'd like to see private enterprise—great corporation and small business alike—lead the fight against racial discrimination. I'd like 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 unnecessary invasions of our private lives.

In this context, I commend 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 seen technological snooping devices and information-storing computer systems as potential 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.

Traditionally, private enterprise has been the innovating and inventive force in the American society. I would like to see those talents used to make the promises of opportunity more meaningful to individual Americans. 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. Look at what Aerojet-General has done in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Look at 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 systems systems people," I like to call them; the people whose formulas, if they aren't careful, will make no provision for a flash of brilliance or an admission of error. Our diversity—our heritage as a pluralistic society—may be at stake in the complex, technology-oriented world of today. I look to private enterprise as a fully appropriate guardian of that heritage.

Court Orders Disclosure of Selective Service Information

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to alert my colleagues that the Freedom of Information Act may well be the undoing of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's one-man, ill-conceived public information policy with which the selective service system has been afflicted for so many years.

Most of you are aware of the running battle my Information Subcommittee has been having with the good general about making public pertinent information about local draft board members. Time and again I have tried to impress on the Selective Service Director that the American people have a moral and lawful right to know the identity and full background of persons who serve on local draft boards and make decisions about the military service of the young men in their communities—decisions which, in many instances, literally deal with life and death.

But despite vigorous prodding, General Hershey has until now steadfastly refused to issue an unqualified directive making it mandatory to disclose a complete identification of local board members as a matter of public record.

However, as I suggested earlier, the Freedom of Information Act may force the Director to change his short-sighted policy because last week, pursuant to an action filed under the judicial review provision of the law, a U.S. district court in Pennsylvania ordered the clerk of a local draft board to disclose the names, residence address, date of birth, length of service with the Selective Service System and to give an indication of any military affiliation of the members of the local board. In addition the clerk was told to disclose the name and address of the adviser to registrants of the local board; the name and address and date of admission to the bar of the appeals agent of the local board, and to give the precise boundaries of the geographical jurisdiction of the local board. With the exception of revealing only the names of the board members, requests for the information had been previously rejected by Selective Service System officials.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. district court in Pennsylvania has rendered a milestone decision as it upholds the principle of the right of the people to be fully informed

about the business of government; it puts General Hershey on notice that his archaic information policy must be revamped, and not least it points up the efficacy of the judicial review provision which I consider to be the keystone of the Freedom of Information Act.

The decision follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania]

DWIGHT AUBREY MARTIN, 434 S. 62ND STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA v. M. NEUSCHEL, CLERK, LOCAL BOARD NO. 136, 1421 CHERRY STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA—CIVIL ACTION NO. 68-301

ORDER

And now, this 13th day of February, 1968, upon consideration of the complaint filed in this action, and after argument by counsel for the parties, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Defendant M. Neuschel, Clerk of Local Board No. 136, is ordered to disclose the following information to plaintiff in accord with his request dated December 14, 1967:

- 1) The name, residence addresses, date of birth, length of service with the Selective System and indication of any military affiliation of the members of Local Board No. 136 as of December 14, 1967.
- 2) Name and address of the Adviser to Registrants of Local Board No. 136.
- 3) Name and address, and date of admission to the Bar of the Appeals Agent of Local Board No. 136.
- 4) The precise boundaries of the geographical jurisdiction of Local Board No. 136.

By the Court:

Wood, J.

Foreign Farm Laborers

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, at the end of January, the Department of Labor once again held hearings on revising the criteria for importation of foreign farmworkers under Public Law 414.

At these hearings convincing arguments were once again presented for abolishing the importation of foreign farm laborers. Experience since the end of the bracero program has proven conclusively that American agriculture can get along well without the massive infusions of foreign laborers which were once claimed to be essential. The number of braceros admitted last year was only 6,100. There is strong evidence that even this number was unnecessary.

I am of the opinion that we should not have any imported farm laborers until we have assured all of our domestic workers of fair wages and adequate working conditions, something which we have not yet done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at the close of my remarks the statement of Mr. Michael Peevey of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, on behalf of Mr. Thomas Pitts and Mr. Cesar Chavez. These remarks were given to the Labor Department's so-called adverse effect hearings on January 31, 1968. In his remarks, Mr. Peevey announces again the position of the California Federation of

Labor opposing the importation of foreign farm laborers.

I commend this statement to the readers of this RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ON REVISING THE CRITERIA FOR IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN FARMWORKERS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 414, SAN FRANCISCO, JANUARY 31, 1968

My name is Michael Peevey and I am Research Director of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. I am appearing on behalf of Thos. L. Pitts, Secretary-Treasurer of our Federation. I am also appearing on behalf of Cesar Chavez, Director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO.

The position of the California AFL-CIO regarding the importation of temporary foreign farm labor has not changed. We oppose importation of such workers, believing it unnecessary. We took this position at similar hearings in December, 1966 and December, 1964.

During the long years that Public Law 78 existed, we maintained that there was no real shortage of domestic farm workers. At every opportunity we pointed out that massive importation of foreign farm workers acted only to severely depress domestic farm worker earnings and to compound the serious problems facing the California farm labor force.

An inkling of the adverse impact foreign importation programs have had can be gained by recognizing that 25 years ago average hourly earnings of California farm workers were about two-thirds the average hourly earnings of the state's manufacturing work force. In recent years, despite the sharp decline in the number of imported farm workers, the comparable figure hovers around 50 percent. Thus, over the last 25 years, in a relative sense at least, California's domestic farm workers have fallen farther behind their industrial counterparts. The major cause has been foreign farm worker importation programs. The best way to change this situation is to cut off, now and forever, such importation.

At this late date it should be unnecessary to point out that all California agriculture has benefited by the termination of P.L. 78. The facts speak for themselves. While the number of "braceros" certified by the U.S. Department of Labor dropped from 20,300 in 1965 to 8,600 in 1966 and 6,100 in 1967, domestic farm worker employment greatly increased. In 1966 it was more than 16,000, on an average annual basis, above the 1964 level, even though farm productivity rose rapidly. Total domestic farm worker earnings, which were \$616 million in 1964 (the last year of wholesale "bracero" importation), rose to \$739 million in 1965, to \$794 million in 1966, and will reach an estimated \$815-\$820 million in 1967. Gross farm income has also risen over the past few years. In 1964 it was below \$3.7 billion; the 1967 estimate is \$4 billion. Moreover, this nation's balance of payments position has benefited by over \$50 million a year.

It is overwhelmingly clear that domestic farm workers, growers, and small merchants in rural communities have benefited from the end of massive foreign farm worker importation. Recognizing this, and for reasons of social equity and justice, it is our strong belief that no foreign farm workers should be imported into the United States this year or in subsequent years. We believe that Public Law 414 should be amended to bar foreign farm worker importation entirely.

There is surely enough unbiased empirical evidence of the benefits to the State of California resulting from the end of massive foreign worker importation to justify such a view.

It should be pointed out, however, that the California Labor Federation recognizes that

our recommendation that no foreign farm workers be imported in 1968 and subsequent years may not prevail. For this reason, if new criteria are to be adopted, we urge they be revised to include at least the following:

1. An hourly "adverse effect" rate in California of at least \$2.25 an hour. This rate should apply regardless of whether a grower uses a piece-rate or hourly pay system. Reasons why this figure is necessary are recent sharp rises in the cost-of-living, including recognition that the cost-of-living will again increase this year, and that such increases hit low income families disproportionately hard; major advances in farm output per man-hour of which events in the California processing tomato industry are but one example; a significant increase and extension of the federal minimum wage, and the adoption in California, effective February 1, 1968, of a state minimum wage for women and minors in agriculture of \$1.65 an hour; the increases in domestic farm worker hourly earnings since the termination of P.L. 78; and last, but not least, the fact that the present adverse effect rate of \$1.60 an hour is much too low.

It should be recognized that an hourly figure of \$2.25 is more than \$1.00 less than the gross hourly earnings of production workers in California's manufacturing industry last year. It is roughly equivalent to the hourly wage paid to workers in non-agricultural industries who were employed in occupations requiring relatively little training.

In no event should the hourly adverse effect rate be set below the highest hourly wage rate arrived at through collective bargaining between California growers and the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO. Moreover, the criteria should be expanded to include provisions for working conditions and fringe benefits that exist under union contracts in California agriculture and also exist in non-agricultural jobs where skill requirements are similar to those in agriculture.

2. In particular crops, such as asparagus, dates, and Brussels sprouts, where the work is more arduous than average and where the nature of the work places demands on workers that are not found in most other crops, the hourly rate set by the Department of Labor should be at least 125 percent of the standard "adverse effect" rate. The belief in "premium pay" for jobs that are particularly arduous has long been recognized as desirable by most labor economists and manpower experts. For California, therefore, we urge a figure of at least \$2.81 be set in those crops where the work, by general recognition, is particularly arduous.

3. In addition to the establishment of a standard "adverse effect" hourly rate of \$2.25, a weekly rate should be established. The weekly figure should be set at 40 times the hourly rate because 40 hours is the standard workweek. Moreover, it is anomalous, to say the least, that when foreign farm workers enter the United States for temporary work in agriculture they are guaranteed a certain number of working hours yet domestic workers have no such guarantee.

The basic reason why a weekly, as well as an hourly, wage payment should be established is obvious. A worker's needs continue around the clock, seven days a week.

4. We also urge that the revised criteria be made applicable to Basque shepherders. For reasons that escape our comprehension, this has not been done in the past.

5. On September 12, 1967, an agreement was arrived at between the Department of Labor and California Rural Legal Assistance. Part of that agreement read as follows:

"1. An independent panel consisting of seven (7) members shall be expeditiously appointed by the undersigned regional administrator to study and examine the certification procedures and make recommendations for changes in such procedures. Three of the seven members shall be nominated by California Rural Legal Assistance."

This agreement has a direct and immediate bearing on the subject of this hearing. The California Labor Federation again urges the Department of Labor to establish this seven-member panel and have it begin deliberations. If this agreed upon panel had been appointed last September or October, this present hearing would probably be unnecessary.

We understand that the Department of Labor would also like to hear suggestions regarding a means of setting "adverse effect" wage rates by formula in order to avoid annual hearings. Hearings such as this, however, perform a number of valuable functions, including being of educational value. Therefore, we urge that the Department of Labor continue to hold such public hearings in order that all concerned parties can make their views known.

One formula which would have merit is to adopt, as policy, the position that the differential between the "adverse effect" rate and the average hourly wage in California manufacturing would disappear in time. Thus, the formula would be to set the "adverse effect" wage at approximately 70 percent of the average hourly wage in manufacturing in 1968. In 1969 it would automatically become 75 percent of the average manufacturing wage; in 1970 it would be set at 80 percent, and so forth until by 1974 the "adverse effect" wage would be equal to the average hourly wage in California manufacturing in 1974.

Another formula which might have some limited merit would be to increase the "adverse effect" wage rate each year by either 10 cents an hour (assuming a base of \$2.25 per hour) or by the over-the-year percentage increase in average hourly earnings of factory workers over the past year, whichever is greater. Percentage increases in the cost-of-living could be incorporated into this formula.

To sum up, all objective observers must agree that tremendous forward progress has occurred in California agriculture since P.L. 78 ended on December 31, 1964. It is to note the obvious to say that the last three years have truly been ones of meaningful forward progress, when compared to the previous 20. However, as we observed earlier, the relative position of domestic farm workers in California's economy today is much poorer than it was 25 years ago.

In the California AFL-CIO's view, no foreign workers will be needed to harvest California crops in 1968. We hope that the U.S. Department of Labor will agree and consequently will take steps to insure that no foreign farm workers enter California under P.L. 414 this year.

The Department of Labor, following Congress' mandate, has gone more than 90 percent of the way towards eliminating foreign farm workers from California's fields. Yet three years have passed and the final step remains to be taken. We hope that in 1968 the final step is taken. If it is, the day when farm workers, not only in California but throughout the nation, join the mainstream of American social and economic life, will be much nearer.

What Price Priorities?

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, education is both a social and economic goal for this country. We will not be able to solve the complex problems of the 20th and 21st centuries without education.

Economic studies have demonstrated the importance of education for increased productivity.

Of the three traditional factors of economic growth—capital, labor, and land—labor has become the most important. For the most part, our economy has enough land and capital but it needs the skilled workers and trained managers that can make the modern industrial state perform efficiently.

Unfortunately, this country only gradually recognizes the importance of education for all. The country has yet to commit enough of its resources to the necessary task. America still spends more for liquor, tobacco, and cosmetics than it does for educating its children.

Shortages of teachers, school facilities, books, and modern educational tools exist throughout the country. In some of our larger cities, the educational systems are trying to compensate for environmental deficiency, requiring even greater allocations of funds.

States' and cities' historical source of revenue, the property tax, is inadequate to meet the financial demands of this modern commitment to education. Recognizing the inadequacy of local sources of revenue and that education is a national concern, Congress, in such legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act, provided for Federal assistance to education. Increased Federal assistance to education is essential.

The President's budget for fiscal 1969 is, therefore, particularly disturbing to me because it represents, at best, a holding operation for education. I recognize the problem facing the President. Even assuming legislative enactment of a surtax and a series of users taxes, there will be a deficit of \$8 billion. I support the concept of users tax but since 1965 Congress has refused to authorize such taxes and may well do so again. I support tax reform in lieu of tax increase. Adding to the budgetary difficulty is the fact that there will undoubtedly be a request for a supplemental appropriation for defense.

Aware of these problems, I still question the priorities established by the budget for fiscal 1969. In terms of budget authority proposed for the major functions of the Federal Government, education rates 14th in a list of 15 major governmental functions. This is hardly the commitment to education that I think is necessary for our welfare and growth.

There is not only a slowdown on educational programs but in some cases funds originally allotted to educational programs have been reallocated to newer programs. The President plans to reallocate \$143 million from the original poverty programs. This will necessitate cuts in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps will be able to help 170,000 fewer high-school-age youngsters than it did in the last fiscal year.

Sixteen centers of Job Corps will be closed and the Headstart program will be reduced. Enrollment for Headstart classes will be reduced by 13,000.

Because of the commitments already made in some cities for summer Headstart programs, these cities' Headstart funds will be reduced as much as 24 per-

cent. I view the diminishing effect for Headstart programs as particularly tragic. Headstart has proven to be successful and has won the support of all.

While total outlays for education are placed at \$4.7 billion, which is about \$200 million over what was spent last year, this in no way indicates the reductions made in educational programs. Many educational programs were allocated funds far below their authorization. For example, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which had an authorization of \$2.6 billion, was allocated only \$1.2 billion in the President's budget. This is a little more than was spent last year under this title, but rising costs will result in less children than last year receiving benefits under this program.

Also, while \$1 billion has been authorized for higher education facilities, only \$75 million is allocated for such facilities in the budget. If cuts have to be made in the education allotment, then I approve of the priorities that were made within the educational programs. For the most part, the President has attempted to continue or increase funds for teachers training and direct aid to students while making heavy reductions in college facilities, library books, and classroom equipment. Our colleges are overcrowded and many schools have poor libraries, but the most important element of education is the student and the teacher. Hopefully, good teachers and alert students can overcome any physical inadequacy of the school.

The President proposes a reduction of about 57 percent for schoolbooks and equipment. While \$202 million was spent this year, only \$86 million will be spent in the coming fiscal year for purchases of schoolbooks, equipment, and for guidance and counseling services in college facilities. While \$450 million was appropriated for college facilities in the last fiscal year, only \$75 million is recommended for this year.

The planned reduction of Federal impact funds will not be so grave, because of the availability of the carryover funds from last year's budget. It would seem that there has been a disproportionate reduction in educational programs. I think it is time to question overall priorities established by the 1969 budget.

We will of course spend whatever is necessary for defense but not everything spent for defense is necessary. The defense allocation for fiscal 1969 is about \$79.8 billion of which \$26.3 billion represents Vietnam expenditures. Defense appropriations should be subject to a careful scrutiny to see if they achieve their stated goal in the most economical way possible.

Some \$1.1 billion is allocated for the "thin" sentinel anti-ballistic-missile system. I wonder if it is really designed or necessary to meet "the threat posed by the emerging Chinese nuclear capability." Also \$525 million is allocated for grants and credit sales of military equipment abroad. While it is in our best interest that certain countries be supplied arms, some previous military assistance have been clearly unnecessary.

The change in the political atmosphere in Europe and the emergence of strong European countries would seem to require a reconsideration of the extent of our troop commitment to Europe.

I particularly question many of the appropriations made for the Department of Transportation. While the country must undoubtedly improve its railroad system, I wonder about the necessity and urgency for increased funds for high speed railroads at this time. I also question the \$351 million allocated for the supersonic transport which is \$251 million more than was spent for this project in the last fiscal year. This was one of the biggest increases, in percentage, in the entire budget. The very need for this program is hotly debated and again, I see no need or urgency to speed up our efforts to construct this supersonic transport. I also wonder about the \$85 million allocated for highway beautification projects for fiscal year 1969. While, undoubtedly this is a worthwhile program, I believe that many educational programs which have been cut, such as Headstart, would be of more immediate benefit to the country.

The President's budget also approves two manned space programs, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program—APP—Apollo application program, and the Air Force—MOL—manned orbiting laboratory. The fiscal 1969 budget earmarks \$440 million for Apollo application program which is a 75-percent increase from last year and \$600 million for the manned orbiting laboratory which is an increase of 40 percent from last fiscal year. I see no reason, except departmental rivalry, why one of these programs cannot be eliminated.

There are some minor allocations which I also seriously question: \$425,000 allocated for the Subversive Activities Control Board which is a 33-percent increase. Considering that this Board has not done anything for many years, I hardly feel that it deserves to be rewarded with more funds.

The President also requested funds for 55,000 new civilian employees. With many Federal programs being curtailed or eliminated entirely, it would seem that Government personnel, or their salaries could be transferred to existing programs.

These are just a few of the areas and programs that I think should be carefully reviewed. It is my hope that the Appropriations Committee will subject the budget to such a review. The Appropriations Committee should hold extensive public hearings on priorities as well as on each budgetary item.

There should be a constant reevaluation of existing programs and a sustained effort to determine the effectiveness of, and the necessity for existing programs and the relation of their cost to the total budget.

Finally the entire appropriation should come to the floor of the House as one bill instead of piecemeal so that Members can make sensible choices between programs. It is ridiculous to be unable to vote funds for migrant workers because funds have already been spent for migratory birds.

Opportunity Has To Knock Hard To Get Into TWO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the very controversial Woodlawn Organization in Chicago, which has received some \$970,000 from the Federal Government through the Office of Economic Opportunity to carry on its activities.

I have been strongly opposed to this allocation of Federal funds and have said repeatedly that if TWO has a real contribution to make it ought to present its program to the Chicago Council on Urban Opportunity—as do other such organizations in Chicago.

I believe Mr. Bob Terpstra of the Chicago's American has performed a notable public service in bringing to light the operations of TWO. It is my understanding that this organization's funds expire in May and it is my sincere hope that they will not be renewed.

Many citizens have written to ask about the expenditures of their funds when organizations such as TWO conduct themselves as he describes.

The article follows:

OPPORTUNITY HAS TO KNOCK HARD TO GET INTO TWO

(By Bob Terpstra)

Opportunity knocks but once, as the saying goes.

But it had better be prepared to knock very loud or beat a business card in ahead if it wants to visit the Woodlawn Organization.

I arrived at T.W.O.'s anti-poverty program headquarters at 1204 E. 63d st. at 11:50 one morning last week and asked to watch a class of high school drop-outs receive instruction designed to help them get and keep jobs.

I was told by a receptionist in the bare but spacious ground floor office that classroom visits were only by appointment. But if I wanted, she said, I could return about 1 p.m. when a "Mr. Gibbs" could talk to me.

At 1 p.m., Gibbs was still not in, the receptionist told me. I asked if there were someone else I could see. Yes, she said, I could see a woman, but the woman wasn't in either—she "might" be back in a half hour, the receptionist added, turning back to the magazine lying on her desk.

A few minutes later, she told a young man who asked for Gibbs that he wouldn't be back until "late afternoon, about 5 p.m."

As I had, the young man asked if there were someone else he could see, and he was told he "might" be able to see a lady "about" 1:30 p.m.

SEVERAL UNDER INDICTMENTS

As we waited—I for the Gibbs due at 1 p.m., the young man for the Gibbs due at 5 p.m., both of us for the secretary who "might" arrive about 1:30—a middle-aged woman came in to see Gibbs. "Gang members" had been creating disturbances and damaging property in her neighborhood, she said, and she thought Gibbs might be interested in knowing, since she had reason to believe his teachers and/or students were involved.

The woman had a point. As director of T.W.O.'s Youth Project which employs Blackstone Rangers and Eastside Disciples gang leaders to instruct Negro youth, most

of them members of the gangs, he might be expected to show an interest in whether his project is deterring his instructors and students from criminal activity—especially in light of recent reports showing several of them under indictment for crimes.

The woman was told Gibbs wasn't in and that he'd left no word about when he would return. She was told she could attend a meeting that night where she could air her complaint. The woman wasn't too happy with the suggestion since it is generally considered unhealthy to openly cross the gangs.

"CAN'T LET JUST ANYONE WALK IN"

Shortly after the woman left, a slim youth in skin-tight pants and a flamboyant purple sweater walked out of an office at the back of the reception room. The receptionist hurried back to meet him and whispered something to him, nodding almost imperceptibly in my direction.

"What guy?" the youth asked. She nodded again in my direction, and he walked over to me.

This was Gibbs.

I explained I was a reporter for Chicago's American and wished to see a class in session. "I thought you were out," I added.

"We can't let just anybody walk in off the street and go into a classroom," Gibbs said.

I said I didn't feel I was just anybody since I was writing for a paper that was bought by a half a million persons who could be presumed to have an interest in the workings of his project.

He told me to make an appointment, that no one could visit a classroom without an appointment.

I said that would nullify the purpose of my story—to arrive unannounced at a classroom for a look at what went on during a normal classroom session. After all, close to a million dollars was being spent in one year by Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity to school 230 students and to employ 20 instructors, all of them high school dropouts.

USED FOR CARD GAMES, SAY POLICE

Police have said the classrooms were being used for card games and craps sessions. A youth was seriously wounded by a shotgun blast in a T.W.O. center a month ago. Other charges pending on instructors in Gibbs' project include murder and rape.

I repeated that I felt the public had a right to see what its money was accomplishing at T.W.O.—without first notifying Gibbs so he could arrange the classroom situation to his advantage. If Gibbs had nothing to hide, he could show me a classroom, I said.

"You don't seem to understand," Gibbs said, fixing me with a stare that would make a Blackstone Ranger turn in his switchblade. "Nobody gets into our classrooms without making an appointment first."

Why?

"I've got to program somebody to go with you into the classroom," he said.

"Most people program computers," I said. "I'm curious. Do you really program people?"

INSTRUCTORS HEARD THE KNOCK

"I don't care what other people do," he said. "I program people."

I looked around the office—at the new IBM electric typewriters quietly resting on desks, at the receptionist who'd told me Gibbs wasn't in, at Gibbs, resplendent in his tan, high-gloss, buckle shoes, his skin-tight pants, his suede-paneled purple sweater, and left.

Gibbs, the man who programs people, works for the Rev. Arthur Brazier, president of T. W. O. Brazier later defended Gibbs in his refusal to let me see a class in session. "What reporters write about this project is immaterial to me," he said.

"I let the O. E. O. worry about that," he said. "My job is to help these dropouts. Most of them are gang members, most have run afoul of the law—but studies show they

respond better to instructions from their peers than from professional teachers," he said. "We're giving them that opportunity."

For 230 students being paid \$45 a week [plus allotments for dependents] to attend class, opportunity has indeed knocked. The instructors—all of them high school dropouts—who are getting paid \$5,200 a year, and assistant instructors, getting \$3,840—have heard the knock, too.

Gibbs, who makes \$12,000, pretty good for a high school graduate, is doing all right too.

A sign outside the office, in the shadow of the Jackson Park "L" tracks, says T. W. O. is operated "for the youth of Woodlawn."

Congressman Claude Pepper Introduces H.R. 15438 To Protect America's Shoreline From Beach Erosion

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to modify certain cost-sharing authorizations of Public Law 84-826, as amended, with respect to Federal participation in the solution of shoreline erosion problems.

Flying across this continent and viewing the heavy concentration of human settlements along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Lakes, one cannot fail to grasp the significance and attraction our shoreline holds. Although we surely understand that this is one of our most valuable national assets, erosion continues to threaten existing and prospective uses that can be made of most shoreline areas.

The Senate Committee on Public Works recently published estimates which indicate that the yearly loss brought about by the normal day-to-day processes of coastal erosion is probably now costing the people of the United States well over \$50 million. This estimate is very definitely on the conservative side for only 23,000 miles of the total 94,000 miles of national shoreline have been covered in data gathering studies by the Corps of Engineers. General Woodbury has stated that there are still approximately 33,000 miles of nonrocky shoreline where the amount and significance of erosion taking place are largely unknown and undocumented.

A recent report on water resources, prepared by the National Academy of Sciences, pointed out that water for heavy industry and air conditioning is due to become scarcer in the inland reaches of this country. Thus, it can be expected that population will increasingly cluster around the Great Lakes and especially the seaside as improvement in desalination techniques enable us to obtain unlimited supplies of potable water at low cost.

Nearly 75 percent of our population now live in States bordering the oceans and Great Lakes. As the shoreline becomes more urbanized, populous, and industrialized, we surely will have to spend greater and greater amounts in restoring and maintaining the coastal environment to prevent both the normal soil

losses and excessive damage resulting from inclement weather.

This Nation's agricultural program of soil erosion control is one of our proudest conservation achievements. Established in the thirties when this country was still primarily rural in character, it was intended to fulfill the dire need of protecting our national soil bank.

In view of the major shift of population to urban areas, it is now clear that equally effective erosion controls are needed along our shoreline. Yet no national plan or coordinated program for such protection has so far been formulated.

The Corps of Engineers has revealed that the current slow pace of shore and beach protection is largely due to the lack of funding on the part of local agencies and private landowners. This defect must be remedied if we are to take advantage of the opportunity to prevent future erosion losses in advance of expanding shoreline developments. In order to move ahead as quickly as possible and with minimum bureaucratic delay, I believe the Federal Government must assume a greater share of leadership and bear a greater share of the costs involved.

At present, the costs allocated to restoration and protection of shoreline adjacent to Federal property are borne fully by the Federal Government. Federal cost participation may be up to one-half the cost of protecting shores owned by non-Federal public agencies. Protection of shores not publicly owned may be eligible for Federal cost sharing up to one-half provided there is significant public benefit arising from public use or from protection of nearby public facilities and provided such work is economically justified. The Federal participation is adjusted in accordance with the degree of such benefits.

The basic change that is necessary to launch a national shoreline protection program is contained in the bill I have introduced today. I propose that the Federal Government assume 90 percent of the cost of construction and related protection measures on all shoreline adjacent to lands held by non-Federal public agencies and private landowners.

El Paso Times Forecasts Texans for Johnson in 1968

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the El Paso Times forecasts that President Johnson will carry Texas in 1968—despite Richard Nixon's recent protestations to the contrary.

As the Times recognizes:

Texans have a tremendous amount of pride . . . to have a native son in the White House.

And well we should when he has performed as admirably as Lyndon Johnson.

President Johnson has combined a compassionate and imaginative program at home with a firm and vigorous policy abroad.

Domestically, the President has forged a program to meet the urgent needs of America. Unparalleled gains have been made in educating our children, providing health care for our elderly, rebuilding our cities, and securing the blessings of a remarkable prosperity for America.

Abroad, we have defended freedom in its hour of challenge, built bridges of friendship to the East, and extended a helping hand to the developing nations of the world.

This November when Texans go to the polls they will vote for a better tomorrow—and Lyndon Johnson.

I insert in the RECORD the El Paso Times editorial:

L. B. J. CARRY TEXAS?

Richard M. Nixon, barnstorming over Texas like a candidate, made an observation in Dallas that undoubtedly will cause considerable talk.

Nixon said that prior to coming to Texas he had been told the state "is in the bag for President Johnson in 1968 because this is his home state."

"After what I've seen and heard in San Antonio, Dallas and Houston, I'd say there is a good chance that when he opens the bag he is going to find it empty," Nixon said.

Between now and election day next November we are going to hear a great deal of speculation as to whether or not Lyndon Johnson will carry Texas.

When Sen. John Tower defeated Waggoner Carr there was talk that it really was a slap at the Johnson administration in Johnson's home state.

We don't pretend to know the answer to that. But we are of the opinion that President Johnson will carry Texas in 1968. Texans have a tremendous amount of pride. It is a source of great pride to have a native son in the White House.

That fact alone will cause some Texans to vote for LBJ even though they may not approve of his conduct in office.

Nixon was talking while in Dallas. Apparently he didn't realize that Dallas does not speak for all Texas.

Two Maryland GI's Killed in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp5c. Albert L. Betts and Cpl. Clifton D. Roy, two young soldiers from Maryland, were recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men, and to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM MORTAR ATTACKS

Two Maryland soldiers, one from Baltimore and the other from Prince Georges County, have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

They were identified as Spec. 5 Albert L. Betts, son of Mrs. Ardella Morgan, of 1901 East Lafayette avenue, Baltimore, and Cpl. Clifton D. Roy, husband of Mrs. Shelia J. Roy, of 9403 Underwood street, Seabrook, Md.

Communications Specialist Betts was killed February 2 in a mortar attack on his base camp at Quang Tri. He was assigned to 545th Signal Detachment of the 362th Signal Company.

Corporal Roy was killed in a mortar attack on the same base which took place January 31. He was a truck driver attached to the 1st Cavalry Division.

Specialist Betts, who was 26, was a 1959 graduate of Dunbar High School. He enlisted in the Army in August, 1964, and was stationed at Fort Jackson, S.C.; Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Sill, Okla., and in Korea, before being assigned to Vietnam last August.

While in school, Specialist Betts worked at the Williams Pharmacy, 1300 North Caroline street. He also worked for a year at the Stadium Pharmacy, 1645 North Wolfe street.

Besides his mother, Specialist Betts is survived by his father, William Betts Sr., a half-sister, Miss Francine Wilkins; a brother, William E. Betts, and two half-brothers, Glen Morgan and David Morgan. All live in Baltimore.

Corporal Roy, who was 19, was born in Cheverly, Md., and grew up in Hyattsville, Md. He attended DuVal High School in Glendale, Md.

He enlisted in the Army last July and took basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. He had advanced training at Fort Lewis, Wash., before being assigned to Vietnam last November.

Before joining the Army, he worked several months for a glass company in Mount Rainier, Md.

In addition to his wife, Corporal Roy is survived by a son, James C. Roy; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence E. Roy, Jr., of Hyattsville; a sister, Miss Juanita Roy of Hyattsville, and a brother, Clarence E. Roy 3d of Hyattsville.

In Tribute to Our Boy Scouts

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of participating in two Boy Scout ceremonies in my district, one, the conference of an Eagle Scout badge to Craig Randall, a member of Troop 8 of St. Cassian's Church in Upper Montclair, and the other the 50th anniversary celebration of Troop 301, Wesley Methodist Church, in Belleville.

It was refreshing indeed to participate in these programs with young men who are truly a credit to our Nation; young men whose actions manifest their integrity, their dedication to justice and freedom for all, and their deep sense of civic responsibility.

Craig Randall, the 15-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Craig E. Randall of 14 Cornell Way, Upper Montclair, who themselves have long been active in scouting activities, is an excellent student, a fine athlete, and an accomplished outdoorsman and camper. Craig started his Scouting activities in Japan, where his father was stationed as a naval officer, and has been a member of Troop 8 for 3 years. In earning the 21 merit badges requisite for attainment of the rank of Eagle Scout, Craig stands out as one of our future leaders, a young man who is a source of pride to his parents and to his community.

Although from a neighboring town,

Craig is typical of the 15 Eagle Scouts who have come from the ranks of Troop 301 of Belleville during its 50 years of service. From selling war bonds and collecting scrap metal during World War I and II to serving at blood banks, working on "get out the vote" campaigns, helping to combat forest fires, and making food baskets for the needy, Troop 301 has proved again and again its great strength and value. In fact, Troop 301 can even point with pride to a diplomatic triumph. After the troop hosted Scouts from La-Paz, Bolivia, who were en route to the World Jamboree, the Minister of Finance of Bolivia personally stopped in Belleville to thank the boys for their hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, it is a truly gratifying experience to come in contact with young men interested in improving themselves and working toward improving the lot of others, and I am delighted to call their achievements to the attention of my colleagues.

Rising Consumer Expectations

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, "Consumer Protection and the Retailer" was the subject of an important article which appeared recently in *Merchandising Week* and which shows the possibilities and the problems as the retailer faces the consumer on one side and his suppliers on the other in this area of rising consumer expectations. The article follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND THE RETAILER

On her way to becoming business' long-anticipated New Consumer, today's shopper has met a snag. Her marketplace has grown up too fast around her, creating as many purchasing pitfalls as purchasable products, and—according to the recent wave of consumer protectionist sentiment—she just isn't ready for it.

Today's consumer, in her characteristic hurry to sample new aspects of convenience and luxury, has been met by an altogether eager system of business that has long been equipped to provide a product to suit every whim, a variation for every taste, and a payment procedure tailored for every budget. What used to be her personal means of self-protection and ammunition against fraud and deception, her right of choice, has become a weighty responsibility for a consumer who, say her champions, is too often ill-equipped to make valid marketing judgments.

Someone has to make the judgments, however. So shoppers are being unionized and led by a consumer protectionist movement that is not unique in concept (protectionism appears as part of a cycle at some time during each successive peacetime economy), but is most certainly unprecedented in scope and intensity. Since President Kennedy issued his Consumers' Bill of Rights in 1962, the government has concentrated with new zeal on promoting the general welfare of consumers. And since consumers—when not busy consuming—do vote, indications are that they will continue to register support of the movement and perpetuate the drive by re-electing its leaders.

Business has become alarmed by the new fervor, and has abandoned its "This too will pass" optimism. It now envisions a 1984 society in which "Big Brothers" might be making it pay not just for its own mistakes, but for the mistakes of its customers.

The government is indeed at it again, suggests the businessman with typical *laissez-faire* leanings, and though Theodore Roosevelt's big business-busting roar has been modulated over the years to Lyndon Johnson's consumer-oriented duet with Betty Furness, the message has remained the same: the American consumer needs all the help she can get to get all she can out of American business.

Three successive Congressional sessions have worked to develop the premise that the average consumer is too often led by deceptive advertising to buy a product which, though she will be making exorbitant payments on it for at least a decade, will break down in 10 days and, in the process, cause her some form of personal harm. Now, all that is left for the upcoming second session of the 90th Congress is to decide what in the name of the Great Society to do about it.

Much to the apprehension of the business community, consumer protection has itself become big business. And in the middle of the melee stands the retailer, who can expect increased pressure from those who see basic flaws in the system within which he works. If marketing must change its role to meet the economic problems that have evolved from leaving the consumer to her own devices, then the first changes will be made at the retail level.

However, the retailer has not yet been forced to work within bounds established for him by someone else. Consumer protection guidelines are only now being set, and governmental protectionists are alert to those areas that business desires to keep under its self-regulatory roof.

By supplying his customers with complete and honestly comparative product information, for example, the retailer is filling the communications void that government feels definitely exists. Too often left to her own selective devices, the consumer has been cast in the role of an expert on all phases of product selection, even though she needs the assistance that a trained salesman can offer her. When she gets that help, when she honestly knows what to expect from her purchase and for her money, she feels that business has done its job in serving her. And her champions agree.

Her champions—those who are leading today's consumer protectionist movement—do plan some legislative action, to fill the void they see between where business has left off and where they hope it will pick up again.

Changes in the Foreign Aid Program

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to evaluate and recommend changes in the foreign aid program. The group will consist of seven Senators and seven Representatives. Membership from the Foreign Affairs Committees of both Houses would be limited to four each in order that there be a balance between specialized knowledge of existing foreign aid programs and new views as to evaluation and future course.

The resolution directs the joint committee to undertake and report a thorough reevaluation of U.S. foreign economic and military assistance programs. The study shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of the objectives and nature of such programs and the extent to which they are related to and harmonious with vital interests of the United States. The committee is directed to study the interrelationship of the departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the United States dealing with such programs and their relationship with international organizations dealing with similar activities.

Most importantly, the committee would be asked to recommend how AID programs might be improved, altered, and/or supplemented so they may be operated and administered in an efficient, effective, and economically feasible manner. Special emphasis would be placed on determining ways and means by which such programs may aid the particular country in achieving self-sustaining economic growth. Consideration would be given to methods of alleviating the effect of the cultural gap between our highly developed technological society and the social structure of the developing nations.

Between the years 1946 and 1967, foreign assistance has cost the American taxpayer \$152,533,000,000. The sums are staggering. They are incredible considering they are spent on programs about which many of us harbor substantial doubts.

I believe prompt and comprehensive action should be taken to direct our foreign aid goals to meaningful, workable, and obtainable accomplishments. A relationship must be shown between development assistance and U.S. national interests. I do not believe that Americans can continue to support aid to nations, such as that to Egypt, who are obviously antagonistic to the interests of the United States. I find unconvincing the direction to channel aid into the hands of unfriendly powers when the friendly power exists. Our foreign aid program is sorely in need of priorities.

It is sorely in need in other respects as well. I question whether AID programs are gaining the self-participation of the aided country in its own economic and governmental stability.

There is need for coordination between private and international participation in foreign aid programs and participation by our own Government organizations.

I am certain efficient procedure and programming is severely lacking. The American citizen must be assured that the channels and methods of disposition of AID funds are effective. He should not be asked to read, thus, that AID has paid \$24,000 for the purchase of ordinary sea water. He should not have to find that U.S. officials are making improper payments to contracting firms.

Daily there occur more reasons to question the use of American-aid dollars in the types of programs that are being administered in Vietnam.

An Associated Press investigating team reported last year that 20 percent of U.S.

civilian aid and Army store supplies were lost to corruption and theft in South Vietnam.

Washington sources thought the figure was too high, but conceded that losses might run 5 to 6 percent. One percent is too much.

A spokesman for AID said a recent sample audit covering \$280 million worth of goods showed that less than 1.2 percent had been diverted from its intended destination.

The entire operation of the foreign-aid program raises serious doubts as to whether the United States, at a time of vast expenditures in Vietnam and increasing and costly burdens at home, can afford to direct money into projects of dubious value, countries of dubious friendship, governments of corruption.

I urge prompt initiation of my request.

Irwin Robinson and the Right of Americans To Travel

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Travel Weekly, an outstanding publication in my district, whose editor and publisher is my constituent and friend, Irwin Robinson, has made a pertinent, lucid, and intelligent analysis of the President's proposals for possible Government restrictions on foreign travel by U.S. citizens.

It has been reprinted in the New York Times of Monday, February 19, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

SHOULD AMERICANS TRAVEL ABROAD?

(By Irwin Robinson, editor and publisher, Travel Weekly)

(NOTE.—We have heard a great deal recently about the so-called "travel gap" and about possible government restrictions on foreign travel by U.S. citizens. The purpose of this message is to dispel some of the resulting confusion and let in a few shafts of light and reason.)

THE TRUTH ABOUT "GAPOSIS"

It is as illogical to speak of a "travel gap" as of a "whisky gap". We Americans spend several hundred million dollars more for Scotch than the British spend on Kentucky bourbon. But is this cause for hand-wringing? Perhaps we should consider taking steps to narrow the "petroleum gap", the "coffee gap", the "sugar gap", the "diamond gap", the "clothing gap" or the "furniture gap". These unfavorable balances add up to a whopping \$4 billion a year.

The fact is that imbalances in specific commodities and services are inherent in—and essential to—international trade. If each country didn't have specialties in which it excelled, there wouldn't be any international trade. The whole system consists of interlocking surpluses and gaps among trading partners. You can't have the "surpluses" without the "gaps".

WE EXPORT MORE THAN WE IMPORT

Our dollar "deficits" have received so much publicity that most people believe the U.S. has an unfavorable balance of trade. This is not so. In 1967 the U.S. had a favorable overall foreign trade balance of nearly

\$4.5 billion. The balance was also in our favor in 1966, 1965—and, in fact, has been for many years.

A good part of the favorable balance comes from the very European countries that would be hardest hit by restrictions on American travel. Last year our exports to Western Europe alone exceeded our imports by more than \$2 billion. We sold to France 50% more than France sold to us. Our exports to Holland were four times as great as our imports; to Greece, three and a half times as great; and the margin in our favor over Spain was three times.

WHAT TRAVEL DOLLAR ACCOMPLISH FOR US

These countries are important tourist destinations for Americans—and the dollars that American tourists spend there are used, in turn, to buy American goods. If we choke off their source of dollars, foreign countries will have to cut down their purchases of U.S. goods. Cutting off access to American tourist income would be an economic catastrophe for many of the very countries with which we have the closest ties.

The inevitable result would be that production here at home would slow down and jobs would disappear.

Latest Department of Commerce figures show that in machinery and transportation equipment U.S. exports exceeded imports by more than \$6 billion. In electrical apparatus the surplus was \$900 million; in power generating equipment, \$650 million; in tractors and parts, \$500 million; in metalworking machinery, \$200 million. Isn't it crystal clear that without these tremendous export markets there would be fewer jobs in New York, Bridgeport, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis and countless other cities and towns from coast to coast?

Tourist dollars coming back to our shores to buy American products create jobs in New Brunswick and Rahway, N.J.—communities whose prosperity depends on several large chemical and medicinal plants. In 1966 the U.S. exported nearly \$2 billion more in such products than it imported. Thousands of jobs in Rahway, New Brunswick and other communities have been sustained by the flow of U.S. tourist dollars abroad—dollars which make it possible for many countries to buy our chemical and medicinal products.

The story is the same in Moline, Ill., known for its production of farm implements and other machinery. In 1966 the U.S. exported \$11 billion worth of machinery and transportation equipment. Tourist dollars helped make it possible for foreign countries to spend these huge amounts—and thousands of wage-earners in Moline and in many other cities and towns derived the benefit.

Take another example. Last year foreign airlines spent \$1.7 billion for American-made aircraft, services and related equipment. Since 1959 Boeing alone has sold 274 jet planes to foreign carriers worth \$1.5 billion. And right now Boeing has an export backlog of another \$1.5 billion. Approximately 25 percent of Boeing's current sales are for export.

Tourist-generated dollars play a major role in enabling the foreign airlines to feed American manufactures this enormous volume of business. Isn't it reasonable to assume that severe curtailment of American tourist expenditures abroad would cause a decline in airline orders—to the economic detriment of large segments of such states as California and Washington?

AN UNREALISTIC APPRAISAL

The balance of payments problem is so complex that even our best economists cannot agree on its dimensions and implications. Washington believes that a sharp reduction in American travel abroad would ease pressure on the dollar. But, neither the travel nor any other portion of the dollar deficit can be

treated in a vacuum, as the Administration is trying to do. Each is only one part of a tightly interwoven system—a system which has been thrown out of balance by our commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere. The danger is that, in seeking a solution by tinkering with just one component, the Administration will actually aggravate the problem.

In thinking about the current international travel situation we should note two things:

First, our Government has done very little to encourage more foreigners to visit the U.S.A. and thus help counteract the outflow of tourist dollars. Much could have been done during the past few years and, even now, should be done.

Second, it is a delusion to believe that the U.S. can succeed in stimulating tourist traffic from Europe and Asia while curtailing American travel to those crucial areas.

THE POSITIVE APPROACH

If a "travel gap" problem exists, the solution must be a positive one. The American travel industry—and its counterparts abroad—believe in two-way travel. They have already invested substantial sums in promoting travel to this country, with impressive results. But the effort must be expanded. Above all, it needs wholehearted, tangible U.S. government support.

Congress must provide the U.S. Travel Service with the resources it needs to do an effective job. In the years the "travel gap" has been widening, Western Europe has spent 15 times as much as the U.S. to promote incoming foreign travel. These countries have been eminently successful. Isn't it about time we joined in the competition?

One of the ironies of the "travel gap" problem is that this administration has consistently stressed America's economic stake in free trade. It has told Congress that protectionism is harmful to world prosperity, including our own, and warned that a single act of protectionism can trigger a vicious cycle of retaliation.

Are these principles now to be abandoned by an overt act of protectionism—a U.S. travel tariff? Are we to risk the hazards of widespread retaliation which can only damage the American economy?

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The travel industry recognizes the seriousness of the dollar imbalance and the outflow of gold. It wants to help. But it considers the proposed Treasury solution impractical, fraught with danger and unlikely to achieve the desired goal.

Congress can act in the public interest by rejecting travel restrictions and fostering the positive approach so earnestly endorsed by the people who know travel best.

The world has no need for another iron curtain—especially one "made in U.S.A."

TRAVEL WEEKLY.

The Spirit and Soul of America

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1968, Richard M. Nixon made, in my view, a very significant address in Concord, N.H. He spoke of the spirit and soul of America. In this address Mr. Nixon points out that there is something wrong when a nation possessing the material resources of the United States finds itself beset on all sides by problems, yet

seemingly incapable of effective leadership and lacking in purpose. Mr. Nixon has indeed pointed to the way out of our dilemma. Therefore, I commend his address to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY RICHARD M. NIXON, CONCORD, N.H., FEBRUARY 3, 1968

The finest hours in our nation's history have been triumphs of the American spirit.

We now are engaged in a great test of that spirit. Throughout the land, bitter conflicts are being waged between the races, between the generations, between ideologies, between advocates of lawful change and of chaotic violence.

When the leaders of a great nation lose the trust of its people, when they lose touch with its spirit, the soul of the nation is torn.

When Lyndon Johnson took office five years ago, he proclaimed the slogan: "Let us continue."

Today, five years later, President Johnson is saying to the American people: Let us continue what we have been doing for the last five years for another four years.

So the question the American people will be answering with their votes in 1968 is: Shall we continue?

The only answer is: When the strongest nation in the world can be tied down for four years in the war in Viet Nam, with no end in sight; when the richest nation in the world cannot manage its own economy; when the nation with the greatest tradition of respect for the rule of law is plagued by rampant lawlessness; when the nation that has been a symbol of human liberty is torn apart by racial strife; when the President of the United States cannot travel either at home or abroad without fear of a hostile demonstration—then it's time America had new leadership.

I don't think America can afford four more years of Lyndon Johnson in the White House.

This is not a time to continue what we have. It's a time for a new beginning.

When I say we need new leadership, I am speaking not simply of leadership able to deal with pragmatic problems like those of military strength and economic management, or of housing and jobs and education. This has to be done and it can be done. But I mean something more.

We need leadership that recognizes that the real crisis of America today is what it once had, but has lost: the lift of a driving dream.

Let us look at America now, at the start of this final third of the 20th Century. Whether peace and freedom survive in the world depends on the United States, and the great question is whether we can meet this challenge.

In a material sense, our assets are immense. Our economic strength is unquestioned, and our military strength can be whatever we choose to make it.

But in what should be our area of greatest strength, we have lost something. Back in the days when America was one of the weakest nations of the world, when this granite state was one of only thirteen, then America's ideals were more powerful than they are today. America meant more to the world. It was a symbol of liberty and hope. It was weak militarily, poor economically, but rich in its devotion to a new concept of freedom.

The tragedy is that somehow, while that concept has driven this nation higher, faster, than any nation at any time, the American idea has been losing its meaning for the world and for America.

There are two reasons: the world has changed, and America has changed.

Then we were a new nation in an old world. Now we are an old nation in a new world.

At home and abroad we must recapture the American dream.

America did not create freedom, but freedom did create America. The trouble is that we have let both the word and the concept grow stale. The word "freedom" has become a cliché, and the concept has too often been made an excuse for inaction.

If we are to restore the vitality of the American ideal, we have to bear in mind that freedom is not static. Like any other living thing, freedom has to grow to survive.

Today we live in a period of unprecedented change and growth in the world, a time when young people at home and new nations abroad are groping for new directions—and a static concept of freedom simply is not enough.

Let us dedicate ourselves not only to the preservation of freedom, but to the expansion of freedom.

The place to begin is here at home. We cannot provide an example abroad unless we set an example at home. None of the battlegrounds on which we are engaged, none of the places in which we are being tested, is more important than the ground we stand on here. For the ultimate testing-place of America is America itself.

And this is the time to begin. It's time to move on to a new freedom. The old negative freedoms—freedom from hunger, freedom from want, freedom from fear—are no longer enough. The new freedom has to mean freedom for the poor as well as the rich, freedom for black as well as for white; and it has to mean not only freedom from but freedom to. It means freedom to grow, freedom to choose, freedom to travel, freedom to create, freedom to work—and freedom to enjoy the fruits of our labors.

Let us recognize that rights have no meaning—freedom has no meaning—without the opportunity to exercise those rights and to use that freedom.

For most of us in America, the American Revolution has been won and the American dream achieved. But there are millions for whom the dream has been an unreachable vision.

The prophets of despair, the peddlers of hate, would have those millions believe that by taking up arms—whether literally or figuratively, or both—they can destroy a society that they see only in fragments, of which they see only the underside and not its promise or its glory.

They have to be persuaded, first, that they cannot—and they cannot.

But, second, they have to be shown the other side of that society, and they have to be shown it as a reality, which they can attain.

It has not been so. Let us begin by confessing that fact.

It must become so. Let us proceed by accepting that commitment.

How do we do this?

We do it, first, by turning the power of freedom to the uses of freedom.

The question today is not whether we provide food for the hungry, homes for the ill-housed, jobs for the jobless. The question is how.

And here we have one of the great, fundamental issues which the people will decide with their votes in November. The Johnson Administration's approach to every problem is to begin with government. Ours is to begin with people. The trouble with their approach is that it has failed. What they forget is that what has made America great as not been what government has done for people, but what people have done for themselves.

The choice we face today, very simply, is this: Do we continue down a road that leads to big government and little people? Or do we take a new road, one that taps the energies of the greatest engine of productivity the world has ever seen—the engine of American industry and American private enterprise?

I say we take this new road.

This means providing tax credit and other incentives for business to go where the need is, and to do efficiently what government now does so inefficiently.

Let me be very precise: I am not saying that government is the enemy. After all, it's our government; it belongs to the people. It has a role to play. But government alone simply is not capable of doing the job that needs to be done. And even more importantly, it's not capable of giving fire to the spirit and life to the dream.

Government would be capable if all we cared about were the old freedoms from. But it fails because it stunts the new freedoms to.

Whenever a new government program is proposed, there is one test that we should apply. Does it limit freedom? Or does it expand it?

There are those who say that there's nothing new about relying more on private enterprise. After all, American business is older than the American government. But what is new is both the capacity and the will of private enterprise to do the job. During this past third of a century, while we've been loading more and more onto the shoulders of government, private enterprise has been undergoing a quiet revolution. Its leaders have developed a social conscience far beyond anything the leaders of the 20's or the 30's would have recognized. And at the same time, technology has thrown wide the windows of the possible. It's private enterprise, not government, that has been turning the wonders of science to the service of man. The American system of private enterprise is the greatest instrument of change and of progress the world has ever known. And the skills and the resources it now commands are those that we need if the new freedoms are to be made a living reality for all of our people.

And it's use of free private enterprise that can provide for all of us an opportunity to participate in this great adventure.

There's another thing we need if we're to make our freedoms real. We need the civil order that makes freedom possible. We need the rule of law to sustain the light of hope, and the light of hope to sustain the rule of law.

This above all is itself a matter of the spirit—the spirit of justice, the spirit of law, the spirit of reconciliation. And this must come from our national leadership.

To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit.

To the young people of America today, I say this: it's true that you are inheriting a world you never made. But this was also true of every generation. The great, exciting difference is that you live in a world you can change.

Never has it mattered so much in the world what the people of one nation do—the choices they make—the vision they hold out.

It's our chance today, and your chance tomorrow, to give a new dimension to the American dream, a dimension which can change America to enable America to help change the world.

As we make the American ideal of freedom come true here at home, America will be able, by its example, to help bring a new freedom abroad—a freedom powered not by the force of arms, but by the power of ideas and the force of example.

The world is waiting for that kind of a message, for that kind of an idea, for that kind of action. For it has become a world of young nations, and young people, tired of the old isms, wanting the material things of life but also wanting something more.

That something more is what America has always meant to the world. And, if America is to heal its spirit and find its soul again, that something more is what America needs today.

Ramsey Clark—A Great Attorney General**HON. EMANUEL CELLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Quinn Tamm, one of the most respected names in law enforcement, is quoted by the Associated Press as saying Ramsey Clark "is more interested in helping local law enforcement than any Attorney General I have known."

This is an impressive tribute to Ramsey Clark. For Mr. Tamm, in 26 years with the FBI and 8 with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has known 18 Attorneys General.

The Associated Press story, carried in newspapers on February 18, reports on Mr. Clark's fight against crime. I include the entire article in the RECORD:

RAMSEY CLARK—A GREAT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Attorney General Ramsey Clark, the man President Johnson has chosen to direct the Federal effort against crime, warns that the growing number of acts of civil disobedience are irresponsible, intolerable "and cannot be permitted."

Clark made the remarks during an interview centering on questions concerning Dr. Martin Luther King's plan to bring thousands of impoverished Negroes to Washington in April to demonstrate for jobs.

It was probably Clark's toughest public statement, and comes from the man upon whose shoulders Johnson has placed two of his biggest and politically most dangerous burdens: an increasing crime rate and big city disturbances.

King has promised nonviolent, peaceful law-abiding demonstrations. But he has said they will "escalate to disruptive proportions if Congress doesn't help the needy."

In the interview, Clark said, "It's clear that any disruption of the activities of this city or any part of this city, or any office of this government, or any of its branches is intolerable and cannot be permitted."

Clark's role in crime fighting has brought him unusually close—at least for an Attorney General—to local police departments. He continually emphasizes that law enforcement primarily is a local responsibility, and the Administration's safe-streets bill is, in Clark's view, the principal Federal anticrime effort.

Clark would not place a priority for action against any particular type of crime, saying these priorities would vary from city to city. But at the Federal level where the Government can take direct action, he placed top emphasis on organized crime, and second, drugs.

"Organized crime tends to be interstate and therefore means the inability of local law enforcement to cope with it," he said.

Clark emphasized the need for drug control because "the major activity in drugs centers around youth attitudes and permissiveness. Kids don't distinguish, and if they're looking for kicks, maybe they'll try marijuana, maybe LSD, maybe something else."

He believes that if young people "are exposed to marijuana, they're probably exposed to dangerous drugs and society has a highly important stake in these drugs."

"If we've learned anything about drugs in the past few years, we've learned drugs can be very harmful."

Johnson for months has pushed Clark further into tougher, more sensitive areas. Last October it was Clark who organized Federal forces at the Pentagon during a mas-

sive antiwar demonstration in which about 35,000 persons took part.

Clark is chief Administration spokesman for the newly proposed antiriot law and for a variety of civil rights legislation.

One of the Johnson Cabinet's most liberal members, Clark is highly thought of by many of the officials with whom he most wants to work—the nation's police chiefs. Quinn Tamm, head of the influential International Association of Chiefs of Police, says Clark "is more interested in helping local law enforcement than any Attorney General I have known." Tamm says he has known eighteen.

But Clark's continued strong stand against wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping and his favorable views on recent Supreme Court decisions conflict with the views of most police officials.

H.R. 15439, a Bill To Freeze the Medicare Premiums**HON. CLAUDE PEPPER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, just last month Congress enacted a benefit increase for the almost 24 million Americans who receive a social security check each month. These increases ranged from 13 to 25 percent and they will show up in the checks for February which these people will receive about March 3. This increase is not enough, but it is desperately needed, especially by the millions of older people who depend primarily on their social security checks to meet their bills every day.

But what the older people of this country have not been told yet, Mr. Speaker, is the decrease which will be made in their checks which are sent out on April 3. The nearly 18 million aged who participate in the part B program of medicare will have an additional dollar deducted from their checks beginning with that month. This will bring the total deduction to \$4 a month. This may sound like a small amount to some people, but to retired people trying to stretch fixed incomes eroded by inflation this is not a small amount.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this additional deduction reduces the increase we just passed by almost 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we must take action now to avoid this situation. We should not expect the older people of this country to bear the burden of the runaway inflation in the medical services area. To meet this problem, I am, today, introducing a bill to freeze the social security pensioner's share of the part B premium at the present \$3. I urge all Members of the House to support this important legislation and to take immediate action so that when the third of April comes around 18 million older people will not see the benefit increase which they received the month before, and which was delayed so long; decreased by a dollar.

Moreover, it is very likely that the premium will be increased again next year and that, too, will have to come out of the benefit increase which will be effective with the March checks. Let me point out, also, that older people have

until April 1, 1968, to decide whether to sign up for this program, if they had not already signed up. Since the premium has gone up by one-third, and shows signs of going up further next year, many older people may come to the conclusion that they just cannot afford the program. To the extent that this is the case, medicare coverage of doctors' fees will be an empty promise.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I urge widespread and immediate support of my bill to freeze the present \$3 figure. The aged of this country just cannot afford any more than that.

Task Force on Western Alliances**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 90th Congress just past, 15 Republican Congressmen supplemented their daily assigned legislative duties with the study of U.S. foreign policy on matters affecting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization of American States. These Congressmen, as members of the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances, expressed their conclusions and recommendations in published statements. The committee was organized under the auspices of the House Republican Conference Committee on Planning and Research. In the future the committee will be called a Task Force.

In all, 14 statements were issued.

The studies revealed that the administration, at best, has been callous in its treatment of U.S. allies. In its dealings with NATO, the United States seems bent on sacrificing the needs and interests of its trusted friends in the hope of reaching an arrangement of dubious value with the Soviet Union.

All this generated a lack of confidence in the aims and aspirations of the United States, and because of it the administration has failed to inspire cooperation so that the resources of these allies could be used to strengthen the entire free world community.

A summary of our most significant statements follows:

On April 6, the committee traced the controversy over the Latin American resolution to the President's attempt to turn Congress into a rubberstamp by forcing hasty action on an ambiguous resolution overemphasizing money. This—not attitudes toward the Latin American allies—motivated dissent.

The committee expressed hope that Latin American economic integration and social achievement would progress. In this context, it suggested that the United States be prepared to encourage and assist the Latin American countries to set up a common market—without proposing or foreclosing U.S. participation. This could be done without altering hopes for broadening the world trade community.

It concluded by urging that a healthy

environment for private foreign investment be created in Latin America and that the channels and institutions for multilateral assistance be strengthened.

On April 21, the committee demanded congressional open hearings on questions raised by the proposed nuclear nonproliferation treaty. These hearings would seek answers and encourage debate on questions such as the foreclosing of NATO-wide cooperation in nuclear technology and defense, and the credibility of the U.S. commitment to NATO if also obligated to defend many other nations against nuclear attack. These matters would be difficult to explore after the treaty is presented for ratification.

On May 19 the committee urged President Johnson to reaffirm the United States' "NATO commitment to Greece" while at the same time expressing hope for an early return to constitutional processes there. This initiative would help repair the damage done by a qualification of our NATO commitment to Turkey during the Cyprus crisis of 1964.

Both of these episodes—the Turkish threat to invade Cyprus in 1964 to protect its former nationals, and the recent military takeover of the Greek Government—reveal an organic weakness in the structure of NATO. As so clearly stated in the official NATO handbook—1965 edition—"The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was not established to defend geographically homogeneous territory but was established primarily to defend a way of life."

The committee expressed hope that the group recently created by the North Atlantic Council to make a thorough study of the Alliance would give this its careful attention.

On June 11, the committee recommended immediate action to establish a North Atlantic Assembly and give it official status in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This would improve exchange of ideas and contribute to the solidarity of the Alliance. In so doing, the committee recounted the many efforts to accomplish this since 1953.

On June 29 the committee asserted that the United States must avoid a "Suez-like disaster in Central America" and must not, by hasty action on new treaties, allow subversive communism to flourish.

On July 5, after assessing the results of the nonproliferation treaty negotiations, our committee suggested that the best course of action might be to withdraw the treaty and start anew. This would strengthen NATO by utilizing it as the forum in which terms of the treaty would be determined before further consultation with the Soviets.

The committee also took this occasion to urge closing—in collaboration with the NATO allies—of the ABM gap.

On June 13, July 5, and August 14, the committee issued a series of statements that formed an in-depth examination of the NATO alliance. The committee explored attitudes, reviewed past action and then put forward a far-reaching program for revitalizing the alliance. The study showed that the alliance was rapidly deteriorating and that bold imaginative

steps were needed to infuse it with new life.

In the June 13 statement, the committee noted that political realities have changed since NATO's inception. Europe has prospered and the Soviet military threat has taken a subtle form. The statement emphasized that the United States must reconcile the move toward detente and closer East-West relations with a strong, reliable NATO. This can be done only through joint discussion, decision and coordination of action. There must be a recognition by the United States that regardless of its commitments in other parts of the world, NATO is still paramount to the U.S. interest.

On July 5, we issued a statement documenting actions which contributed to the deterioration of NATO. The record included the unilateral and abrupt strategy change of the United States from "massive retaliation" to "flexible response"; the inability of the United States to harmonize Western policy toward Africa and Asia; the abortive Skybolt project; dislodgment of U.S. missiles in Turkey; and the MFL and other acts reflecting U.S. indifference to NATO.

On August 14, the committee presented constructive alternatives that could give new meaning to the alliance. These were—

To establish a NATO Strategy Council to give Europe a genuine role in determining NATO defense policy and nuclear deterrence.

To revitalize the NATO Council as the principal instrument for allied political decisionmaking.

To broaden the Council's responsibility to include more matters of common interest; for example, East-West trade, disarmament.

To revise NATO targets, quotas, and force levels.

To attempt to harmonize defense policies and budgets.

To consider more equitable distribution of NATO command positions.

To grant official status to the North Atlantic Assembly.

To set up machinery for the collection and review of intelligence material.

To clarify U.S. nuclear defense policy toward Europe.

The overall objective should be to make NATO a relevant instrument for inter-allied accommodation and decision.

On August 21 the Committee released a comprehensive analysis on the renegotiation of the Panama Canal Treaty concluding that approval of new treaties was premature.

The Committee deplored the secrecy surrounding the proposed treaties and recommended that before consideration be given to the treaty, the final report of the study commission should be issued with full public disclosure of all proposals of the negotiators. This would allow for intelligent public dialog on the issue.

The study included a history of the canal from 1850 to the present, excerpts from unofficial copies of the proposed treaties, and opinions of prominent leaders and groups.

On November 6, the committee recommended that the United States fully explore with NATO allies the possibility of

a NATO ABM system, warning that pressing ahead with a "thin" system without NATO consultation could rupture the alliance. To prevent this calamity it is essential that the United States seek to share with its allies the development of a NATO ABM system serving the entire community on the basis of cooperative funding and construction.

In addition to the statements, the committee conferred with former President Eisenhower at Gettysburg and with Secretary Rusk at the Department of State. The chairman also served as a U.S. delegate to the North Atlantic Assembly.

Members of the committee were Representative PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois, chairman, and Representatives E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana; WILLIAM O. COWGER, of Kentucky; WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida; MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; SHERMAN P. LLOYD, of Utah; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; WILLIAM V. ROTH, of Delaware; HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr., of Ohio, and LARRY WINN, Jr., of Kansas. The committee is indebted to the staff members of various congressional offices and committees who provided valuable research and other assistance. These include Everett Bierman, Harold Eberle, Robert Gaston, Stanley Langland, Pierre Purves, William Reisinger, Bill van den Toorn and Don Zahn. Col. John Mathews and Gail Werner served as the committee staff.

Grumman Leads the Way

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, much is said but too little is done to bring disadvantaged persons into the mainstream of our economy through the provision of good jobs.

Recently on Long Island lip service was traded for real service as Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., located in my district, took to the road. Grumman took to the road to recruit employees from predominately Negro communities. As is the pattern throughout the country the incidence of unemployment is higher in these communities than on the rest of Long Island.

I wish to commend Grumman for this fine program that demonstrates a sense of public responsibility combined with a commitment to true equal opportunity.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the January 31 issue of Newsday commending Grumman for this giant step forward:

Equal opportunity is a pleasant slogan, and the law requires it, but it takes more than a slogan to convince deprived Negroes that they can fill jobs in industry. Someone has to seek them out.

In this area, the initiative has been shared by the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.

with Koppers Corp., a Farmingdale firm. Grumman on Saturday will send recruiters to Wyandanch and North Amityville, both predominantly Negro communities. The purpose is to provide unskilled workers and trainees with about 75 jobs starting at \$2 per hour. Koppers already has undertaken a similar program.

The recruitment program of both firms is a hopeful sign. Other big companies should follow suit to draw in Negroes, Puerto Ricans and underprivileged whites who from lack of information draw back from applying for jobs.

Legislation To Aid Potato Growers

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, my district lies in California's San Joaquin Valley, one of the most fertile areas in the world. One of our most important crops is potatoes.

The potato growers of California have joined with their counterparts across the Nation in deciding that it is time to aggressively promote the virtues of their nutritious, low-calorie crop.

I have filed a bill, H.R. 15197, to enable the potato growers in every State to join together to finance a coordinated research and promotion program to expand their market. Such a voluntary program to improve the competitive position of the potato grower is in the best tradition of our free enterprise system. I hope that we will be able to give this matter our prompt consideration.

I insert this bill at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 15197

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

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Potatoes are a basic food in the United States. They are produced by many individual potato growers in every State in the United States. In 1966, there were one million four hundred and ninety-seven thousand acres of cropland in the United States devoted to the production of potatoes. Approximately two hundred and seventy-five million hundredweight of potatoes have been produced annually during the past five years with an estimated sales value to the potato producers of \$561,000,000.

Potatoes and potato products move, in a large part, in the channels of interstate commerce, and potatoes which do not move in such channels directly burden or affect interstate commerce in potatoes and potato products. All potatoes produced in the United States are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in potatoes and potato products.

The maintenance and expansion of existing potato markets and the development of new or improved markets are vital to the welfare of potato growers and those concerned with marketing, using, and processing potatoes as well as the general economic welfare of the Nation.

Therefore, it is the declared policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Act that it is essential in the public interest, through the exercise of the powers provided herein, to

authorize the establishment of an orderly procedure for the financing, through adequate assessments on all potatoes harvested in the United States for commercial use, and the carrying out of an effective and continuous coordinated program of research and development, or advertising and promotion designed to strengthen potatoes' competitive position, and to maintain and expand domestic and foreign markets for potatoes produced in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other entity.

(c) The term "potatoes" means all varieties of Irish potatoes grown by producers in the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States.

(d) The term "handler" means any person who handles potatoes except a common or contract carrier of potatoes owned by another person.

(e) The term "handle" means to transport or sell potatoes or otherwise place potatoes in the current of commerce; except that the sale of unharvested potatoes and the transfer or delivery of potatoes from the farm on which they are produced to a temporary storage facility, packing shed, or processing plant shall not be considered handling.

(f) The term "producer" means any person engaged in the growing of five or more acres of potatoes.

(g) The term "promotion" means any action taken by the National Potato Promotion Board, pursuant to this Act, to present a favorable image for potatoes to the public with the express intent of improving their competitive positions and stimulating sales of potatoes and shall include, but shall not be limited to, paid advertising.

AUTHORITY TO ISSUE A PLAN

SEC. 4. to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, the Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, issue and from time to time amend, orders applicable to persons engaged in the handling of potatoes (hereinafter referred to as handlers) and shall have authority to issue orders authorizing the collection of assessments on potatoes handled under the provisions of this Act, and to authorize the use of such funds to provide research, development, advertising and promotion of potatoes in a manner prescribed in this Act. Any order issued by the Secretary under this Act shall hereinafter in this Act be referred to as a "plan". Any such plan shall be applicable to potatoes produced in the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States.

NOTICE AND HEARING

SEC. 5. When sufficient evidence is presented to the Secretary by potato producers, or whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that a plan will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, he shall give due notice and opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed plan. Such hearing may be requested by potato producers or by any other interested person or persons, including the Secretary, when the request for such hearing is accompanied by a proposal for a plan.

FINDING AND ISSUANCE OF A PLAN

SEC. 6. After notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary shall issue a plan if he finds, and sets forth in such plan, upon the evidence introduced at such hearing, that the issuance of such plan and all the terms and conditions or modifications thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to make such regulations with the force and effect of law, as may be necessary to carry out the

provisions of this Act and the powers vested in him by this Act.

REQUIRED TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 8. Any plan issued pursuant to this Act shall contain the following terms and conditions:

(a) Providing for the establishment by the Secretary of a National Potato Promotion Board (hereinafter referred to as "the board") and for defining its powers and duties, which shall include powers—

(1) to administer such plan in accordance with its terms and conditions;

(2) to make rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and conditions of such plan;

(3) to receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary complaints of violations of

(4) to recommend to the Secretary amendments to such plan.

(b) Providing that the board shall be composed of representatives of producers selected by the Secretary from nominations made by producers in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. In the event producers fail to select nominees for appointment to the board, the Secretary shall appoint producers on the basis of representation provided for in such plan.

(c) Providing that board members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in performing their duties as members of the board.

(d) Providing that the board shall prepare and submit to the Secretary for his approval a budget, on a fiscal period basis, of its anticipated expenses and disbursements in the administration of the plan, including probable costs of research, development, advertising, and promotion.

(e) Providing that the board shall recommend to the Secretary and the Secretary shall fix the assessment rate required for such costs as may be incurred pursuant to subsection (d) of this section; but in no event shall the assessment rate exceed 1 cent per one hundred pounds of potatoes handled.

(f) Providing that—

(1) funds collected by the board shall be used for research, development, advertising, or promotion of potatoes and potato products and such other expenses for the administration, maintenance, and functioning of the board as may be authorized by the Secretary;

(2) no advertising or sales promotion program shall make any reference to private brand names or use false or unwarranted claims in behalf of potatoes of their products or false or unwarranted statements with respect to the attributes or use of any competing products; and

(3) no funds collected by the board shall in any manner be used for the purpose of influencing governmental policy or action.

(g) Providing that, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, any potato producer against whose potatoes any assessment is made and collected under authority of this Act and who is not in favor of supporting the promotion program as provided for under this Act shall have the right to demand and receive from the board a refund of such assessment: *Provided*, That such demand shall be made by such producer as prescribed by the board and approved by the Secretary, and upon proof satisfactory to the board that such assessment, for which refund is sought, was deducted from settlement on such producer's potatoes or was otherwise paid by him.

(h) Providing that the board shall, subject to the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of this section, develop and submit to the Secretary for his approval any advertising or sales promotion or research and development plans or projects, and that any such plan or project must be approved by the Secretary before becoming effective.

(i) Providing the board with authority to enter into contracts or agreements, with the approval of the Secretary, for the development and carrying out of research and development projects or promotion and advertising activities and the payment of the cost thereof with funds collected pursuant to this Act.

(j) Providing that the board shall maintain books and records and prepare and submit to the Secretary such reports from time to time as may be prescribed for appropriate accounting with respect to the receipt and disbursement of funds entrusted to it and cause a complete audit report to be submitted to the Secretary at the end of each fiscal period.

(k) Providing that the board shall report to the Secretary unpaid assessments after diligent effort has been made by the board to collect such assessments.

PERMISSIVE TERMS IN PLANS

SEC. 9. Any plan issued pursuant to this Act may contain one or more of the following terms and conditions:

(a) Providing authority to exempt from the provisions of the plan potatoes used for nonfood uses, and authority for the board to require satisfactory safeguards against improper use of such exemptions.

(b) Providing for authority to designate different handler payment and reporting schedules to recognize differences in marketing practices and procedures utilized in different production areas.

(c) Providing for the establishment, issuance, effectuation, and administration of appropriate programs or projects for the advertising and sales promotion of potatoes and potato products and for the disbursement of necessary funds for such purposes: *Provided, however,* That any such program or project shall be directed toward increasing the general demand for potatoes and potato products: *And provided further,* That such promotional activities shall comply with the provisions of section 6(f) of this Act.

(d) Providing for establishing and carrying on research and development projects and studies to the end that the marketing and utilization of potatoes may be encouraged, expanded, improved, or made more efficient, and for the disbursement of necessary funds for such purposes.

(e) Providing for authority to accumulate reserve funds from assessments collected pursuant to this Act, to permit an effective and continuous coordinated program of research and development or advertising and promotion in years when the production and assessment income may be reduced: *Provided,* That the total reserve fund does not exceed the amount budgeted for two years' operation.

(f) Providing for authority to use funds collected herein, with the approval of the Secretary, for the development and expansion of potato and potato product sales in foreign markets.

(g) Terms and conditions incidental to and not inconsistent with the terms and conditions specified in this Act and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of such plan.

ASSESSMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) The first handler of potatoes shall be responsible, under the provisions of this Act and any plan issued pursuant to it, for payment to the board of any assessments levied on potatoes; and such handler may collect from any producer or deduct from the proceeds paid to any producer, on whose potatoes such assessment is made, any such assessment required to be paid by such handler. Such handler shall maintain a separate record with respect to each producer for whom potatoes were handled, and such records shall indicate the total quantity of potatoes handled by him including those handled for producers and for himself, shall indicate the total quantity of potatoes han-

dled by him which are included under the terms of a plan as well as those which are exempt under such plan, and shall indicate such other information as may be prescribed by the board.

(b) Handlers responsible for collection of assessments under subsection (a) of this section shall maintain and make available for inspection by the Secretary such books and records as required by the plan and file reports at the times, in the manner, and having the content prescribed by the plan, to the end that information and data shall be made available to the board and to the Secretary which is appropriate or necessary to the effectuation, administration, or enforcement of this Act or of any plan or regulation issued pursuant to this Act.

(c) All information obtained pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section and section 14 shall be kept confidential by all officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture and of the board, and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed by them, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary, or to which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the plan with reference to which the information to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit—

(1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of handlers subject to a plan if such statements do not identify the information furnished by any person, or

(2) the publication by direction of the Secretary of the name of any person violating any plan together with a statement of the particular provisions of the plan violated by such person.

Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this subsection shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, and shall be removed from office.

PETITION AND REVIEW

SEC. 11. (a) Any person subject to a plan may file a written petition with the Secretary, stating that such plan or any provision of such plan or any obligation imposed in connection therewith is not in accordance with law and praying for a modification thereof or to be exempted therefrom. He shall thereupon be given an opportunity for a hearing upon such petition, in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary. After such hearing, the Secretary shall make a ruling upon the prayer of such petition which shall be final, if in accordance with law.

(b) The district courts of the United States in any district in which such person is an inhabitant, or has his principal place of business, are hereby vested with jurisdiction to review such ruling: *Provided,* That a complaint for that purpose is filed within twenty days from the date of the entry of such ruling. Service of process in such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the complaint. If the court determines that such ruling is not in accordance with law it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (1) to make such ruling as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (2) to take such further proceedings as, in its opinion, the law requires. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not impede, hinder, or delay the United States or the Secretary from obtaining relief pursuant to section 12(a) of this Act.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 12. (a) The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain any person from violating any

plan or regulation made or issued pursuant to this Act.

(b) Any handler who willfully violates any provisions of any plan issued by the Secretary under this Act, or who willfully fails or refuses to remit any assessment or fee duly required of him thereunder shall be subject to criminal prosecution and shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$1,000 for each such offense which shall accrue to the United States and in addition shall be subject to civil suit brought by the United States to collect any unpaid assessments levied under this Act.

INVESTIGATION AND POWER TO SUBPOENA

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary may make such investigations as he deems necessary for the effective carrying out of his responsibilities under this Act or to determine whether a handler or any other person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices, which constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued under this Act. For the purpose of any such investigation, the Secretary is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, and documents which are relevant to the inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of any such records may be required from any place in the United States. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to, any person, including a handler, the Secretary may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; and such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Secretary, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(b) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, and documents before the Secretary, or in obedience to the subpoena of the Secretary, or in any cause or proceeding, criminal or otherwise, based upon, or growing out of any alleged violation of this Act, or of any plan, or rule or regulation issued thereunder on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, except that any individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

REQUIREMENT OF REFERENDUM

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of potatoes for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of a plan is approved or favored by producers. No plan issued pursuant to this Act shall be effective unless the Secretary determines that the issuance of such plan is approved or favored by not less than two-thirds of the producers voting in such referendum, or by the producers of not less than two-thirds of the potatoes produced during the representative period by

producers voting in such referendum. The ballots and other information or reports which reveal or tend to reveal the vote of any producer or his production of potatoes shall be held strictly confidential and shall not be disclosed. Any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture violating the provisions hereof shall upon conviction be subject to the penalties provided in paragraph 10(c) above.

SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF PLANS

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary shall, whenever he finds that a plan or any provision thereof, obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, terminate or suspend the operation of such plan or such provision thereof.

(b) The Secretary may conduct a referendum at any time and shall hold a referendum on request of the board or of 10 per centum or more of the potato producers to determine if potato producers favor the termination or suspension of the plan, and he shall terminate or suspend such plan at the end of the marketing year whenever he determines that such suspension or termination is favored by a majority of those voting in a referendum, and who produce more than 50 per centum of the volume of the potatoes produced by the potato producers voting in the referendum.

AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

SEC. 16. The provisions of this Act applicable to plans shall be applicable to amendments to plans.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 18. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; but no funds so appropriated shall be used for the payment of any expenses or expenditures of the board in administering any provision of any plan issued under authority of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 19. This Act shall take effect upon enactment and may be cited as the Potato Research and Promotion Act.

If This Is Victory

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Vietnam have raised serious questions regarding the effects our military efforts are having, the capacity and willingness of South Vietnam to defend herself, and the future of that nation once the fighting ceases.

These issues were analyzed in a penetrating and perceptive column in today's New York Times by Washington bureau chief Tom Wicker. I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues, for these questions are of burning importance to all of us in Congress and to the American people:

IN THE NATION: FIREPOWER VERSUS SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The sad truth of Vietnam has seldom been clearer than it is

in the decision by the American military command to "use all the firepower needed" to root Communist forces out of Hue and other Vietnamese cities.

So, as The Associated Press describes the situation, "Heavy bombs, aircraft rockets, naval gunfire, napalm, tear gas and all the usual ground weapons from eight-inch howitzers to tank guns" are being used in heavily populated city areas and—in Hue—against the historic inner city Citadel, from which Vietnamese imperial governments once ruled.

MISERY COMPOUNDED

American military men are not happy about this; they know the result is bound to be thousands upon thousands of homeless refugees adding to the limitless weight of human misery in Vietnam, as well as rising totals of civilian dead and wounded.

"It is a terrible thing to have to do, but we have to do it," a marine officer said of the decision to use "all the firepower needed" against parts of Hue held by the North Vietnamese.

There appear to be two reasons why that officer and his superiors believe they "have to do it." The first is a shortage of manpower in the area around Hue and in the northern provinces generally, a shortage mostly due to the opposing concentrations of forces at Khesanh. This manpower shortage means that the Americans and South Vietnamese cannot root out the North Vietnamese and Vietcong invaders without heavy dependence upon the sheer destructive force of American firepower.

The second reason is that nothing less than victory, in these situations, is considered acceptable. "We could not permit them to believe that they could seize populated areas and escape our firepower," an American official explained. If they could do that, they would obviously take advantage of the opportunity.

This is not, therefore, a mindless unleashing of violence by American soldiers; it is what they see as a necessary evil, and one in which the dreadfully militaristic South Vietnamese Government concurs fully.

But if the situation is viewed in something other than military terms, it appears quite different. How is the Saigon Government, for instance, ever going to win the "hearts and minds" of its people if it not only approves the American destruction of South Vietnamese cities but—according to press reports—actually wants the Americans to do the job more quickly with even more firepower?

A SAD COMMENTARY

What kind of a commentary upon this extraordinary "Government," and upon the years of American assistance, is it if the insurgents not only can seize these urban areas by surprise, but can hold them with such desperate and deadly tenacity that the only alternative is to destroy the cities themselves?

Even if the destruction of their homes, businesses and treasured places fills South Vietnamese hearts with gratitude toward Saigon, have the authorities in that city or their American supporters shown any ability to cope with the thousands of refugees, the wounded, the sick and the helpless, who existed in South Vietnam even before the Vietcong winter offensive began in the cities?

The inescapable facts are that the South Vietnamese Government and its American ally were unable to protect the cities and their populations to begin with. When the attacks came, they proved unable to overcome them without the destruction of whole areas and the mass production of dead and homeless civilians. And when all the firepower has done its deadly work, neither Saigon nor Washington will be anywhere near able to take care of the human tide of misery and despair that will be the result.

IF THIS BE VICTORY

If this is a victory for Saigon, a defeat would be too terrible to behold. If this is what President Johnson demands that Americans stand and fight for, what heartbreaking tragedy must happen before he realizes that fighting alone cannot vindicate his policy?

The sad and terrible truth of the decision to blow up South Vietnam's cities in order to defend them is that neither Washington nor Saigon has anything to rely on but firepower. With that, they can destroy South Vietnam, but they can never save it from Communism, or anything else.

National Conference of Christians and Jews Honors H. E. S. Reeves

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, each year, the National Conference of Christians and Jews selects a citizen of Miami, Fla., to receive the Special Brotherhood Award for outstanding civic and humanitarian achievements. This year's award recipient is Mr. H. E. S. Reeves, editor of the Miami Times. The conference chose wisely indeed in recognizing such an exceptional citizen and fine individual.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following news article about Mr. Reeves and his accomplishments. I know that you will join with me in saluting the career of an outstanding civic leader:

BROTHERHOOD AWARD FOR EDITOR REEVES

A Special Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews will be made to Henry E. S. Reeves at the Annual Brotherhood Dinner February 20, at the Fontainebleau Hotel in Miami Beach, Co. Mitchell Wolfson, the Awards Chairman announced.

Previous recipients are Sister Dorothy, President of Barry College, Senator Harry P. Cain and Father Theodore M. Gibson.

It was nearly a half century ago that Mr. Reeves founded the first newspaper primarily devoted to the social, religious and business interests of the Dade County Negro Communities.

Today's resultant weekly, "The Miami Times," has never missed a publication date, despite all of the legendary emergencies of pioneer printing.

Mr. Reeves, at the age of (84) eighty-four has many years of dedicated service behind him. Now semi-retired, he serves in an advisory capacity every morning at the newspaper of which he is still publisher, and where his son, Garth, is Editor-in-Chief. He also serves as Assistant Minister at the Church of the Incarnation.

Mr. Reeves has received citations from many organizations including: The Florida Teachers' Association, the Dade County Community Chest, the American Cancer Society, the Advisory Board of Registration and the Ambassadors of Goodwill for the State of Florida.

In 1966 Variety Children's Hospital tendered Mr. Reeves a testimonial dinner and presented him with the Variety Children's Hospital Volunteer of Valor Award. At the same time the late Mayor of Miami, Robert King High, presented him with an award in "Recognition of two decades of untiring and devoted community service." Last year, Mr. Reeves received the Distinguished Editor

Award from the National Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Mr. Reeves has contributed his time and energy to many community and civic organizations including: Chairman of the Carver Branch of the YMCA, Vice-Chairman of the Greater Miami Urban League, Vice-Chairman of the local branch of the USO, District Chairman of the Community Chest, Chairman and Member of the Christian Hospital Board of Directors, Director of the Advisory Board of Registration and Director of the Senior Citizens' Clubs.

In addition to Garth, Mr. Reeves has four daughters: Hazel, Clarice, Doreen and Frances, all teachers in the Dade County Public School System.

Student Reporters in Vietnam

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, no war in our national history has been better reported to the American people than has the present war in Vietnam. Perhaps because of this exhaustive general coverage, our interest in that war is aroused but often left unsatisfied.

It is in this sense that I especially value the journalistic contribution currently being made by the Queens College Phoenix which sent two student reporters to Vietnam. Readers of the Phoenix now have the rare opportunity to evaluate on-the-spot student views of the Vietnam conflict.

It is my hope that the reports of Mr. Lee Dembart and Mr. Ralph Palafino can probe beyond the official press releases which form much of the substance of what we read and hear about this war, and that they can bring to bear the very special perspectives of students on what they will see in Vietnam. If they can do these things, they will have performed a magnificent and most necessary service for all of us.

Their first dispatches from the Queens College Phoenix Vietnam bureau follow. Subsequent articles will be reprinted in the RECORD as they are received by my office:

(By Ralph Palafino)

SAIGON, February 4, 1968.—The Communist attack on the capital of South Vietnam began on the second day of the Chinese New Year. Simultaneously, dozens of major government and American installations in and around Saigon were attacked by small bands of well-armed Viet Cong with orders to capture and hold until relieved. The relief never came. Within 72 hours, two-thirds of the attackers were dead or captured, the rest routed.

Within seconds of one-another, troops attacking the Presidential Palace were spotted by Korean guards in front of the nearby Ambassador's home, a powerful explosion damaged the Philippine Embassy, a 19-man suicide squad breached the outer wall of the American Embassy and was able to capture a portion of the building, the Vietnamese radio station was destroyed, numerous police stations were attacked, and Tan Son Nhut Airbase, a few miles outside the city, was fired upon. Throughout the entire South, similar attacks were in progress with varying degrees of success.

It seems clear that there were three pur-

poses in carrying out this concerted attack on most of the major population centers of the country: to score enough significant military victories as possible to force a coalition government on the South, to demonstrate to the people of the large cities, who are losing their fear of the Communists, that the Viet Cong are still around and powerful enough to strike anywhere, and to score as many propaganda points as possible against the U.S. at home and the rest of the world. They had some failures and some successes.

There is little doubt that the Viet Cong failed to achieve any significant military victories. In Saigon, only the attacks on the radio station and the American Embassy were successful. Captured areas of the city were retaken almost immediately. Military and police installations beat off the attackers without exception. Snipers were only a scattered inconvenience. In the remainder of Vietnam, captured areas of the provincial capitals were regained within hours, air bases continued to operate, with only one field damaged seriously. Over 12,000 Viet Cong were killed and 3,000 captured, a ratio of 12 to one over allied killed. Militarily, in fact, it was a complete rout.

It had been over six months since any of the major cities of the South have come under Viet Cong attack. Since the last major offensive, the government has strengthened its hold on the provincial capitals and through them, the people. It has legitimized its rule through elections, and instituted some badly needed reforms throughout the country.

While only a small step, the people in the cities are for the first time being approached by government agents other than tax collectors. Some of the remoteness and apathy is breaking down, and the cities are not secure places for the Viet Cong. Suspected VC are regularly informed upon in the large cities today, while a year ago this was unheard of. And most important, the Viet Cong have not been able to retaliate in force against the informers.

The new radio and television nets that blanket Vietnam have played a large role in creating a sense of national identity—not as Vietnamese, but as South Vietnamese. For the first time, national heroes, popular actors and singers are creating some community in the South. The Viet Cong attack on the Saigon radio station and on a number of local radio stations in other parts of the country underline the fact that the Viet Cong realizes the threat the airwaves pose to them. American radio and TV, heard and watched by as many Vietnamese as Americans, are helping our national image and making more and more untenable the Viet Cong picture of Americans as imperialist oppressors.

Cholon in Saigon is populated by Vietnamese of Chinese extraction, and in an attempt to infiltrate successfully without fighting, the Viet Cong employed their members of similar ethnic background. Almost to a man they were identified by resident Chinese. When ARVN and American troops entered the city in force, the most fierce fighting in Saigon broke out. With the help of the local citizens, all the VC infiltrators were rooted out and hundreds killed in battle. Hundreds more attempted to exfiltrate in sampans and barges. Snipers in Saigon were captured or killed with the help of the Vietnamese who pointed out escape routes and building entrances to the police. General Weyand, Commander of the III Corps, estimated that ARVN carried 70% of the fighting load throughout the South, and accounted for 700 of 1,000 casualties.

The Viet Cong killed and wounded thousands of civilians in the three days of fighting. In Saigon there were two reported cases of Viet Cong using women and children as shields to make their escape out of the city. In Cholon they captured a children's hospital and used it as a stronghold. They over-

ran a military compound outside of Saigon and executed the wives and children living in it. Snipers shot at civilians and soldiers alike.

Whatever else the Vietnamese feel about the Viet Cong, it is not fear. When the curfew was lifted for a few hours in the secure parts of the city, people and traffic cluttered the streets within minutes. While the Viet Cong may still be around, they seem to have lost their credibility. It is difficult to terrorize a people that simply does not take you seriously anymore.

Much has been made of the VC ability to attack and hold the American Embassy in Saigon, if only for a few hours. Banner headlines throughout the world press proclaim the lack of security that this indicates. Is it possible that with a half million troops in Vietnam, the United States cannot even protect its own Embassy from attack? The answer is that we did not try.

Only seven men guarded the Embassy on the night of the attack. The Viet Cong had no trouble approaching the grounds and blasting a hole in the wall surrounding the compound. The counterattack which occurred within minutes was slowed because of a lack of heavy weapons that might have destroyed valuable papers and buildings. But in a few hours, and without extensive damage (bullet holes in the walls and damage to the roof was the worst of it), the Embassy was recaptured and 19 enemy killed.

In the last six months American forces in Saigon have dropped from a high of 27,000 men to under 6,000, mostly administrative personnel. Protection of the city is almost entirely in the hands of municipal police. To protect Saigon totally from infiltration and attack would require an inordinate number of men, and even then could only be done by instituting police state methods of control. But if freedom is one of the issues of the war, then this is clearly not the solution. It is better to forego a degree of security. Security can only be attained by assuring the enemy that gains will be temporary and much too expensive.

Militarily, then, the attack on Saigon and the rest of the nation failed to meet its objective. The present government is still functioning and is in control as much as before the attack. What successes the Viet Cong did have were temporary and pyrrhic. The people have been reminded that the VC are still around but the attack is more likely to harden their opposition to the VC, and by default, strengthen the citizens' allegiance to the government. The only victory will be in the world press.

It is difficult to conceive that the United States can possibly be winning a war in which it cannot even protect its own Embassy from enemy attack. But it must be conceived, if the engagements of last week are any indication, the United States is winning. It should be more difficult to accept than the fact that at the height of the battle, planes were still using Tan Son Nhut Airbase, Americans and Vietnamese were walking the streets, Vietnam Radio stayed on the air from auxiliary transmitters, and the battles were watched from rooftops and windows. Vietnam was attacked, but it was never under siege.

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON, February 4, 1968.—We had thought that we would see some action during our three months in Vietnam. We didn't expect we would see it so quickly. The Viet Cong gave us a noisy, if not altogether receptive welcome less than 15 hours after our arrival here, as they began an all-out offensive in Saigon that included an attack on the Presidential Palace 100 yards from our hotel window.

Saigon is a sprawling city that shows both its French heritage and its rampant poverty. Well manicured parks and lawns offer a se-

rene backdrop. Beggars, street urchins, and families living on cots in the middle of the sidewalk show that this is a destitute country. Barbed wire blockades show that it is a country at war.

The sun was hot and the air was dry as we stepped out of the plane at Tan Son Nhut International Airport. Less than 24 hours later, the field would be under constant mortar, artillery, and small arms fire, and hundreds of soldiers would lose their lives in the battle for the airbase. But all was quiet as we walked to the terminal and stood in line to clear immigration and customs.

It was Tet, the Oriental New Year, and flags, signs, and banners welcomed it. Firecrackers, sounding unnervingly like rifles, exploded around us as we walked through the downtown area to the U.S. and Vietnamese press offices.

Full-scale battles had erupted throughout the country except in the capital. Every major city from north to south was under attack. Signs in military installations warned that Charley was infiltrating Saigon, and that all personnel should take extreme caution. But on the streets it was Tet, and no one seemed concerned about an imminent onslaught.

At precisely 3 o'clock in the morning the celebration of Tet ended in Saigon. There were still fireworks, but now they were coming from grenades, rockets, bazookas, automatic weapons, and high-powered rifles. A tremendous explosion rocked the courtyard outside the hotel. Two more blasts and accompanying flashes brought us quickly from sleep to full consciousness.

The sharp cracks of rifles were answered by machine guns. Another explosion, closer to the hotel, and then quiet. But only long enough for us to think the worst. They were surely coming into the hotel, coming to blast down the doors, coming to machinegun us all.

And then more shooting outside. Mortar explosions. More automatic fire. Another brief pause.

For an hour the exchanges were broken only by the even more frightening quiet. Helicopters began dropping flares, casting an eerie glow over the scene, but not illuminating any of what was going on outside. Occasionally a close mortar explosion would cast dirt and debris against our fourth-floor window panes. Two of them would be broken by the gun battle the following day.

I tried sleeping. The firing continued outside. So did the explosions.

Daylight always has the advantage of making things seem more manageable. With the sun up, we had almost convinced ourselves that all the noise the night before had been nothing more than big firecrackers. We were still unaware of the extent of the fighting going on throughout the city. But the desk clerk warned us. "Be careful, sir," he said as we walked out. "There's shooting outside."

Only later in the day did we discover that the Viet Cong had attacked eight major areas in the city, including the American Embassy, and had taken over the Cholon section to the south. They were still firmly entrenched in the partially completed apartment building next to the hotel, having sought cover there when their attempt to storm the Palace met resistance during the night.

Four Viet Cong bodies lay in the street and were to remain there 36 hours until they began to rot in the heat. The apartment building was surrounded by Korean and ARVN troops who periodically exchanged machine gun fire with the Viet Cong fortress.

Reporters and amateur photographers swarmed over the area, taking cover behind walls and parked cars whenever the shooting resumed. Less courageous spectators took up positions on the roof and balconies of the hotel, occasionally peering over the barriers to see what was going on. Everyone took a

periodic time-out to sit in the hotel bar, eat lunch, sip a beer, and discuss the progress outside.

Among the civilians on the scene, there was almost a picnic atmosphere, disrupted only by the necessity of walking past the corpses and the bombed out American jeep whose tires were still smoldering 12 hours after the vehicle had been hit by a Viet Cong grenade from the building. The driver had been killed instantly. The others escaped.

At nightfall, fighting continued heavy throughout the city, and marshal law and a 24-hour curfew had been imposed. The streets were completely deserted. And the Viet Cong still held the building despite the mortar and bazooka pounding it had sustained throughout the day.

Returning to our room with a view, we drew the curtains and prepared for a long night. Fortunately the heavy activity did not begin in earnest until 6 o'clock the following morning when the shelling and mortar attacks resumed. One fellow occupant of the hotel reported two bullets ricocheting into his room, but we escaped with two shattered windows.

Prices in the hotel restaurant began to soar with each meal. At lunch steak cost 300 piastres (\$2.50). By dinner the price had climbed to 350 piastres (\$3.00). Beer was now 90 piastres a can (\$8.75). A warm bottle of Coke was 50 piastres (\$4.00).

Reports from around the country said that the Viet Cong attack was being beaten back in all but a few northern cities. Enemy casualties were first held at 5,000 killed, later updated to 7,000, and finally put at near 13,000, "subject to adjustment when administrative reports are received."

Sniper fire was being felt throughout Saigon, so the curfew remained in effect. The few people whose jobs were considered essential received armed escorts to their offices. Everyone else stayed in or near their quarters, or risked being stopped by military or Saigon police. Rumors abounded, and the armed forces radio gave little or no concrete information beyond reminding everyone to stay inside and exercise caution.

By afternoon the last of the Viet Cong holding the neighboring apartment building had been killed, and civilians strolled casually through the area, taking pictures of the mangled corpses, inspecting the destroyed vehicles, and commenting among themselves about the daring or stupidity of soldiers willing to go into the place and try to hold it, knowing that they could not possibly get out.

Occasionally conversation focused on the Embassy attack. The Viet Cong had held the building for six hours before being killed, but had managed little significant damage. How important was it that they got in? Why weren't there more guards? Who was responsible? Are more troops needed? In the absence of facts, the answers were almost invariably based on what one already believed.

If the attack on Saigon had any purpose other than propaganda, it failed. If the Viet Cong hoped or expected a massive civilian uprising on their behalf, they were sorely disappointed. The fact that they flagrantly violated their own declared Tet cease fire to launch the campaign has hardened sentiment against them. Several acts of sheer terrorism were reported in the city. I saw pictures of one.

On the other hand, the publicity value of the strength and scope of the attacks will undoubtedly have widespread repercussions. People are already talking about a greater commitment of U.S. troops in order to prevent such a campaign from being mounted in the future.

If these last few days were in fact the Big Effort by the Viet Cong, where they were willing to gamble everything in the hopes of another Dien Bien Phu, and there has been

some talk that this was the case, then they have been defeated.

Military people here are predicting that the biggest blow is yet to come, and that it will come in the DNZ area in the not distant future.

If the casualty figures for the Viet Cong are anywhere near correct, and if they sustain similar losses in any "bigger" action yet to come, it would seem certain that they would have a difficult time rebuilding their forces, if in fact they could do it at all.

The U.S. command says it was taken by surprise by the intensity of this Viet Cong effort. But it responded quickly to the attack, and has been able thus far to push back the offensive. Militarily, the U.S. is not about to lose the war. From the looks of things, though, it seems that they're not about to win it either.

Private First Class Powell, 19, Killed in Viet by Rocket

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Larry K. Powell, a young man from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS POWELL, 19, KILLED IN VIET BY ROCKET

A Lexington Park marine was killed in Vietnam last week when an exploding rocket struck the Ontos recoilless-rifle carrier he was driving in Phu Thien province.

Pfc. Larry K. Powell, 19, was killed less than a month after returning to Vietnam after volunteering for a second tour of duty there.

He had spent eleven months there before returning home to Lexington Park for a month's leave December 8.

Mrs. Jessie D. Powell, his adoptive mother, said that fighting in Vietnam was "what he wanted to do—this was his life." Mrs. Powell is the wife of Walter R. Powell, Jr., a brother who reared Private Powell after his parents died.

Private Powell enlisted in the Marine Corps in July, 1966, and volunteered for Vietnam duty while still in boot camp. He had been planning to join the Marines since childhood and was looking forward to becoming a sergeant, Mrs. Powell said.

He told his brothers and sisters that he was fighting to protect them, she added.

It was after boot camp that he trained to drive an Ontos, a specialized vehicle that operates on tank-like tracks and carries six recoilless rifles. The vehicle's name comes from the Greek word for *thing*.

He was driving one as a member of a convoy when a rocket struck his column and he received head and stomach injuries, Mrs. Powell said.

Private Powell was born in Alma, Ark., and moved to Lexington Park when he was 9, attending schools there until he moved to Elwood, Ind., where he attended Elwood High School and was graduated.

He then worked for several months in a machine shop in Dallas before enlisting in the Marines.

Survivors include, besides Mr. and Mrs. Powell, two sisters, Deborah Lee Powell and Pamela Ann Powell, and another brother, Roger C. Powell, all of Lexington Park.

An Article by the Institute for American Democracy

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, there are many private corporations in this country which are taking a greater interest in community and national affairs. I welcome that interest and believe it is of the utmost importance that it continue.

That interest and those community and national activities are quite different from the use of large amounts of corporate funds to put forth what is essentially a political point of view, which, in many instances, represents the radical right in this country—the antidemocratic forces which basically hope to subvert democracy. Such a program seems now to be undertaken by the Schick-Eversharp, Schick Electric, and Technicolor companies. Extensive use of funds for essentially political purposes by publicly held corporations is a serious danger. Company stockholders are not consulted in decisions to use funds in this manner. Moreover, these expenditures are tax-exempt. It is another loophole for the wealthy to avoid paying their share of taxes. Thus, all of us pay a little to propagate one man's views.

I recommend to my colleagues the following article printed by the Institute for American Democracy, a reputable organization:

SCHICK SETS MILLION DOLLAR PRECEDENT— DOUBLE-EDGED DOLLARS BUILD POLITICAL CLIMATE

Where does a publicly-held company draw the line in using its advertising dollars to advance the ideological viewpoint of its top executive?

So far as the stockholders in Patrick J. Frawley's Schick-Eversharp, Schick Electric, and Technicolor companies are concerned, that is a million-dollar question. By his own lights, Frawley sets a sterling example in using the tax-deductible advertising dollars to help mold the political climate.

Item—The newest entry in the super-conservative magazine field is *Twin Circle*. One of the editors is Father Daniel Lyons. The *Twin Circle* Publishing Company is a Schick subsidiary, and the first eight issues carried full page Schick ads. The page rate is \$1,260. Promised circulation is 100,000.

Item—Father Lyons' daily 5-minute opinion radio program, aired over 20 stations, is Schick-sponsored. The program was launched last July. IAD's projection places the 1967 cost to Schick at about \$53,092.

Item—Schick and/or Technicolor are running two full-page ads in each monthly issue of *Triumph*, appealing to approximately the same audience as *Twin Circle*. (See December Home-Front.) The cost for last year: approximately \$13,400.

Item—*Rally*, the newest magazine aimed at youth (sworn circulation 4,200) has had three full-page ads from Frawley's companies in each of its twelve 1967 issues. Cost compiled from the rate card: \$12,275.

Item—The rerun of the Ronald Reagan-narrated TV spectacular, "Freedom's Finest Hour" to a nationwide audience last December cost Schick approximately \$300,000, according to IAD projections.

The program is well-done, and probably pulled a good audience, but since Frawley headed the Southern California committee

which raised money going into the Reagan's 1966 TV campaign spots, a cynic might suspect that Frawley was killing two birds with one tax-deductible stone.

IAD's estimates, based on rate cards and information supplied by publishers, place the Schick-Technicolor expenditures in the conservative *National Review* at \$36,732 and the *Radical Right Drake's Freedom Press* at \$1,627, and *Wanderer* at \$3,952. *Human Events* got about \$1,000 in Schick ad money while YAF's *New Guard* received two full-page ads for 10 consecutive issues, a \$10,613 item.

Senator Thomas Dodd and Congressman Walter Judd credit Frawley and Schick with the public service grant making possible their American Security Council "Washington Report" series, termed the largest daily radio program in the U.S. radio. The emphasis of this is on the international Communist threat. A 1966 *Wall Street Journal* story pegged the annual cost to Schick at \$390,000 plus another \$6,373 grant for Commentator Dodd's salary. No report on 1967 totals as yet available.

The same *Wall Street Journal* story listed Schick annual grants of \$5,000 each to the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation (star member: right wing author Phyllis Schlafly); Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade and the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

Those touring moral re-armament "Up With People" teenage show troupes got a Schick grant of \$150,000 according to the *Journal*, and Frawley's picture appears on the cover of the "Up" record. The 36 full-page ads in *MRA's Pace* magazine in 1967 represent another \$43,515, according to the rate card.

Schick also sponsored a 1967 \$100,000 Business Citizenship Award essay contest beamed at advertising agencies with the top prize going to a member of Sen. Strom Thurmond's staff.

Some of the Schick advertising dollars and grants go to organizations and publications which are merely rather conservative, but some to operations considerably to the right. They reflect Frawley's preoccupation with Communism to the exclusion of other problems. They all have some impact on American attitudes.

If you are one viewing Paul Harvey's "Commentary" as helping create the mood which can lead to a big political shift, then the IAD-estimated \$939,000 it takes for Schick to alternate sponsorship of Harvey's daily 5-minute commentary on 425 ABC stations also emerges as a double-edged investment.

—C. R. B.

First 1968 Report to Congressman Wolff's Constituency

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, periodically I report to the residents of New York's Third Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in Congress, on congressional actions and my position on major issues. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include my first report of 1968 in the *Record* at this point:

FEBRUARY 1968.

DEAR FRIEND: As the second session of the 90th Congress settles down to work, it is appropriate that as your elected representative I report to you on my work in Congress during the past year and comment on what we might expect this year.

Vietnam continues to be the all pervading issue here in Washington, as well as throughout the world. Everything that came before Congress during 1967 was considered in light of the extensive and expensive American presence in Vietnam. I will have more to say on this predominant issue later.

Government spending continued unabated last year. I have attempted to achieve a halt in non-essential federal spending. I am opposed to a tax increase because I believe we can eliminate the need for a surcharge.

However, there are urgent problems at home that cannot be overlooked nor postponed even while we are engaged in hostilities abroad.

In reflecting on the eleven and a half months first session of the 90th Congress, I see the visions and ideals of the 89th Congress were sorely lacking. There were serious backward steps on domestic programs. During the past year the effect of a negative coalition in Congress resulted in many problems, including the following:

Congress's very grave failure to reclaim its prerogatives regarding the war in Vietnam.

The House of Representative's failure to enact reasonable cuts in non-essential spending, proposed by a fiscally responsible, bipartisan membership. (For example the four billion dollar Public Works "Pork Barrel" Bill should have been cut substantially. There are many other projects that could be postponed while we attack other urgent problems here at home.)

Continuation of excessive farm subsidies, to the tune of almost three billion dollars, that place a double burden on you, the taxpayer. First you pay for the subsidy and then you are taxed by the inexcusably high price of food.

Congress failed to recognize that social and educational advancement are necessary to avoid the danger of a "welfare state" to which we are all opposed. There was too little, too late funding of educational programs thereby impeding the transition of many Americans from the welfare rolls to the tax rolls.

A severe and undue delay in major legislation and appropriations that left important programs in doubt for long periods. This in turn demoralized those involved in the programs in doubt for long periods. This in turn demoralized those involved in the programs and impeded their effectiveness.

Duplicate funding for our military and civilian space programs. Since these programs are redundant, we must curtail the duplication and save billions of dollars.

Although generally disappointed by the first session of the 90th Congress, I did see some bright spots. I would cite:

Congressional determination in heading off a tax increase. (As I indicated in my newsletter last fall, I continue to oppose a tax increase and suggest non-essential spending cuts as an alternative.)

Reasonable and responsible cuts in the civilian space budget.

Positive strides in pollution control and conservation. (I am especially concerned about this since we must not permit Long Island to become a big ball of earth tied together by ribbons of concrete.)

Substantial increases in veterans' pensions and social security to protect our senior citizens with fixed incomes from being forced onto the welfare rolls as prices continue to climb.

These, then, are some of the highlights of the first session. Now I would like to comment on certain areas of concern to you and advise you of my actions in these areas.

FRENCH POLICY AND FRANCE'S WORLD WAR I DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES

It has been said that I am conducting a one-man war against deGaulle. I doubt that is so since I have had thousands of encouraging letters from across the country. Also more than 135 Members of Congress are co-

sponsoring my resolution to collect France's seven billion dollar, World War I debt. In light of France's attempts to undermine the dollar and de Gaulle's anti-American policies, France should be required to pay this long overdue legal debt. I will continue to pursue this debt until it is paid in full.

FOREIGN AID AND TRADE

We must conduct a meaningful foreign aid program to build trading partners and develop new markets for American goods. In this vein, foreign aid must not be conducted as a giveaway, but rather as a productive investment. The dollar drain can and should be controlled by eliminating unnecessary government expenditures overseas and encouraging profitable private sector investments abroad.

TRAVEL TAX

I am concerned about our balance of payments deficit. However, this problem has been caused by our increasing commitments abroad (including Vietnam), not by our balance of trade which is favorable. I do not feel this problem can be solved by a travel tax and I oppose this proposed measure. I feel it will do harm to our relations abroad and bring with it retaliatory measures that would cause a deficit in our balance of trade.

MIDDLE EAST

I was severely distressed last summer to discover that we were continuing to train military personnel from Arab countries that had broken diplomatic relations with the United States. I was successful in adding an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill to prohibit this practice. Moreover, I have called upon our government, in the face of Soviet-inspired aggression to make clear our support for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East.

"PUEBLO"

It would be a grave error of dire consequence for North Korea, or any other nation, to interpret the strong desire of the United States for peace as a sign of weakness. North Korea has committed an act of piracy on the high seas by boarding and capturing the USS *Pueblo*. We are all anxious for peace in the world. But we will not have peace if we do not defend the security of this nation and protect our international rights. Our main concern must be for the safety of the crew of the *Pueblo* and we must pursue the steps necessary to guarantee the safe return of the crew.

DOMESTIC EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Continuation of such programs as Head Start, the Job Corps and the Teachers Corps is vital to the growth of our nation. There can be no better investment in our future than the preparation of previously untrained persons to fill skilled jobs.

CRIME IN THE STREETS

We cannot tolerate lawlessness and must enact legislation to end violence and deal firmly with those who disregard the laws and lives and property of others. At the same time we must eliminate the root causes of violence by eliminating the poverty, joblessness, inadequate housing and substandard schools that exist as a continuing source of shame in our society.

CONSUMERS

Last year saw the enactment of important consumer legislation including the flammable fabrics act and a strong meat inspection law. Early in the current session we were successful in passing a very strong truth-in-lending bill which I actively supported.

JET NOISE AND AIR SAFETY

I place these two problems together since their solutions must be found together through the use of our advanced technology. Jet noise is an offensive health hazard and

must be controlled. Last year to alleviate the jet noise problem that plagues sections of our district, I secured approval of new instrumentation at Kennedy Airport. Also I held investigatory meetings on air safety in New York and plan further efforts to protect those who fly and those on the ground.

LONG ISLAND INDUSTRY AND ECONOMY

Another growth year for Long Island's economy was 1967. Working to build our economy we have reached the point where 41 per cent of the largest employers on Long Island are in the Third Congressional District. I am pleased that my efforts to secure federal contracts for local businesses have helped to make this possible.

NORTH SHORE CONSERVATION

This year I hope the Town of Oyster Bay will complete the conservation plan I offered to the Town Board last year. Unfortunately the Town Board has dragged its feet on this matter. Time is running short and the Oyster Bay Town Board must act soon if we are to save the North Shore. Interior Secretary Udall has assured me the federal government will do all that it can to conserve the precious shore area that is threatened with destruction.

SERVICE TO YOU

Last year saw another increase in federal funds coming into the Third Congressional District. Also approval was voted for the creation of a federal court district in Mineola. My offices in Port Washington, Glen Cove and Jericho remained open to serve you. Many more district residents visited Washington and we were, as always, pleased to have them visit our office. I especially welcome visits to Washington since it gives me an opportunity to talk with you. Also in 1967 we held a number of Town Meetings in different areas on matters of interest to local residents. Also, I hope you will continue your welcome habit of writing to your Congressman regarding issues pending in Congress.

VIETNAM

I believe I speak for everyone when I say this nation desires a just and lasting peace in Vietnam. We hear many different ideas on how to reach that peace, but no one has yet offered a solution acceptable to all parties. For truly, no one has all the answers.

I have long been of the opinion that no amount of military successes will bring about an enduring peace. Such a peace will only come from an attendant political solution. This is because if we continue to escalate we only broaden the war and create a graver situation. Yet a unilateral pullout will not bring peace to Southeast Asia nor will it achieve our proper goal of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

While I do not believe in either of the extremes, I do not agree with the present course of American policy in Vietnam. We need new thinking, new initiatives to change the course of the war and create the climate for peace that will make a political solution possible.

To date the steadily increasing bombing of North Vietnam has not slowed the infiltration to the south nor driven the North Vietnamese to the conference table. At the same time, North Vietnam, U Thant and others close to the situation have made it clear that the bombing is an impediment to peace. Moreover, top military authorities, including Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, have made it clear we will not endanger our troops by halting the bombing. With this in mind I have called for a cessation in the bombing of North Vietnam to test the possibility that such a halt might lead to negotiations. Should the North Vietnamese take undue advantage of the bombing halt, we would not be precluded from resuming necessary bombing.

I have proposed to President Johnson a three-point program that I believe will go a long way toward achieving what I have called the climate for peace. First, we should secure civic action teams of civilian specialists from other Asian nations to administer the pacification program that is now being handled unsuccessfully by the South Vietnamese. Second, South Vietnamese military units now engaged in pacification and freed from that responsibility could then assume their rightful position filling whatever military role may be necessary. This is their war and if there is fighting to be done, they should do it. Third, American forces would be relieved of much of their present role and revert to their former position before escalation as a supply and advisory force. After offering these suggestions I sent my speech to South Vietnamese President Thieu, whom I met while in Vietnam. I am pleased to report that he has indicated his tacit approval of my recommendations. While many shout for peace, little if any concrete plans or suggestions are offered. This war cannot nor will it be ended abruptly. Therefore, our hope for peace will come through a reversal of the present escalation to one of deescalation. This then is a plan for deescalation that can bring about a just settlement, self determination and peace in Southeast Asia.

As the situation in Vietnam changes, I am constantly reevaluating my position. As you know, I use your thinking as a guide while exercising the leadership that is part of my responsibility as your elected Representative. If you would please take the time to answer and return the following questionnaire to my office at 156A Main Street, Port Washington, N.Y. 11050, I would greatly appreciate it. This way I can best represent you.

With the hope and prayer of peace and prosperity in 1968, I remain

Sincerely yours,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Your Congressman.

Which of the following do you believe should be part of the United States policy in Vietnam? (You may check more than one.)

1. Send more troops to Vietnam.
2. Unilateral cease-fire by the United States.
3. Withdraw to enclaves.
4. Invade North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.
5. Remove restraints on hot pursuit by United States troops.
6. Recognize the National Liberation Front as a participant on negotiations.
7. Stop bombing of North Vietnam.
8. Bomb Hanoi and Haiphong harbor.
9. Exert greater effort to bring Vietnam problem before United Nations.
10. General deescalation.
11. Continue present course.
12. Use nuclear weapons.
13. Exert greater efforts to secure negotiations.

Town Destroyed To Save It

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1968, the Associated Press carried a report in many newspapers concerning the progress of the war in South Vietnam being waged on behalf of the Vietnamese people. According to the AP, a U.S. major said, in reference to a city 45 miles southwest of Saigon:

It became necessary to destroy the town to save it.

The AP report goes on to quote the commander of the U.S. Advisory Team 93:

"We will never know for sure" the number of civilians who died.

"Many families are buried permanently under the rubble," he said.

Another major added:

It is always a pity about the civilians.

Mr. Speaker, this dispatch raises anew very grave questions concerning the war in Vietnam. How can one rationalize a war in which we must destroy the people we have proposed to protect in order to save them?

Tom Wicker in a very perceptive article in the New York Times of February 20, comments upon similar tactics in the heavily populated city of Hue and other Vietnamese cities where massive firepower is being used to root out Vietcong forces from among civilian populations.

Mr. Wicker points out, in effect, the bankruptcy of the policy which relies on a military solution to a political problem.

Mr. Wicker's article of February 20 and the AP report of February 8 follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1968]

IN THE NATION: FIREPOWER VERSUS SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The sad truth of Vietnam has seldom been clearer than it is in the decision by the American military command to "use all the firepower needed" to root Communist forces out of Hue and other Vietnamese cities.

So, as The Associated Press describes the situation, "Heavy bombs, aircraft rockets, naval gunfire, napalm, tear gas and all the usual ground weapons from eight-inch howitzers to tank guns are being used in heavily populated city areas and—in Hue—against the historic inner city Citadel, from which Vietnamese imperial governments once ruled.

MISERY COMPOUNDED

American military men are not happy about this; they know the result is bound to be thousands upon thousands of homeless refugees adding to the limitless weight of human misery in Vietnam, as well as rising totals of civilian dead and wounded.

"It is a terrible thing to have to do, but we have to do it," a marine officer said of the decision to use "all the firepower needed" against parts of Hue held by the North Vietnamese.

There appear to be two reasons why that officer and his superiors believe they "have to do it." The first is a shortage of manpower in the area around Hue and in the northern provinces generally, a shortage mostly due to the opposing concentrations of forces at Khesanh. This manpower shortage means that the Americans and South Vietnamese cannot root out the North Vietnamese and Vietcong invaders without heavy dependence upon the sheer destructive force of American firepower.

The second reason is that nothing less than victory, in these situations, is considered acceptable. "We could not permit them to believe that they could seize populated areas and escape our firepower," an American official explained. If they could do that, they would obviously take advantage of the opportunity.

A NECESSARY EVIL

This is not, therefore, a mindless unloosing of violence by American soldiers; it is what

they see as a necessary evil, and one in which the dreadfully militaristic South Vietnamese Government concurs fully.

But if the situation is viewed in something other than military terms, it appears quite different. How is the Saigon Government, for instance, ever going to win the "hearts and minds" of its people if it not only approves the American destruction of South Vietnamese cities but—according to press reports—actually wants the Americans to do the job more quickly with even more firepower?

What kind of a commentary upon this extraordinary "Government," and upon the years of American assistance, is it if the insurgents not only can seize these urban areas by surprise, but can hold them with such desperate and deadly tenacity that the only alternative is to destroy the cities themselves?

Even if the destruction of their homes, businesses and treasured places fills South Vietnamese hearts with gratitude toward Saigon, have the authorities in that city or their American supporters shown any ability to cope with the thousands of refugees, the wounded, the sick and the helpless, who existed in South Vietnam even before the Vietcong winter offensive began in the cities?

The inescapable facts are that the South Vietnamese Government and its American ally were unable to protect the cities and their populations to begin with. When the attacks came, they proved unable to overcome them without the destruction of whole areas and the mass production of dead and homeless civilians. And when all the firepower has done its deadly work, neither Saigon nor Washington will be anywhere near able to take care of the human tide of misery and despair that will be the result.

IF THIS BE VICTORY

If this is a victory for Saigon, a defeat would be too terrible to behold. If this is what President Johnson demands that Americans stand and fight for, what heartbreaking tragedy must happen before he realizes that fighting alone cannot vindicate his policy?

The sad and terrible truth of the decision to blow up South Vietnam's cities in order to defend them is that neither Washington nor Saigon has anything to rely on but firepower. With that, they can destroy South Vietnam, but they can never save it from Communism, or anything else.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 8, 1968]

ALLIES SAY TOWN DESTROYED TO SAVE IT

BEN TRE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"It became necessary to destroy the town to save it," a U.S. major said Wednesday.

He was talking about the grim decision that allied commanders made when Viet Cong attackers overran most of this Mekong Delta city 45 miles southwest of Saigon.

They decided that regardless of civilian casualties they must bomb and shell the once-placid river city of 35,000 to rout the Viet Cong.

Heavy guns were turned on the city's streets. Jet fighter-bombers carrying bombs, rockets and napalm were ordered into the attack.

The decision was not taken lightly, U.S. advisers said.

"They are our friends out there," said one American, pointing to the smoking city. "We waited until we had no choice. The Vietnamese chief of staff had to bring in an air strike on the house of his neighbor."

Ben Tre was one of the cities attacked by the Viet Cong at the height of last week's fighting. Details of its destruction in the three-day battle to oust the Viet Cong became known yesterday.

U.S. advisers said the heavy allied firepower hurled on the city to drive out the Viet Cong probably contributed largely to

the deaths of at least 500 civilians and possibly 1,000.

South Vietnamese officials say the enemy dead totaled 451.

About 50 Vietnamese soldiers died, along with more than 20 Americans from the 9th Infantry Division.

Lt. Col. James Dare of Chicago, Ill., commander of U.S. Advisory Team 93, said, "We will never know for sure" the number of civilians who died.

"Many families are buried permanently under the rubble," he said.

Americans say 45 per cent of the city was destroyed. The Vietnamese province chief said that if the village environs are considered, Ben Tre was 85 per cent destroyed.

U.S. officials say that the firepower had to be used and that allied casualties would have been far higher without the heavy firepower.

The battle began when an enemy force of approximately 2,500 men invaded the city and the surrounding villages, U.S. advisers said. The decision to use jets and heavy guns was made early in the battle when the Viet Cong almost had control of the city.

U.S. advisers said the Viet Cong occupied the city so rapidly that it was not possible to warn civilians of the impending air strikes or the artillery barrages, particularly with the Viet Cong in control of the radio station.

Allied firepower included 500-pound bombs, napalm, rockets, various types of antipersonnel bombs and 105 and 155mm artillery.

"We had to argue with our corps headquarters at Can Tho," a U.S. captain said. "They didn't like the idea. But they were convinced when we explained that it was rockets and bombing or the end for us."

Fighter-bombers splashed napalm on a 3,000-yard long river bank opposite the U.S. military compound. Thatch-roofed homes went up in flames.

Armed helicopters made dozens of passes at the rambling market place in the center of the city. Squatter districts and poor people's housing at the northern and western sides of the city were leveled.

Maj. Chester L. Brown of Erie, Pa., spent hours over the city as an Air Force forward air controller directing helicopter and fighter-bomber attacks.

"It is always a pity about the civilians," he said. "In the mass confusion of this kind of thing, the people don't know where the lines are, they don't know where to hide. And some of the weapons we use are area weapons, spraying a general area instead of a specific target."

"That way, people get hurt."

Address of Congressman John Brademas at 100th Annual Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 19, 1968

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 19, 1968, I had the privilege, together with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota with whom I serve on the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE, of addressing the 100th annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, N.J.

Congressman QUIE and I discussed the subject, "The Shape of Federal Funding for Tomorrow's Schools."

Under unanimous consent, I insert the text of my address on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMANS

I am honored to be invited to participate in this conference for several reasons.

First, it brings me together with my distinguished colleague and friend, Al Quile of Minnesota. Al and I have sat on the House Committee on Education and Labor for nearly ten years now and although we are not always in agreement on the legislation we consider—as our presence with you tonight indicates—there is no one on our Committee or, indeed, in Congress more deeply dedicated to better education for Americans than is he.

And I am glad also to reassure you that we have worked many times in support of the same legislation. For example, he made a decisive contribution to the passage of a bill of which I am the sponsor, the International Education Act of 1966.

I am glad to be here too, to meet with the administrators of America's schools.

My late grandfather was a school principal and superintendent for many years in the towns and rural areas of Central Indiana—and I learned from him that there is no nobler vocation than helping young people learn.

In today's America, in my view, no one plays a more significant role in determining the future of tomorrow's America than do you—the men and women who run our nation's schools.

The final reason I am glad to be with you is the opportunity it affords me to talk about the contribution that our Federal government can make to strengthening the schools of our country.

I say "contribution" deliberately because it must be obvious to many of you that so many and so complex are the challenges facing the American people today in the fields of jobs, housing, health, pollution—as well as education—that we need the intelligent and energetic commitment of all the resources we can muster, public and private, Federal, state and local, if we are to master these problems and not be overcome by them.

I share therefore the view of one of the great public servants of our time, John W. Gardner, who spoke recently of what he called "the value of President Johnson's assertion that the Federal government should operate more and more through mutually respecting partnerships with state and local governments, with the universities and corporations, and with the other great estates of the private sector. Such partnerships, rightly designed, can maintain the dispersion of power and initiative that we cherish."

Indeed I believe that for our American Federal system to function properly, all levels of government must be strong, vigorous and effective.

NEED TO STRENGTHEN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

In particular, I believe we must strengthen both state and local government if they are to meet the responsibilities our changing society is thrusting upon them.

But let me make very clear at the outset of my remarks that though I believe there is a significant role for the Federal government in support of education, I draw the line at sanitation. Even if Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Lindsay look with yearning eyes to Washington, I am strongly opposed to Federal control of garbage—and you can quote me on that. Or does Al Quile have a block grant for garbage disposal proposal that he wants to advocate tonight?

But more seriously, let me give you just

two examples of what I mean when I say that it is imperative that we strengthen state and local government in this country.

This week a Subcommittee on which Al and I sit will hear testimony on several bills, one of which I introduced, the Public Service Education Act, aimed at encouraging highly talented young men and women to enter state and local government by providing them with fellowships for graduate study.

Because I feel so strongly about improving state and local government, I have also been a militant supporter of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which, as you know, is aimed at strengthening our state departments of education.

In fact, it was on my motion in the Education Committee that the Administration's original proposal in 1965 of \$10 million for Title V was raised to \$25 million—more than doubled—and in 1967 we increased still further the authorization to strengthen state education agencies.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Indeed, one can perhaps say that the chief importance of the Federal financial assistance we have been providing to our nation's schools, especially through ESEA, is that it can help state and local communities do a better job of teaching than they could do without these funds.

It is therefore significant that we no longer debate the legitimacy or wisdom of Federal aid but rather the question of the best way to provide and administer it.

More Federal money, not less, is the theme we in Congress hear from nearly all segments of the education community, including many groups formerly hostile to Federal assistance to schools.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers legislative chairman wrote me only last week in support of a program whereby the Federal government would subsidize 25 per cent of the cost of public schools.

The Legislative Commission of the National Education Association just last month called for a "major escalation of the nation's commitment to quality education," and pressed for a \$6 billion Federal program to meet "urgent needs" in our elementary and secondary schools.

And I understand that your great organization has under consideration here at Atlantic City a resolution urging Federal aid to guarantee a minimum per pupil expenditure throughout the country.

So we are no longer squeamish about accepting Federal funds. We must now draw our attention to the question of how best to administer Federal assistance to local and state school systems.

Some have framed this discussion in terms of two approaches:

Should Federal dollars be channeled in block grant form to the states or should Federal funds be provided to help meet pressing national needs in education which are not being met effectively from local, state and private sources?

My answer is that while general Federal aid to education—aid not targeted on critical needs—may be a desirable objective which I hope we can achieve in the long run, it is imperative that we maintain for the present the prevailing pattern of categorical aid aimed at such needs. To dismantle, for example, the programs initiated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and replace them with general unrestricted grants would seriously weaken our effort as a nation to get at our toughest educational problems.

THE MYTHS BEHIND GENERAL AID VIEW

Let me here list some of the myths upon which the case for so-called general aid to education has been developed.

The first myth is the notion that while categorical programs involve narrow categories of assistance encumbered with many

restrictions, general aid offers flexibility and freedom from red tape.

In practice, no such clear distinction exists. Many Federal categorical programs incorporate fewer limitations and are nearly as broad as many state general support or foundation programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for example, though directed at particular needs, is nevertheless extremely flexible in application and allows wide discretion to state and local authorities. In fact, the ESEA contains some of the most permissive authorizations in American legislative history. I hear almost no complaints from school administrators in my state that Federal agents are roaming the state, commanding them what to do in their schools.

On the other hand, state general aid programs are often replete with detailed "strings" on curriculum, salaries, classroom size, and number of teachers.

My point is that general aid provides no sure escape from bureaucratic disorder and red tape. Mr. Quile's own block grant proposal offered as an amendment to the ESEA last year illustrates the problem; his substitute bill was a far cry from general aid freely to be expended by the states. In its final form, the bill was honeycombed with conditions and restrictions that would dazzle the imagination of the hardest-core bureaucrat.

Let me assure you that I am sympathetic to the need for simplifying Federal programs and I understand the problems you face in confronting an often untidy and confusing Federal aid structure. But the answer to the problem does not lie in a wholesale conversion to block grants.

WE MUST CONSOLIDATE AND STREAMLINE AID PROGRAMS

Instead, we must seek to broaden, consolidate, and streamline existing categorical programs where appropriate. Congress and the Administration are now moving in this direction. The Education Professions Development Act of 1967, for example, of which Al Quile and I were co-sponsors, has replaced a number of fragmented legislative authorities for training educational personnel with one comprehensive and flexible program. Right now, Congress is working on legislation to improve vocational education programs and to consolidate college student aid. These programs are aimed at providing local and state education authorities with greater flexibility and less red tape, not the reverse. But they remain categorical programs, targeted on meeting urgent needs in these two areas.

The second myth on which advocates of general aid frequently ground their case has to do with alleged "control" of education. The special purpose education programs passed by Congress in recent years, so goes the argument, must inevitably bring Federal control of our schools and colleges.

But you and I know that policy-making in education in the United States is so widely dispersed and so deeply imbedded in traditional American pluralism that effective control has never been—and never should be—concentrated in one institution or in one level of government.

After all, we do not really have a "system" of education in the United States at all, but rather a whole variety of systems each with substantial autonomy. That the Federal government or the Office of Education could exercise control over 25,000 school boards and 50 state education departments, even if it wished to do so, is highly unlikely.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE HAS ENHANCED OPTIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

Furthermore, it is important to note that the Federal aid programs enacted in the past few years, far from limiting the role of state and local education agencies, have considerably enhanced their options and responsi-

bilities. Indeed, the effectiveness of Federal aid-to-education programs depends fundamentally on initiative and creativity from local school systems themselves and on the capacity for leadership and coordination of the state departments of education.

The ESEA in particular places heavy responsibility at the grassroots. Title I compensatory programs are conceived and designed entirely at the local level and approved by state education agencies.

Title II, the textbook title, gives both state and local school systems new and valuable resources for learning; it does not cripple state and local leadership.

Title III, aimed at encouraging innovation, also stimulates initiative by local schools. The states, which have played a reviewing and recommending role up to now, will soon, under the 1967 amendments, take over control of Title III projects. Let us all hope that State education agencies will respond to this new opportunity with imagination and vigor. Some of us in Congress have frankly been dubious but hope we are proved wrong, and I can cite to you more than one local school superintendent who prefers Federal red tape to the kind manufactured in his state capital.

I believe the enactment last year of the Education Professions Development Act is itself an excellent refutation of the contention that categorical aid leads to Federal control of education and should, therefore, be opposed.

It is true that the funds under this Act are not, as Commissioner Howe noted the other day, "a cornucopia showering Federal largess over the educators of the land for all good causes in general, but a carefully written and precisely focused law designed to improve education by increasing the supply of well-trained educators."

Can it be seriously contended that the passage of this legislation will—or is intended to—usurp or erode state and local prerogatives in education? The only programs that will be carried out under the Act will be those proposed to the Office of Education for preparing or upgrading educational personnel—and the proposals will be initiated by colleges and universities, state education departments and local school districts.

As Commissioner Howe has noted, "The act represents a decision by Congress that the shortage of educational manpower is a national problem of such scope and importance that it requires a national effort."

There are two other points that must be made in respect of the allegation of Federal control:

A NATIONWIDE MANDATE

First, the impetus for increased Federal support of education has not come from heavy-handed, anonymous bureaucrats in Washington. It has been the elected representatives of the people from every state and locality in the nation in Congress assembled who have considered and enacted the new education programs. Federal aid to education derives from a nation-wide mandate in Congress; it has not been ordained by Federal administrators in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Second, the states, by law and custom, have the primary responsibility for education, but historically the Federal government has shown an interest in helping the states improve their educational systems. From the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 through the Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and the G.I. Bill of World War II, the Federal government, while clearly a junior partner in the educational enterprise, has sought to identify national needs in education and to help the states to meet them. My point is that recent Federal education measures, though substantially increasing the Federal investment in education, are not a radical departure, viewed in this historical perspective. The Federal government

is not seeking to take over state and local prerogatives; it is not making a power play to control education. Rather, the American people, acting through their President and Representatives in Congress, have again identified certain educational problems requiring attention on a nation-wide basis and have determined to direct Federal funds to help solve them.

SOME THORNY ISSUES RAISED BY GENERAL AID

So much for the myths which I think cloud the discussion of general versus categorical aid. As I have indicated, I would not be unsympathetic to some form of block grants at a later date. Given the mounting cost of education, the inadequate tax resources of local governments, and the unwillingness of some state politicians to support funds for education (here cite Governor Kirk of Florida), it may be essential for the Federal government to use its revenue capacity to underwrite the major expense of the national educational system. But let me outline some of the serious questions which I think must be raised before we can move ahead with the general aid approach.

First is the simple fact that we are in a period of serious retrenchment in Federal expenditures. All the current education programs, from Head Start to college facility grants, are feeling the pinch. As long as education is on a tight budget, we clearly cannot afford both to continue financing categorical programs and to initiate general, across-the-board support. And as long as we cannot afford both, we must hold our focus on the programs already established to meet critical needs.

Consider the matter in these terms. In 1963-64, the Federal government provided 4 per cent of the costs of elementary and secondary education. In 1966-67, the Federal share, largely as a result of the passage of ESEA, nearly doubled, but nonetheless amounted to only 7.2 per cent of the total funds expended.

If the increased Federal investment of a little over 3 per cent were lumped into block grants, it would simply be reflected in a slight percentage increase of each school operating budget, and the impact on special education needs would be inconsequential.

The effect of converting categorical programs to general aid reminds me of Mark Twain's description of the Platte River: 6 miles wide and a half-inch deep.

As it is, we are now spending only a bare minimum to support the categorical programs under ESEA. Dean TheodoreSizer of the Harvard Graduate School of Education has recently pointed out that the major programs in education are still operating on a marginal basis. I quote from his just published annual report:

"The Federal government's entrance into educational reform, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was first seen as a modest start, a short step in anticipation of a longer one. The major provision was \$1.2 billion directed at schooling for the children of poor families. While this sum sounds large, it averages out to \$92 per "disadvantaged" child, a small increase, considering the need, above the \$564 now being spent per American school child."

Dean Sizer notes that there have been few startling results, either positive or negative, to date—"an unsurprising fact," he says, "considering the small scale of the effort and the short span of the experiment."

The annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children made a similar point only a few days ago—that most projects for improving the education of poor children are spreading funds too thinly. Substantially more money is needed, said the Council. "The surface of this important work has been only lightly scratched."

To make general the Federal aid that we are already providing would therefore, in

my view, only further reduce the possibility of achieving significant results.

Fiscal reality, then, requires that we postpone any move toward general aid in the immediate future. Only when Federal funds are running more freely—perhaps only after Vietnam—can we seriously consider a program of block grants to education. But even at the point where we might have sufficient resources to undertake both categorical and block grants, there are several other problems that would need to be resolved. Here are some of the thorniest issues:

THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE

1. A renewal of strife over the church-state issue could pose a major dilemma. Controversies over this question contributed to the defeat of Federal school aid for many years. The ESEA broke the deadlock in 1965 with the provision that parochial school children should share in the benefits of a number of publicly operated programs.

Yet the constitutions of over 30 states explicitly prohibit the use of any state funds for the support, direct or indirect, of church-related schools. Block federal grants to the states, to be distributed not on a categorical basis but at the discretion of state agencies, could, therefore, raise anew the issue of religion. The result could be to create widespread discord and to vitiate the cooperative efforts between public and parochial schools that are now taking place under ESEA.

2. Second, the question of school integration is still, 13 years after *Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka*, the most sensitive problem, North as well as South, in American elementary and secondary education. It is no secret that some Members of Congress favor block grants to the states rather than categorical aid because they believe that the state-directed programs offer a more promising refuge from the school desegregation guidelines than do current programs.

Although compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act remains a condition of receiving Federal funds for a wide spectrum of programs, of which education is only one, there is surely little justification for arguing that turning Federal funds over to the states will make easier the effective implementation of either court decisions or legislative actions in resolving this most difficult dilemma in American life.

3. A third problem is that not all states have the capacity to administer effectively a substantial infusion of block grants. Testimony before Congressional committees has shown that many state education agencies are not yet sufficiently equipped with staff and other resources to take on such a major administrative responsibility. Some states do have this capacity and with the help of Title V of ESEA, the states are making significant efforts to strengthen their education departments. Nevertheless, serious personnel shortages and resistance to change still leave some state departments badly handicapped administratively.

4. Another point that, in my view, has received insufficient attention, is that many chief state school officers—22 to be exact—are, like Al Quile and me, elected politicians, and not solely professional educators. Turning over large sums of unrestricted Federal money to state education officials who do not bear the burden at the polls of having voted for the taxes poses certain questions about responsible and democratic government.

5. A fifth problem: how to insure that state and local governments do not substitute Federal block grant support for their own fiscal effort. If Federal dollars merely replace state and local dollars, general aid will achieve no purpose. Only this month a Federal court struck down as unconstitutional a law of the State of Virginia that reduced State assistance to school districts receiving Federal impacted area funds. Per-

haps Virginia was demonstrating its devotion to states' rights!

UNRESPONSIVENESS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS TO URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

6. But the most disturbing issue the general aid concept poses is the traditional unresponsiveness of state governments to the overwhelming needs of urban school districts. States support for local schools is typically riddled with disparities between rural and urban areas, city and suburb, and between suburbs themselves. Above all, distribution formulas for state aid have long been weighed against the cities, thereby short-changing urban school children.

What hope, then can we find in block grants to education channeled through the states? The most likely prospect is that such general aid would only magnify the inequities that already exist within the states.

Inequitable treatment of the cities in programs of state aid historically reflects the influence of rural dominated state legislatures. And reapportionment is bringing no remedy for this situation. In fact, the effect of reapportionment appears to be to strengthen the position of suburban interests rather than those of the inner cities. Many cities have actually lost some state representation as a result of the one man-one vote decision.

A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, covering 37 metropolitan areas, shows clearly the tendency of state financial aid to favor suburban schools over central city schools. The Commission's study found that schools serving low-income central city children are receiving less per pupil as well as less per capita than those serving the more affluent suburbs. A Carnegie Corporation survey in 1966 estimated that on the average suburbs receive \$40 more per pupil in state aid than the cities.

Hardly any state has yet sought to revise its school aid formulas to account for the relative financial requirements for educating different kinds of children—for example, disadvantaged as distinguished from middle class children. Just as we spend a great deal extra for the education of physically handicapped children, so we need to spend much more to educate children with economic and cultural handicaps. A program like Head Start is an attempt to compensate for the needs of the poor child; to pay for special services and smaller classes, Head Start makes an average per pupil expenditure of \$1200, compared with \$600 or \$700 for the suburban child. So far the states have made no such effort to gear their financial aid programs to the needs of different children.

The President-elect of the University of Chicago, Edward H. Levi, has recently posed the following question: Are the inequities in the operation of state educational systems "to be justified because this is the way the ball bounces; that is, this is how state action happens to collect and happens to allocate funds for the education it requires of all?" Dr. Levi suggests that there may be a strong argument to be made for the unconstitutionality of certain aspects of state and local educational financing.

THE DETROIT SCHOOL BOARD CASE

In fact, Levi's proposal is now being tested by the Detroit Board of Education, which has initiated what may be a landmark case concerning the issue of equity in the distribution of state school aid. The Detroit suit is aimed at compelling the state of Michigan to provide equal educational opportunity for all public school children in the state, even if this means unequal amounts of aid per child. The Detroit School Board, basing its case on the 14th Amendment provision that states grant equal protection of the laws to all citizens, maintains that equal opportunities in education require that state educational assistance be based upon the needs

of each child and the costs of providing the required educational services.

The Detroit case could have an enormous impact upon traditional state practices in support of education.

In all of this discussion, I do not mean to say that there have been no stirrings within the states themselves for mending their ways. Indeed, I was encouraged by a report I saw recently of a Florida Commission for Quality Education, which has made some challenging recommendations for state action. The Commission recommends that the state of Florida take over 75 per cent of public school spending and that the tax burden for supporting the schools be equalized through state-wide, uniform assessment of property for tax purposes.

But we have a long way to go before such essential measures are fully implemented in all states. Until the states have developed the capacity and willingness to deal with today's critical problems in education, general aid to the states will not be a sound proposition.

When, however, general aid does come, it should clearly be in addition to, not in place of, effective programs of categorical assistance.

Again to quote Secretary Gardner:

"A strong Federal government . . . must create flexible partnerships with State and local government and the private sector that throw the challenge back to the people and their local institutions. They can and should rise to the occasion; they can and should contribute solutions in their own style. I don't think many Americans today understand the extent to which much of recent legislation dealing with health, education, poverty and the cities devolve initiative and operating responsibility to the grass roots."

For I return in conclusion to the theme with which I began my remarks. So manifold and difficult are the problems that beset Americans today that we need strong and imaginative leadership at every level—in education and elsewhere—from the grass roots, where you are, to our state and Federal units of government.

Working together, and not at cross purposes, we can make of American education what all of us want it to be—the foundation of our freedoms and the hope of our future.

Code of Ethics

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the decisive action taken by the Springfield Avenue Merchants Association of Newark, N.J., to protect customers against questionable business practices and improve community relations. A comprehensive code of ethics, adopted by the merchants, is enforced by the Springfield Avenue Complaint Bureau manned by volunteer businessmen and one paid assistant and director operating on a most modest budget.

The code reads as follows:

CODE OF ETHICS OF THE SPRINGFIELD AVENUE MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION

1. I will not advertise in the newspapers, on radio or through store window display any merchandise unless such merchandise is actually available for sale at the advertised price.

2. Any reduced price sale of merchandise will be a bona fide sale of regular merchandise

that has actually been sold by me at a higher price and is now being reduced in price for legitimate business reasons. When I buy special merchandise to be sold at special prices, I will not misrepresent it as regular merchandise that has been marked down.

3. The price for all goods will be dictated by business cost plus reasonable profit. We will not raise prices on the first of the month because welfare checks are issued on the first of the month.

4. When a welfare client asks for an estimate on furniture or appliances, they will be shown the merchandise and will receive a written estimate on the merchandise they have seen that will bind me to sell them that merchandise at the estimated price. I will not charge a fee to give an estimate.

5. All time sales contracts will clearly identify all interest charges, fees and handling costs. Interest charges will be cited in annual percentages and in total dollars and cents cost over the life of the contract.

6. I will only charge 10% interest on any installment contract that is personally carried by this business establishment.

7. In so far as possible, where I cannot carry the contract myself, I will deal with that discount house which will give the consumer the lowest and fairest rate.

8. All contracts will be available in either the Spanish or English language.

9. If a customer does not understand a contract, I will refer him, if he meets income eligibility requirements, to the Newark Legal Services Corporation for aid.

10. Every customer will receive a copy of every legal document that he has signed.

11. Products will not be represented as to performance and quality unless I am prepared to back up every oral promise with a written guarantee. Nothing shall be represented as guaranteed or warranted unless I intend to give the customer a written guaranty or warranty.

12. All goods will be legibly marked in dollars and cents as to their cost. No codes will be used.

13. All retail stores run on a cash only basis will give refunds cheerfully.

14. If a deposit is made pending approval of a credit agreement and the credit agreement is not approved, the deposit will be cheerfully refunded.

15. All complaints will be treated fairly and will be settled to the customer's satisfaction.

16. I will participate in meaningful, worthwhile community programs.

17. We will deal with each customer fairly, in good faith and without undue suspicion.

18. We offer the services of the Springfield Avenue Area Complaint Bureau, 382 Springfield Avenue, Newark, for the mediation of all problems which consumers shopping on Springfield Avenue have encountered.

19. For the protection of the consumer, we will maintain a continuing working relationship with the New Jersey Office of Consumer Protection, the Essex County Welfare Board and the Voice of the Ministers.

Hamilton Fish

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently published a letter from the Honorable Hamilton Fish, who was chairman of the first congressional committee to investigate Communist activities in 1930 and 1931. Mr. Fish offers some pertinent com-

ments on our involvement in Vietnam, and although I do not agree with each of his criticisms, his analysis should be read carefully by each Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1968]

WAR OPPOSED

NEW YORK, February 1, 1968.

TO THE EDITOR: I admit utter confusion over the position of the Johnson Administration in South Vietnam. While President Johnson encourages trade and the creation of consulates with the Communists, he continues to send young Americans to defend Southeast Asia against Communism.

It is beginning to appear more and more that the original understanding of the Tonkin incident in 1964 was not correct. Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who steered the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution through, now claims that our ships had been spying on North Vietnam and had even violated the territorial waters of that country. The information regarding the Tonkin incident was apparently not only incorrect but was manipulated to secure the authorization from Congress for President Johnson to take whatever military action he deemed necessary.

FOR NEGOTIATED PEACE

The Republicans in Congress are right in supporting our armed forces once they are engaged in battle and for refusal to withdraw until a just and honorable peace has been negotiated. However, the Republican leadership in Congress errs in not making it perfectly plain that this was not Eisenhower's or Kennedy's war, but is and has been Johnson's war, and for not pressing harder for a negotiated peace. President Kennedy said, "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

It is my opinion that any of the Republican candidates mentioned will defeat President Johnson, if the war is still going on, by merely copying what President Eisenhower did in the Korean war: promising to end it immediately after he became President.

As a long-time anti-Communist leader, I am convinced that our involvement in Vietnam was unnecessary, illegal and unconstitutional, and the wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Soviet Russia and Communist China, two dominating forces, want to keep our armed forces bogged down while Communism reaps the harvest of hatred as a result of their massive propaganda depicting our killing and maiming women and children. But, even more than that, Soviet Russia is quietly seizing economic and military control and rapidly increasing influence throughout the Middle East and along the coast of the Red Sea, free from interference from the United States, trapped in Vietnam.

HAMILTON FISH,

Chairman of the First Congressional Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930-31.

Stand Up, Squares

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following commentary, which appeared in the editorial column of the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, presents one of the most thought-provoking messages I have read in a long time.

I believe my colleagues will agree that we would have far fewer problems in the

world today if the population of "squares" were increased. The editorial follows:

STAND UP, SQUARES

In our mail is an attention-getting commentary captioned "All Squares Please Stand."

We don't know its origin. The copy we have come from a friend and is signed "compliments John S. Swift Co. Inc."

We believe you will enjoy it: "Square," another of the good old words, has gone the way of "love" and "modesty" and "patriotism." Something to be snickered over or outright laughed at.

Once there was no higher compliment you could pay a man than to call him a "square-shooter." The adman's promise of a "square deal" was as binding as an oath on a Bible. One of those admen, Charles Brower, says he's fed up with this beat generation distorting and corrupting our time-honored vocabulary. He said most of this first, but we second the notion: Today's "square" volunteers when doesn't have to.

He's a guy who gets his kicks from trying to do a job better than anyone else.

He's a boob who gets so lost in his work he has to be reminded to go home.

A square doesn't want to stop at the bar and get all juiced up because he prefers to go to his own home, his own dinner table, his own bed.

He hasn't learned to cut corners or goof off.

This creep we call a "square" gets all choked up when he hears children singing, "My country, 'tis of thee . . ."

He even believes in God and says so—in public!

A square lives within his means whether the Joneses do or not, and thinks his Uncle Sam should too.

A square is likely to save some of his own money for a rainy day, rather than count on using yours.

A square gets his books out the library instead of the drugstore.

He tells his son it's more important to play fair than to win.

Imagine!!

A square reads scripture when nobody's watching, prays when nobody's listening.

A guy who thinks Christmas trees should be green and Christmas gifts should be hand-picked.

And he wants to see America first—in everything.

He believes in honoring father and mother and "do unto others," and that kind of stuff.

He thinks he knows more than his teenager about cars, freedom, and curfew.

... Will all gooney-birds answering this description please stand up. You misfits in this brave new age, you dismally disorganized improperly apologetic ghosts of the past, stand up! Stand up and be counted! You squares . . . who turn the wheels and dig the fields and move mountains and put rivets in our dreams. You squares . . . who dignify the human race . . . You squares who hold the thankless world in place.

Lerner Press Carries Excellent Series on Greece

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lerner publications in my district recently carried a three-part series on the current situation in Greece which I believe deserves the attention of my colleagues.

In a few days, Andrea Papandreou, one of the leading spokesmen in the opposition is expected to visit the United States and I am sure he will bring with him his own views on the current situation in Greece.

I do not agree with Mr. Papandreou's evaluation of the current situation. As a matter of fact, after having personally observed the situation in Greece, and after having talked to his distinguished father the former Prime Minister of Greece, George Papandreou, I am convinced that Andreou Papandreou has contributed more toward the turmoil in Greece which led to the present coup than any other single individual in Greece.

It is for this reason that I am pleased today to put into the RECORD the series which appeared in the Lerner Press because Miss Lily Venson, the reporter who wrote this series, has done a truly outstanding job in depicting the present situation in Greece.

Miss Venson demonstrates a penetrating journalistic mind and an exceptional gift for good writing.

I hope her excellent series will help to put into perspective the current situation in Greece, and I hope that those who might be tempted to shower any great praise on Andrea Papandreou will compare his observations to those so excellently described in the Lerner Press series.

The series by Miss Lily Venson follows:

PUCINSKI VIEWS "NEW" GREECE

(By Lily Venson)

All the world is watching as "the glory that is Greece" hangs in the balance. The birth place of democracy and freedom has been placed in a crucible—and the test is severe.

Many people in the United States have lashed out with sharp criticism of the new government imposed on the people of Greece following a military coup d'etat last April.

A great number of these critics, including some in the mass media, have been outspoken in spite of the fact that not all are fully informed about events and conditions leading up to the coup.

But one North Side Congressman, Roman Pucinski (D-11th), made it his business to become informed—during a personal 10-day inspection tour of Greece last month.

The opportunity arose when Chris Mitchell, president of the Pan Arcadian Federation, invited Pucinski to attend the organization's convention in Athens. Some 3,500 Greek-Americans participated.

During an interview with this newspaper, Pucinski spoke eloquently about the people of Greece and with a quiet reverence as he described his visit to the Acropolis.

And he was coolly realistic in his analysis of the military takeover. He was there to try and understand the entire complex condition and his appraisal of the situation was tempered by an unbiased attitude.

He relates that "a 10-day visit to Greece leaves one fully aware that the new government has not taken any overt acts to enforce many of their edicts.

"There are no soldiers in the streets, no armed guards in the hotels. Young women continue to wear mini-skirts, and fortunately," he said mirthfully, "the Greek women have the legs to go with the mini-skirts."

"Generally, the casual visitor to Greece would not be aware that a military junta is running the country.

"The military leaders themselves recognize that Greece depends heavily on tourism to sustain her economy and, if anything, the

new government has gone to extreme means to assure visitors courteous treatment all along the way.

"The government has done nothing to disturb the traditional and world-renowned Greek hospitality."

Cong. Pucinski remarked that perhaps the most amazing thing that a visitor finds is that the people themselves, despite the fact that their own personal liberties have been severely restricted, appear to be the greatest defenders of this present regime.

"People are quick to tell you that a revolution was inevitable and that only a strong military government could have restored order out of complete disorder which reached chaotic proportions prior to April 21 when the junta took over," continued Pucinski.

"The Greek people tell you about what it was like in Greece prior to the revolution.

"They say that wildcat strikes were the order of the day and that when they left home in the morning, they never knew if they would arrive home at night because almost every day, some portion of the transit system underwent a wildcat strike, with bus drivers leaving buses in the middle of the street during rush hours."

The congressman was told that the press was in total disarray, with violent attacks upon all segments of Greek society.

A publisher who is now working under severe censorship and who is strongly opposed to the present system said to Pucinski:

"If you had asked me about the condition of the Greek press prior to the revolution, I would have to admit with great shame that I was a member of the journalistic fraternity."

The publisher said the state of the press was incredible before the coup, and had reached new heights of irresponsibility.

As he toured Greece, talking intimately with people at all levels of life, the congressman learned more about the state of the country up to the military takeover:

"The people told me that morality and graft among public officials became so intolerable that even the slightest service, such as signing an inconsequential document, required a payoff."

"George Papandreou, former prime minister who is now under house arrest and one of the strongest critics of the present regime, told me that members of parliament were being corrupted and bought and sold every day for their votes in parliament."

"The people of Greece tell you that this whole situation is what made the revolution inevitable, and when it finally occurred on the morning of April 21, the general reaction was—'what kept it so long in coming?'"

The North Side congressman had many discussions with the military leaders during his 10-day tour. These were the men who led the revolution.

One of them reported "this country was so ripe for a revolution that we didn't even have to stretch; we just yawned and 8½ million people rolled into our laps."

Pucinski emphasized again that the most amazing thing he encountered was the seeming acceptance of this revolution by the people, but he qualified the comment with the following opinion:

"This acceptance, it is quite clear to me, will be short-lived if the military junta fails to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government as quickly as possible."

"The military government has imposed severe limitations on the Greek people and while they are accepting these limitations today, there is every reason to believe—as anyone who has studied the history of Greece knows—that they will not tolerate this kind of repression indefinitely."

Pucinski then detailed some of the restrictions imposed by the new government:

The military leaders have passed a slander law. Any citizen who speaks out in criticism of the new government is arrested

and tried and can be punished by imprisonment for up to five years.

They have imposed severe limitations on assembly and no more than five people can assemble at any one time without giving police the names and addresses of all those in excess of five. Prior permission for such a meeting is also required.

The junta has imposed a total censorship on the press and newspapers have to submit proofs to a censor before the presses can roll.

They have installed military courts in place of a judicial system. Tribunals are held for all crimes against the state—so that you are tried by court martial with no bond and no bail.

The military people have arrested more than 6,500 Greeks who have been, in some way or other, associated with communist activities.

"JUNTA MUST KEEP PLEDGE": PUCINSKI

(NOTE.—This is the second of a series on conditions in Greece since the military takeover last April, as viewed by Cong. Roman Pucinski (D-Ill.), who made a 10-day inspection tour of Greece last month.)

(By Lily Venson)

"There are no soldiers in the streets, no armed guards in the hotels and young women continue to wear mini-skirts," Pucinski told the Lerner Newspapers, "and the casual visitor to Greece would not be aware that a military junta is running the country."

But during his tour, which included discussions with persons at all levels of life, as well as the top military officials who led the coup d'etat April 21, Pucinski was told that the revolution was inevitable because of the "chaotic conditions" that prevailed throughout every facet of society.

The military junta has imposed severe limitations on the Greek people, Pucinski related, and although the people have seemingly accepted the revolution, the congressman feels strongly that this acceptance will be short-lived if the military junta fails to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government as quickly as possible.

He emphasized that anyone familiar with the history of Greece knows the people will not tolerate any repression of their freedom for very long.

Pucinski observed that some of the severe restrictions include: a slander law with imprisonment up to five years for anyone criticizing the new government; general assemblies restricted to five persons at any one time—names and addresses of more than five must be given to police and prior consent for the meeting is up to the police.

Total censorship of the press has been instituted, and a judicial system has been replaced by military tribunals with no bond or bail permitted.

The Congressman was informed that more than 6,500 Greeks who have been associated with Communist activities have been arrested.

"Approximately 2,500 of these prisoners are in custody on the island of Yaros, which is in the Aegean Sea, about one hour's helicopter flight from Athens," continued Pucinski.

"I am the only foreigner to ever visit the island and I was taken there by General Patakos, minister of the interior in charge of security."

"He led the tanks in the revolution and he is considered one of the strong men of the military government."

"During my visit to the island, I observed with amazement while Patakos told hundreds of prisoners that if they would either sign statements or make oral statements pledging not to conspire with the Communists to overthrow the government, they could go home immediately—and they all refused."

"One woman, the mother of three young children whose photos she had put up on her prison wall, listened as the general told her, 'you don't belong here—go back to your children who need you and be a mother. Leave the politics to us.'"

"She answered politely, 'No, thank you. I am a leftist and I will stay a leftist and I will stay here.'"

Pucinski reports that the same ritual was repeated over and over during his visit on the island and while most of the prisoners protested their incarceration, none of them would sign the document pledging not to conspire with the Communists.

The general said that 4,000 of the 6,500 originally arrested did sign the document and were released. He insists that those left on Yaros are hard core Communists.

During his long discussions with the military leaders, Pucinski, was informed that the junta had to institute repressive measures throughout Greece to save the country from Communism.

As an aside, Pucinski said that these same leaders now readily admit they made a mistake in getting into a fight with Melina Mercouri, the Greek film actress of "Never on Sunday" fame whose citizenship was stripped because she criticized the new regime.

The government feels it can do nothing about it now and they wish to ignore her, Pucinski was told.

Under arrest, Pucinski learned, is the 22-year-old daughter of Constantinos Doxiadis, world famous city planner. She is accused of conspiring with the Communists.

Composer Theodorakis, who wrote the musical score for the film "Zorba the Greek," is also under arrest according to Pucinski, who reacted to all of this news with the following comment:

"My own feeling is that this kind of political prosecution is repugnant to Americans, but the Greek military leaders insist that these people must be tried."

"It is my hope that as the new regime establishes its own position and gets the government moving, the authorities are going to at least assure these people adequate defense counsel. If, indeed, they did conspire with the Communists, they should be tried in an open court."

"However, there is no question that the rough attitude of the government toward this whole business of court martial trials has brought Greece a much greater stability."

"But you feel, as you speak with people around the country, that while they are willing to accept these severe measures for a brief time, the trouble of this new administration will mount if they try to make these repressive measures permanent."

The North Side congressman said that in talking to leaders of the junta, he had the feeling that they are very much aware of this and all of them told him that they had given the king their pledge that they would return to a parliamentary government as quickly as possible through free elections.

"Only time will tell to what extent they intend to keep their word," Pucinski added.

"One of the former members of parliament, who is not part of the military junta but who is not under house arrest, admitted that a strong change was inevitable."

"He felt that this government will have to start easing up on some of the restrictions if it is to survive."

Former prime minister George Papandreou, who is under house arrest, informed Pucinski that there was no need for the military coup.

He argues that the elections, which had been scheduled for May 28, five weeks after the coup, would have cured most of the evils rampant in Greece.

"But the leaders of the coup say that the Communists would have elected 60 seats in the Greek parliament, which had 300 delegates, and with these 60 seats, the military

people insist, the Communists could have forced a coalition government to draw Greece out of NATO and pull Greece away from her alliance with America," continued Pucinski.

"The military junta has strongly endorsed continued membership in NATO. Our own government has temporarily suspended sending any military aid to Greece but, in my own judgment, we should restore this aid because Greece is the keystone of our whole defense perimeter in Europe."

MUST KEEP GREECE IN NATO

(By Lily Venson)

"No matter how cynical one might feel about the present military regime in Greece, it is a truly inspiring experience to walk in the land which gave birth to democracy, to the ideas and to the philosophy that carved a new concept for the dignity of man.

"You cannot stand on the hallowed grounds of the Acropolis and rub elbows among those ancient rocks without feeling a surge of history all around you."

Describing his recent 10-day tour of Greece was Cong. Roman Pucinski (D-11th) who was there to gain insight into conditions of the country before and after the coup d'etat last April.

After what he calls an exhaustive study, long discussions with leaders of the military government, and in-depth interviews with the man on the street, Pucinski formulated the personal opinions he stated before Congress during a one-hour presentation after his return from Greece.

Following are some of the salient points in his long statement:

"It is in the interest of the United States for our country to resume shipment of important military aid to Greece as part of our NATO defense structure.

"It is in the interest of the United States to press for restoration of parliamentary government in Greece, and this can be done by giving the present government of Greece technical assistance to meet many of the civilian problems, which the generals, by the very nature of their military background, will find difficulty in solving.

"We should help this government develop a democratic base for restoration of constitutional government.

"It is important for the United States to help King Constantine press the present military regime to restore parliamentary government to Greece as quickly as possible.

"I do not want my observations or my remarks ever to be construed as condoning a government which would deny its people basic civil rights.

"But neither would I ever want to be blinded by the realities of life, and one of those realities is that the military regime presently is in control of Greece.

"Furthermore, this regime has stated publicly and unequivocally that it supports America's position in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will keep Greece in NATO."

The Congressman then emphasized that our nation cannot, and must not, ignore the fact that the crisis in the Middle East is not over.

"The Soviet Union continues to have her evil designs for the destruction of Israel. We may need Greece as our most reliable base if the situation in the Middle East should worsen.

"During the recent crisis, Greece stood with us and helped relocate Americans from the Middle East."

Pucinski reported to Congress that, on the basis of his most honest and sincere studies, the military government has the popular support of the people of Greece at this time.

"There are those who would challenge this statement and I respect their views.

"But the fact remains that if an election were to be held in Greece today, responsible

people in Greece—including the bitter critics of the present regime—told me that the present military government would be overwhelmingly elected because it has restored order out of chaos in the country.

"I know there are those who will seriously question this conclusion, but the fact of the matter is that the people in the streets of Athens and in the villages told me that conditions had become so intolerable in Greece prior to April 21 that a revolution was inevitable."

Referring again to the importance of U.S. military aid, Pucinski declared that it is easy enough for Americans, deeply set in traditions of democracy, to insist that the Greek government institute constitutional rule in Greece before any further assistance is given.

"I would subscribe to this doctrine," the congressman continued, "but I think it is important to know that in a country whose northern border has three nations under Communist rule—the fears of its leaders are justified.

"Greece has Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on her northern border. History has shown us there is no 'second chance' with communism.

"You do not have any time to be wrong when you have three neighbors who would like to plunge you into the Communist orbit at the first opportunity."

During his tour of Greece, Pucinski spent two hours with former prime minister George Papandreou, who is under house arrest in his villa.

Based on this interview, Pucinski told Congress, "It is very clear that Papandreou had nothing but contempt for the present government and this is certainly understandable.

"The senior Papandreou defends his son, Andreas Papandreou, who is now awaiting trial for treason.

"It will be recalled that the King had deposed George Papandreou as prime minister in 1965 when he tried to make his son Andreas minister of defense.

"It is a known fact that Andreas recommended pulling Greece out of NATO. This was one of the main subjects of dispute within the government and the reason King Constantine deposed his prime minister.

George Papandreou told Pucinski that he and his son were critical of NATO because the NATO command told them NATO would not help Greece if she was attacked by Turkey for trying to recapture Cyprus.

"NATO insisted it could help only when a non-member nation attacked Greece. Both Papandreous insisted they did not need NATO under those conditions, and threatened to pull Greece out of NATO, the former prime minister said."

George Papandreou told Pucinski that he would never have agreed to work with the Communists, that he would never have agreed to a coalition government if the coalition was with the Communists.

"But," Pucinski told Congress, "those within the present Greek government insist that after two years of being deposed as prime minister, Papandreou would have been willing to agree to form a coalition government with the help of the Communists, and the price of such a coalition would have been the withdrawal of Greece from NATO."

The Congressman reported further that there is a fear in Greece that if the present government should fall, civil war may very well ensue, forcing Greece out of NATO and throwing the nation to the Communists.

He stressed that he can think of nothing more disastrous to the interests of America than to see Greece forced out of NATO or for NATO to lose "this very important bastion on the Mediterranean."

"It would give the Soviet Union access to the Mediterranean and probably force our 6th Fleet out of the Mediterranean.

"It would give the Soviet Union control

over the Middle East and ultimately the gateway to Africa. This is a prize that the Communists have coveted for the last two decades."

Pucinski reminded Congress that the Greeks were the first ones in 1947 who, against great odds, stood up to the Communists, and suffered great losses to protect their country for freedom.

He said he will stake his hopes and confidence on the people of Greece, confident that they will force the military junta to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government.

"It is my hope that we will help King Constantine return Greece to its traditional role as the cradle of democracy.

"The indisputable fact of the day is that in this troubled world, with great trouble in the Middle East, with great trouble in Europe, with great trouble in Asia, I submit that America needs Greece today a great deal more than Greece needs us."

A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education Conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Bank Street College of Education has been conducting a 2-year study of auxiliary personnel—nonprofessionals—in education for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The first phase of the study during 1966-67 consisted primarily of developing, coordinating, and analyzing 15 demonstration training programs located throughout the country.

Trainees varied in ethnic background including Negroes, Caucasians, Orientals, and American Indians as well as Mexican Americans and Americans born in Puerto Rico. The trainees also varied in age and in extent of their previous training and experience. All were at or below the poverty level: some from depressed rural areas and some from the target areas in cities. The trainees were drawn from the neighborhoods served by the schools—many of them parents of pupils—hence they helped to provide a communication bridge between home and school in disadvantaged areas. All trainees had one trait in common: the ability to work well with children and youth. This was seen as the essential criterion in the selection process.

From the analysis of these 15 projects and from consultations with educators and community leaders throughout the country, some significant findings and recommendations emerged. They are summarized in a pamphlet which has provided guidelines to school administrators, deans of colleges of education, teachers, parents, community leaders and to the auxiliaries themselves as they plan and work together for the training and effective utilization of auxiliary personnel in the schools.

The recent amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requiring training for auxiliaries employed with ESEA funds, makes this

pamphlet of particular relevance. I therefore shall take this opportunity of reading into the RECORD this pamphlet in its entirety. I believe we may derive some new insights from this document, as we survey a new phenomenon in education. It is our task to provide not only for the training of auxiliaries in the schools but the opportunity for upward mobility in this new career.

The pamphlet follows:

NEW PARTNERS IN THE AMERICAN SCHOOL: A STUDY OF AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN EDUCATION

(By Bank Street College of Education for the Office of Economic Opportunity, November, 1967)

THE NEED

Have you ever heard pupils say: "I don't dig school. Man, they tell you how to talk, how to act, how to eat even. Then at home, they tell you just the opposite. Why don't they either get together on all that stuff or leave me alone. I want out."

Have you ever heard parents say: "School? Well, I don't know what goes on there but I do know that my children can't read. I can't get them to feel school is important the way they should."

Have you ever heard teachers ask: "How can I teach when I have to collect money, prepare bulletin board displays, check supplies, find missing books, prepare flash cards, supervise lunch hours, check attendance, and do all the other little things that eat up my time?"

What can I do for a child who needs a little extra help at a crucial time for him, when all the other children need me at the same time?"

Have you ever heard school administrators ask: "How can I meet the increasing demands—and the very real need—for additional services, when I can't even find enough teachers and other professionals to do the job?"

AN ANSWER—NOT THE ONLY ANSWER

The rapidly changing social scene raises many complex and urgent questions, and demands many answers from the school.

One answer, and a good one, is the use of auxiliary personnel, such as teacher-aides, teacher-assistants, family workers, counselor-aides. These school employees have had little prior academic training when they start work. They learn from experience. They may study and grow on the job. Many have incomes at or below the poverty level. Often they are parents of children in the school they serve, but they do not work with their own children. They vary in age, racial and nationality background, and in the degree of skill, but they have one trait in common: the ability to work well with children and youth.

Auxiliaries who have had training help the learning-teaching process in two ways: first by relieving the teacher of many time-consuming duties and thus freeing him to teach; and second, by working directly with the children under the teacher's supervision, helping them to study, to play, to inquire, to think, to talk, in short—to learn.

RESULTS OF A NATIONWIDE STUDY

Fifteen demonstration training programs for auxiliary school personnel were studied by Bank Street College of Education for the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1966-67.

Trainees included: residents in target areas (predominantly Negro) of the cities of Berkeley, Detroit, Gary (Indiana), East St. Louis (Illinois), New York City, and Washington, D.C.; Navaho Indians in Arizona; rural poor in Appalachia, Maine, Mississippi; migrant workers in Florida; Puerto Ricans in San Juan and New York City; Mexican-Americans and others in Southern Califor-

nia; and a cross-class, cross-cultural group in Boston.

Some major findings are—

1. When carefully selected, continuously trained, and appropriately placed, low-income auxiliaries with minimum prior schooling seemed capable of assisting directly in the learning-teaching process with benefit to: pupils, teachers, administrators, home-school relations, and to the auxiliaries themselves as workers and persons.

2. Training—preferably team training of teachers and auxiliaries who would be or were working together—was seen as the essential to the effective use of auxiliaries.

3. Job definition was obviously necessary to set limits, but in the most successful programs such specifications were applied flexibly, to meet the needs of each learning situation.

4. Career development (assurance of stable employment, opportunity for advancement, and training at each step in the job sequence) was found to be least in evidence, although most crucial, in school systems throughout the country.

STUDY FINDINGS—EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Some special needs of disadvantaged children

1. Education which is geared to the need of each child is important for all pupils but crucial for the disadvantaged.

2. Free movement and varied activities are particularly helpful for children with a high anxiety level who consequently exhibit restlessness and short attention span.

3. Communication between middle-class teachers and lower-class pupils is frequently difficult because of language and cultural barriers, lack of common experiences, and frequent inability of the disadvantaged to express their real feelings appropriately and constructively.

POSSIBLE STAGES IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF AUXILIARIES

	Illustrative functions	Training suggested
(1) AIDE such as:		
General school aide.....	Clerical, monitorial, custodial duties.....	Brief orientation period (2 or 3 weeks) in human development, social relations, and the school's goals and procedures, as well as some basic skill training.
Lunchroom aide.....	Serving and preparation of food, monitorial duties.....	
Teacher aide.....	Helping teacher in classroom, as needed.....	No specified preschooling required.
Family worker or aide.....	Appointments, escorting, and related duties.....	
Counselor aide.....	Clerical, receptionist, and related duties.....	
Library aide.....	Helping with cataloging and distribution of books.....	
(2) Assistant such as:		
Teacher assistant.....	More relationship to instructional process.....	High school diploma or equivalent; 1 year's inservice training or 1 year in college with practicum.
Family assistant.....	Home visits and organizing parent meetings.....	
Counselor assistant.....	More work with records, listening to children sent from class to counselor's office because they are disrupting class.....	Both can be on a workstudy basis while working as an aide.
Library assistant.....	More work with pupils in selecting books and reading to them.....	
(3) Associate such as:		
Teacher associate.....	More responsibility with less supervision by the professional.....	A.A. degree from 2-year college or 2-year special program in a 4-year college. Both can be on work-study basis while working as an assistant.
Home-School associate.....		
Counselor associate.....		
Library associate.....		
Social work associate.....		
(4) Teacher-intern such as:		
Student teacher.....	Duties very similar to those of associate but with more involvement in diagnosis and planning.....	B.A. or B.S. degree and enrollment in a college of teacher education or other institution which offers a program leading to certification.
Student home-school coordinator.....		
Student counselor.....		
(5) Teacher.....		

Note: An auxiliary can enter at any stage in the career ladder, depending upon his previous training and experience. He can cease training at the level at which he feels most comfortable. Upward mobility should be possible but not compulsory. The auxiliary's work should be treated with respect at each stage, so that he will have a sense of dignity and accomplishment, however far he may rise. Group and individual counseling should be available throughout both preservice and inservice training.

TYPES OF WORK AUXILIARIES CAN DO IN SCHOOLS WITH PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISION

1. Examples of activities which directly support the learning-teaching process

The following activities were seen as particularly helpful in one project of the nationwide study which stressed listening, relating, supporting, inspiring, and serving as "trouble shooter":

4. Insecurity about his adequacy for coping with life is a block to learning for any child. It is a frequent problem for those who have been subjected to indignities and inequalities in all phases of living, from early childhood on through adulthood.

5. A parent who has, himself, failed in a school setting, sometimes tends to be hostile to the school and ridicule education. Home-school conflict then becomes one of the destructive influences in the child's learning.

How auxiliaries may help to meet these needs

1. Both teachers and auxiliaries may develop a different quality of relationship which is more pertinent to the child's needs when there are several concerned adults in the classroom instead of one.

2. More small groupings and a wider range of activities are feasible in an aided classroom than in a situation where one person is working all alone, often in an overcrowded classroom and with an overloaded schedule.

3. The auxiliary who lives in the child's own neighborhood often communicates with the child in a way that is neither threatening nor strange. He may help the child adjust to the unfamiliar world of the school and also interpret some aspects of his behavior to the teacher.

4. The low-income auxiliary who has faced up to and overcome some of the difficulties and frustrations the child now faces, says to the child by his very presence in the school: "It can be done. You, too, can succeed here."

5. Involvement of parents from the neighborhood in the classroom may help them support their children's learning. The parent who understands the school's goals may be the best interpreter of the school to the community. Further, parents-as-auxiliaries and teachers may alter each other's ideas and behavior and thus reduce the gulf between life styles of home and school.

(a) Taking charge of a small group which is working on a special project while the teacher works with another group

(b) Listening to a pupil tell a story

(c) Giving a pupil a chance to show he can do something well

(d) Encouraging pupils to help each other

(e) Interesting a restless pupil in some of the available activities

- (f) Helping pupils learn how to settle arguments without fighting
- (g) Talking quietly to a pupil who is upset
- (h) Helping a pupil look up information in a book
- (i) Helping pupils improve special skills (such as gym, sewing, or dancing).

These are merely illustrative of the wide range of activities that are possible and sometimes desirable, always depending on the particular needs of the pupils, the ability of the auxiliary, and the leadership skills of the teacher. Persons from a disadvantaged area are sometimes slow in reading books but seldom slow in reading people. They pick up cues of troubles or of promise with alacrity.

2. Examples of activities which help the teacher by relieving him of noninstructional duties

The following activities were seen as particularly helpful in several of the demonstration projects, where the dual role of the auxiliary was stressed—that is, (1) helping the teacher, and (2) relating directly to the pupils. The task-oriented activities deemed most helpful were:

- (a) Preparing audio-visual materials such as charts, at request of the teacher
- (b) Keeping health, attendance records
- (c) Checking supplies
- (d) Filing and cataloging materials
- (e) Operating equipment such as movie projector, slide projector, tape recorder
- (f) Taking charge of pupils on various occasions, such as during lunch period, in hallways, on bus
- (g) Checking playground equipment for safety
- (h) Getting the classroom ready for the next day
- (i) Running a duplicating machine.

Some of these activities are regular assignments for which the auxiliary plans and takes initiative. Others are assigned at a given moment as the need arises. All are duties which may be delegated outright to the auxiliary, rather than duties which are supportive of instruction and carried out under the teacher's supervision. Most of them involve some contact with pupils, however, which the auxiliary may capitalize upon for pupil learning if he is sensitive to the opportunity.

3. Examples of activities which provide a link with home and community

The following activities are usually performed with the supervision of the school counselor or social worker. These activities were seen by the Study team as particularly helpful in the schools where auxiliaries were used in this manner:

- (a) Visiting parents of children who are new to the school to welcome them to the school community
- (b) Reporting to the counselor problems observed in home visits so that appropriate action may be taken
- (c) Taking children to their homes when they become sick in school
- (d) Talking with parents of children who have been absent or to such children and their parents together
- (e) Working individually with a child who is too upset to remain in his own classroom and who is consequently sent to the counselor's office
- (f) Helping to plan and organize parent meetings
- (g) Talking with parents to find out how they feel about the school and reporting their reactions to a counselor
- (h) Helping parents understand how children learn and grow, and relating this to the children's homework
- (i) Helping recruit and register pupils in the preschool program
- (j) Answering the calls of parents and giving them information and referring them to the proper source.

Of all the auxiliaries employed in a school, relatively few are usually assigned to the guidance department. For example, of the 24 auxiliaries working in each school in the Berkeley demonstration project, only four were counselor-assistants. They were selected from auxiliaries already working in the school who had shown most sensitivity to children's needs and had demonstrated their skills in working with pupils and communicating with parents.

The Study team observed that a cadre of counselor-assistants permitted the guidance counselor increased mobility, it guaranteed that there would be a concerned and knowledgeable adult in the office at all times, to talk with a child who had been sent to the guidance office, to receive visitors, and answer the telephone. Since there was always at least one person in the office, the counselor could be reached in moments of crisis, even though the other three counselor-assistants might be in the field, performing such functions as making home contacts, working with pupils in the "cooling off room," or escorting children to clinics.

Some auxiliaries have special skills which are valuable for use in the classroom or the school at large. For example, auxiliaries who speak another language as well as English often are asked to serve as interpreters for parents who do not feel comfortable talking in English.

Perhaps the most important skill of all is the ability to listen and understand what the child is trying to say. "No one ever listened to me before," one auxiliary in Puerto Rico said of her experiences in an assistant training program. This woman, understanding the need to be listened to, went into the classroom determined to listen to what children were really saying, and to work with their concerns.

An ultimate goal of education may be expressed as helping children learn how to cope effectively with life situations. Auxiliaries have demonstrated their skills in helping children become self-directed. One auxiliary in Berkeley, California, recounted an experience in her school:

"One day I went to a child as I had been doing every day for several weeks to give him help in reading certain words. The child gave me a beautiful smile—one I'll never forget—and said proudly, 'I don't need you any more.' He was on his own. He knew I would be there if he needed me, but he now felt sure enough to work by himself."

The auxiliary, having identified with the goals of the school, saw this episode, not as a rejection of herself, but as a tremendous personal achievement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

It is recommended—

That when a school system decides to utilize auxiliary personnel, the program be incorporated as an integral, permanent part of the system.

That goals be thought through carefully, stated clearly, and implemented by means of definite procedures.

That there be cooperative planning by school systems, local institutions of higher learning, and neighborhood representatives, both before and after the program has been instituted.

That job definitions set a floor and a ceiling on the auxiliaries' activities; but that within these limits the auxiliaries' role be flexible, accommodating to situational and individual requirements.

That career development be fostered in terms of job descriptions, salaries, increments, and fringe benefits, moving from primary routine functions at the entry level to more functions which are relatively responsible and directly related to the learning-teaching process with appropriate training available at each stage on a work-study basis.

That professional standards be preserved

and that all tasks performed by nonprofessionals be supervised by a professional.

That recruitment and selection tap the wealth of previously undiscovered talent, particularly among males and underachievers, who appear to be capable of development in the specific role to be filled.

That there be orientation of both the administrators and the professionals with whom the auxiliaries will be working, including an opportunity for the expression of resistance where it may exist, and for resolution of conflicts, leading, hopefully, to acceptance of the new leadership role of the professionals.

That whenever possible, professionals be asked to volunteer, rather than having auxiliary personnel assigned to them without option.

That there be preservice training of auxiliaries to develop communication skills, other concrete skills, and basic understandings needed for success during their first work experience in a school situation.

That professionals and nonprofessionals who will be working together on the job receive preservice training on a team basis and intensified inservice training also as teams with competent supervision.

The inservice institutes be developed for the team training of administrators, other professionals, and auxiliaries, on a school-wide basis.

That encouragement of those who desire to train and qualify for advancement be expressed in such a way that others who prefer to remain at the entry or any other level feel no lack of job satisfaction, status, or recognition.

That hiring precede training, so that trainees will be given orientation for an actual job, rather than for a job which, in the end, may not exist.

That feedback from trainees be encouraged and that their comments be received with openness and serious consideration.

That both group and individual counseling be available as an integral part of training.

That the use of auxiliaries be explored at various levels, secondary as well as elementary and preschool.

That time be scheduled during the school day or after school hours with extra compensation for teachers and auxiliaries and other professional-nonprofessional teams to review their team experience and plan together for the coming day.

That an advisory committee of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, auxiliaries, parents, community leaders, and university consultants be established to evaluate and improve the utilization of auxiliaries in each school where such a program is undertaken.

THE TASK AHEAD

The values derived from the utilization of auxiliary personnel in the 15 demonstration programs did not accrue automatically from the introduction of more adults into the classroom. Many complex but not insoluble problems arose as school people moved into new roles and relationships. This section deals with some of the more urgent problems that may be faced and coping strategies that may be employed as effective interaction is developed among professionals, auxiliaries, pupils, and parents in a community-centered school.

Reaching the unreached

In most of the demonstration programs studied there was a tendency to do a certain amount of "creaming"—that is, selecting persons who, though poor, were most similar in values, appearance, and behavior to middle-class professionals. This was understandable in view of the importance of demonstrating that people below the poverty level and with little prior schooling can, in fact, make a valuable contribution to the learning-teaching process.

It appears that the time has now come to recruit and select those with potential which is less obvious though very real. This

practice does not mean that anyone should be selected to work in a school simply because he is poor. There is no magic in poverty which automatically makes its victims able to reach out to others in a way which helps children learn and teachers teach. However, experience has shown that it is possible to "screen in" low achievers who have been "screened out" even of poverty programs—and with dramatic results in terms of combatting the sense of frustration, resentment, and loss of identity that may lead to violence.

Action Needed

1. Recruitment patterns to reach those most victimized by poverty and discrimination, particularly men.

2. Selection criteria and procedures which attempt to ascertain the ability of candidates to work well with children.

3. Brief preservice programs which serve a double purpose: (a) to train, and (b) to explore and develop potential strengths before assignment of specific duties.

4. Vocational counseling to help place in other appropriate jobs those who do not qualify for work in schools.

Developing a team approach

Traditionally, many teachers have had an image of themselves as standing before pupils giving out information with the classroom door locked—figuratively and sometimes even literally. When a child did not respond to the information, as presented, he was usually written off as a failure. Seldom was there any question as to what was being taught or how it was being taught as possible causal factors for the child's inability to learn.

Today, a searching self-evaluation has been initiated by many teachers, administrators, and other professionals such as specialists in curriculum, mental health, and physical health. The aim is to discover how to reach every child. The introduction of auxiliary personnel into the schools has strengthened such self-analysis, since professionals find they have to clarify their own goals and practices for themselves before they can interpret them to their helpers.

A new leadership role is emerging for teachers as they learn to coordinate the contributions of other adults in the classroom, very much as an orchestra combines strings, brass, and woodwinds into harmony. The "teacher-leader" analyzes the learning and emotional needs of children. He utilizes all available resources—professional and nonprofessional, human and material—in a unified program designed to meet those needs. The teacher is the pivotal person, responsible and accountable for seeing that learning takes place in the classroom.

However, many teachers see this new role as a dilution rather than an enhancement of teaching. For one thing, they fear that they might lose personal contact with children, even though the help they receive in performing routine tasks may actually increase rather than lessen their opportunity for interaction with individual children.

Other professionals, such as counselors and social workers, also tend to resent any intrusion onto their particular turf. Many professionals look at their own small part of the child, without ever sharing their views and values as part of a team.

In essence, the team approach means that members of a working team do not ask: "How come I always wind up doing this kind of job?" or "How can untrained people do any part of my job?" but rather, "Which of us can learn how to perform this particular task in a way which will best help the pupil?"

Action Needed

1. Team training of administrators, teachers, other professionals, and nonprofessionals, so that the needs of children become more important than the needs of the adults for personal achievement and recognition.

2. Application of the team approach simultaneously to the school as a whole and to each class situation—in fact the development of "teams within a team," so to speak.

3. Emphasis upon and preparation for this new and expanded role of teachers in institutions of higher learning which prepare teachers for certification.

Involving the community

As parents and community leaders begin to make new demands upon the schools and seek a new role in decision-making, delicate negotiations are required. Two essentials of successful negotiation are a balance of power and a willingness to "give" a bit on both sides. Too often, in the past, parents have negotiated from weakness of several kinds—lack of status, lack of "know-how," lack of communication skills. And all too frequently, in the past, both sides have taken inflexible positions.

One sensitive and extremely complex problem has been discovered as low-income parents assume new responsibilities in the school, i.e., the effect of this shift in role upon their relationship with their neighbors. Sometimes, those who take on leadership roles are rejected by their peers as having "sold out" to the Establishment. Sometimes, the reverse is true; the new leaders adopt middle-class values and reject their own people.

Action Needed

1. Involvement of selected parents as auxiliaries in schools situated in both advantaged and disadvantaged areas, with emphasis upon educational goals in training.

2. Establishment of school-community advisory boards composed of persons with various viewpoints in both school and community, working together toward analyzing realistically the situation and toward maximizing the contribution each group can make toward quality education.

3. Case by case analysis of each situation with counseling to support and guide the adjustment.

Facing the administrative challenge

Administrators are not only chiefly responsible for establishing overall goals and policies, setting the tone, and identifying what functions need to be performed by whom; they are also responsible for implementing these decisions through fiscal operations and organizational procedures.

In the fiscal realm uncertainty as to continued federal funding is a major problem. This uncertainty inhibits career development with its concomitants of job security including graduated compensation, increments, and fringe benefits as well as work-study programs with remuneration for study and educational credit for work experience.

There are also many procedural matters to consider such as (1) matching the "right" kind of auxiliary with the "right" kind of teacher within an appropriate situation; (2) allowing teachers to volunteer to use auxiliaries, or at least to self-select them; (3) providing the opportunity to change partners with the minimum of sensitivity when the principal problem appears to be a clash of personality; and (4) scheduling time within the school day for the teacher-auxiliary teams to review their experiences in the classroom and plan together for the next day.

The role of the administrator as interpreter to board, parents, and staff may seem burdensome to one who is not, himself, convinced of the ultimate values of auxiliaries to the school, and who lacks assistance both within and outside the school in coping with the complexities of the challenge.

Action Needed

1. Assurance of continued funding by government, as is unquestioned for roads and the maritime industry.

2. Priority in school budget "hard funds"

for the employment and training of auxiliary personnel.

3. Close cooperation and joint planning by schools and local institutions of higher learning to develop work-study programs.

4. Orientation of administrators through institutes and workshops involving professional associations, unions and community agencies at some point in the discussion.

5. Additional personnel in each school to provide for administration and supervision of special projects, made possible by federal funding, such as projects for the use of auxiliary personnel.

6. A plan for career development in each school system, along the lines of the model on pp. 8-9.

AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL DEMONSTRATION CENTERS: SPONSORS AND DIRECTORS

Columbus Elementary Laboratory School: Berkeley Unified School District, 2211 Seventh Avenue, Berkeley, California; Jerome Gilbert, Director, Tel. #415-841-1422.

Continuing Education Department: Detroit Public Schools, 5057 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan, Aileen Selick, Director, Tel. #313-833-7900.

New Careers Program: Howard University, D.C. Department of Public Health, College of Medicine, 1808 Adams Mill Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.; William H. Denham, Director, Tel. #202-629-4991.

School of Education: Morehead State University, Box 827, Morehead, Kentucky; Milan Dady, Director, Tel. #606-784-4181.

Department of Education: University of Maine, Orono, Maine; John Lindlof, Director, Tel. #207-866-7297.

CONSULTATION AND INFORMATION SERVICE

Offers assistance to school systems, institutions of higher learning, community action agencies, and to groups and individuals interested in developing programs for the training and utilization of auxiliary personnel.

Specific services offered: distribution of materials based on analysis of demonstration projects; free consultation service in New York office and throughout the country; arrangements made for visits to Demonstration Centers; recommendation of speakers who are leaders in the field of auxiliary personnel.

For assistance and information Telephone: 212-831-1200; or Write: Consultation and Information Service, A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education, 103 East 125th Street, New York, New York 10035.

STAFF

Gordon J. Klopff, Director.
Garda W. Bowman, Research and Program Coordinator.

Lodema Burrows, Editorial Associate.
Marion Armstrong, Administrative Assistant.

Barry Greenberg, Research Assistant.
Vera Weisz, Research Associate.

ABOUT BANK STREET COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Bank Street College of Education was founded in 1916 as an institute for educational research and school experimentation. Preparation of teachers has been a central function of the program for 30 years. Other major undertakings of the College are research in education and human development, experimental schools, field services to the public schools, and the publication of professional literature.

Television

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, television is unavoidably an integral part of

today's American culture. A lot of what is on television is not very good. Educational television is pressing the commercial stations to upgrade their product. TV news, documentary and commentary are improving. Very clearly television has made and is continuing to make a major contribution to American life.

One of the most eloquent defenses of the quality of television broadcasting appeared recently in TV Guide by Mr. Eric Sevareid.

Mr. Sevareid says in part:

It seems clear to me that what is bad on television—and too much still is—is rather innocuously bad, not evil. It seems clear that television gets better, just as do the films, the press, the magazines. And it is surely clear by now that TV has not debased American tastes, standards or habits. I suspect it has improved them, and I am certain that it has enormously stimulated intellectual curiosity.

Such is the state of television as Mr. Sevareid sees it. I commend his view to my colleagues, by including his article in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

Television is a marvelous vehicle for education as well as entertainment. The challenge is for us to use it well. The article follows:

A LITTLE LESS HYPOCRISY, PLEASE

(By Eric Sevareid)

Until a few years ago every American assumed he possessed an equal and God-given expertise on three things: politics, religion and the weather. Now a fourth has been added—television. TV serves nicely as the national whipping boy, after LBJ, that is.

The most conspicuous critics of the medium, of course, are the professional intellectuals, because they are articulate and they have the access to newsprint. TV GUME has published a series of essays on the evils of television by world-known intellectuals. I have read six of these essays and I am baffled. With one and possibly two exceptions, these amount to complaints by fastidious intellectuals, addressed to other fastidious intellectuals. They are telling each other what they themselves like and dislike about TV. But they put on disguise. They pretend that their concern is with the great mass of the people.

They tempt me to agree with Eric Hoffer, who said on a recent broadcast that intellectuals must never be given power because they want people to get down on their knees and learn to love what they really hate and hate what they love.

When printing was invented, I suspect that much of the literati and other elites of Europe took fright, convinced it would diffuse easy and therefore dangerous knowledge and ideas amongst the ordinary people whose minds should be guided by their betters. When the typewriter was invented, the literati scorned it, convinced it was a debasement of the art of writing. When the first, flickering motion pictures appeared, only the "vulgar" watched them. The intellectuals said the flicks would never compete with the legitimate theater in either artistic or mercantile terms. When talking pictures began, many critics warned that they would destroy the art of film acting, which was pantomime, and ruin the whole illusion.

The lesson should be clear. There is, and always has been, a broad swath of professional intellectuals who fear and detest anything new, particularly if it is adaptable to the pleasure of the great mass of ordinary people. This particular type of intellectual neither knows nor likes ordinary people. This is why they write about "humanity" and not about persons. They are like the English Puritans who hated bearbating, not because

it gave pain to the bears but because it gave pleasure to the spectators.

Indeed, this kind of critic would deny the very premise, the uniqueness of America, which is that we are the first mass civilization, the mass culture in all history. For the first time, the effort is to educate everyone to the limit of his capacity. America, says Hoffer, is God's gift to the poor, who largely created this society. Of course intellectuals of the traditionalist type do not feel at home here; and of course they hate TV, which is simply the latest and most universal symbol of a culture of universality.

It seems clear to me that what is bad on television—and too much still is—is rather innocuously bad, not evil. It seems clear that television gets better, just as do the films, the press, the magazines. And it is surely clear by now that TV has not debased American tastes, standards or habits. I suspect it has improved them, and I am certain that it has enormously stimulated intellectual curiosity.

It is claimed that TV discourages reading. It does the contrary. Book reading in this country over the last 18 years, the approximate life span of general television, has increased far more than the increase in the population. The day after the Hoffer interview in September, his books sold out, all across the country. When the late classicist, Dr. Moses Hadas, in a program with me from the Roman Forum offered to send lists of recommended books about ancient Rome to listeners, requests poured in from some 20,000 persons who otherwise, very probably, would never have read any classical history at all. There have been hundreds of other such instances in TV's lifespan.

It is claimed that TV destroys conversation. This is surely bunk. Nonconversing families were nonconversing families before there was any TV or radio. Actually, thousands of specific TV programs have generated millions of specific conversations that otherwise would not have taken place.

It is claimed that TV debases the English language. More bunk. There are millions and millions of people living in slums and remote rural areas who almost never hear good diction except on TV and radio.

It is claimed that TV programs are much too commercialized, and I agree. But, believe it or not, TV content is not as heavily larded with advertisements as the daily newspapers, which give an average of 60 percent of their space to ads. The difference is that TV operates in linear time and the press in space, and TV commercials are, alas, unavoidable. Press advertisements are eminently avoidable.

It is objected that TV news programs and documentaries are not The New York Times. It may be a question who feels worse about this condition, inasmuch as every survey shows that a majority of people trust the accuracy and impartiality of broadcast news more than that of press news, and inasmuch as a far greater number of people follow TV news than read The Times or any other daily publication.

I have read hundreds of condescending pieces in the printed press about TV journalism, but I observe some strange phenomena: 1. The press covers TV and not vice versa. 2. The press accepts the TV system of projecting elections, not vice versa. 3. The movement of aspiring journalists is from the press to TV, far more than vice versa. 4. Newspaper salaries have risen in the direction of TV salaries, not vice versa.

I do not, by any means, regard TV journalism as generally superior to print journalism. I would have a very hard time without the daily papers and the magazines. The two media are not half so competitive as they are complementary.

But let us consider a few notes and beams. Press critics still accuse TV of cravenly avoiding controversial issues. This bewilders people in TV. We have dealt, graphically

and explicitly, with race hatred, the cigaret menace, the insecticide menace, homosexuality, drug addiction, demagoguery, slumlords, the official illusions about Vietnam—you name it. Our trouble is not cowardice but shortage of raw material. As Mr. Jack Gould of The Times was nice enough to say recently, "TV is now at least as outspoken as the print media." Critics often hark back with nostalgia to the exposé programs done some 15 years ago by the Murrow-Friendly team. They forget that those programs were great because—besides Murrow's incomparable presence—they were the first. In technique, the same kind of thing is done even more effectively today.

Press critics still, sometimes, accuse TV of toadying to advertisers on program content. In truth, that battle was won by the networks long ago. Yet when a recent network documentary on advanced technology showed, by sheer happenstance, some gadgets manufactured by the sponsoring concern, some press critics made a big, alarming thing of it. Let them look at their own papers and take note of the whole sections of "puff copy" written to pad out pages of advertising on real estate or resorts or foreign investments. Let them search for editorial criticism of leading businessmen or society matrons in newspapers published in small or middle-sized cities. Let one of them, just for the fun of it, write a letter to the editor criticizing a specific make of automobile as a lemon and see if it gets printed.

While they compose columns and editorials deploring TV's "wasteland" of trivia, let them measure the column space devoted to astrology, moronic comics, advice to the lovelorn, liquor ads—none of which appears on TV. Let them, at the same time, see what TV programs and personalities are featured on the cover pages of the weekly TV supplements their own papers publish. In the six issues of TV GUIDE containing the six essays I read deploring the low cultural state of television, the cover featured characters from the following programs: *The FBI*, *Batman*, *Gidget*, *The Big Valley*, *Mona McCluskey*, *Laredo*.

Occasionally, in my bad moments, I harbor the dire suspicion that newspapers criticize TV so much because they long ago lost the guts to criticize each other in the lusty old American tradition of the press, and need a substitute.

Well, it's a nice day and I hate to sound waspish. My only point is that we need a little less hypocrisy and a lot more common sense in our evaluations of an all-pervasive (if not all-persuasive) medium for amusement, information, enlightenment, inspiration, boredom, irritation and anxiety—one that is already imbedded in the warp and woof of America, is going to be with us permanently, often reflects the mediocre in our society, rarely the worst and sometimes the finest.

Things Don't Just Happen

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a fine statement of the relationships between education, government, and industry made by Dr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before the National Industrial Association a few months ago.

Dr. Halperin's speech seems to me an altogether splendid presentation of the intricacies and problems involved in

these relationships. I would like us all to have the benefit of his thinking:

THINGS DON'T JUST HAPPEN

(By Dr. Samuel Halperin)

Those who have a printed copy of my statement may wonder if they are attending the correct Task Group meeting. The uncertainty arises because I have titled my remarks "Things Don't Just Happen. . . ." At the same time, the former Program lists me as discussing "Future Legislation Involved Interface."

I have departed from the assigned Program title for two reasons: First, I don't understand it; second, I'm frightened by it. Despite Project Aristotle's gracious invitation to meet with you today, I have reluctantly concluded, in the words of an esteemed colleague with a talent for creating couplets, that

"The world would be a better place,
Minus words like interface!"

So this afternoon I intend to discuss, not "interface," but relationships—relationships among businessmen, educators and government administrators.

My trade, after all, is that of semantic and political bridge-building among educators, the Congress, the Executive Branch, and the public-at-large. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to several fairly simple propositions, and the kind of unencumbered language that bridge-builders must use if they seek to communicate with their highly diverse and frequently contentious constituents.

Proposition Number One—Education is the growth industry of America.

Although I am a good, professional, non-partisan, non-political, loyal, liberal, Democrat, I nevertheless have little hesitation in commending your attention to a most stimulating document published by the Republican Policy Committee of the U.S. Senate, Entitled *Where the Votes Are* (Senate Document No. 106, 89th Congress, 2nd Session), the study informs GOP vote-seekers that "coming down the pike is an avalanche of schoolchildren like we've never experienced before." In 1985, there will be 100 million Americans aged 5-24. The occupation for most of them—perhaps $\frac{1}{2}$ —will be "student."

Already, almost a third of our population is enrolled in one kind of school or another. As popular demand simultaneously pushes Americans toward both preschool learning and graduate education, that proportion is certain to expand.

Teachers, supervisors, administrators and other educational personnel, now more than 3 million strong, will soon surpass the number of American farmers. Their influence on politics and American society at large—as well as on education—cannot be overstated.

Under present trends, expenditures for education will rise even faster than educational employment and student enrollments—from \$50 billion today to a projected \$66 billion in 1975 (in 1965-66 dollars).

In short, the impressive growth prospects of American education are worthy of your most serious attention.

Proposition Number Two—Although huge and growing rapidly, "it ain't necessarily so" that the education market is a lush and ready hunting ground for quick profits by enterprising businessmen.

Much of the corridor talk at this Symposium, as at other convocations of persons interested in encouraging business participation in the world of education, centers about the particular difficulties of this or that industry giant in locating the fiscal black ink of American education. While I cannot account for all of the difficulties which may have led corporate executives initially to misjudge the educational market, at least the following are contributing factors:

1—The hardware-software imbalance, which dominates so much of this Symposium's attention.

2—The deceptive composition of American educational expenditures. Simply stated, while education may be a \$50 billion annual market, after the vast bulk of educational funds are committed to essential staff salaries, utilities, maintenance, and interest on bonded indebtedness, only a small percentage is available for spending on *things*—books, equipment and facilities. In short, educators generally lack much "free money" to buy the products which industry has to sell.

3—The difficulties of "getting a handle" on the sales market. As you may have discovered—to your great pain—American education has no centralized buying system. Instead, businessmen must learn to cope with a confusion of ways of tapping the educational market: through 70-plus Federal agencies supporting educational programs, 23,000 operating public school districts, 55 State and territorial departments of education, 2,300 colleges and universities—with 1-2 new colleges springing up every week. All of this is very baffling, indeed. Perhaps it makes some of you yearn for the relative simplicity of selling the TFX to the Pentagon?

4—The non-availability of Federal R&D funds for large-scale development by private industry of new systems, facilities, equipment, etc. Despite the Office of Education's authority, obtained in 1965, for contracts with private corporations to develop new educational systems, the Office never has had the significant funds required to do the job. Nor is there much prospect over the near-term that such funds will be forthcoming. Unlike the space race, the development of the SST, or new national commitments to deal with air pollution, the political as well as budgetary climate does not yet indicate that the Office of Education will be able to obtain large sums of money which, in turn, could be used to harness industrial R&D to the problems of educational development.

5—The hostility of some educators to the entry of big business into the new and growing educational markets. It cannot be denied that much of American education still regards business participation in the improvement of education with a jaundiced eye while many businessmen look askance at cooperation either with the Federal government or with the American educational system. It is to these gaps in understanding that some of my subsequent remarks will be addressed.

Proposition Number Three—The Administration genuinely seeks to enlist industry in the struggle to build a better America—in education and in every domestic arena.

Our President continuously exhorts the businessmen of America to pitch in with the great domestic challenges of our time. Only last Thursday, at the swearing-in of the new Under Secretary of Commerce, he detailed a depressing inventory of stubborn problems plaguing America. Then President Johnson reminded us that the real business of business is America:

"We do need help. Government just cannot do it alone. We need the energy, we need the genius, we need the imagination, and we need the initiative of the businessmen of America who have built this great, free enterprise system into the most powerful economy in all the world."

This, too, is the keen desire of Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II who, more than a year ago, invited American industry "to provide innovative and original contributions to the educational process itself." "American industry," he acknowledged, "has an unsurpassed history of effectiveness; yet one of our greatest industries—education—has not fully profited from the capacities of industry. Forty million consumers of educa-

tion and their families await the product of our cooperation."

But rhetoric alone—no matter how genuine—cannot build the industry-education-government partnership. Some less felicitous examples of recent rhetoric lead us to the inescapable conclusion that a full and easy role for industry in education has yet to be earned, not enjoyed as a matter of right.

Proposition Number Four—Don't get hung up looking for the "Welcome Mat."

Despite the challenges of President Johnson, Commissioner Howe, and other Administration leaders, few educators are rushing out to embrace industry participation in the task of upgrading American schools and colleges. Communications between businessmen and educators still range largely from the non-existent to the hostile. Much of the Congress is still "on the fence."

As Exhibit One in what some businessmen termed an unmistakable "educational cold-shoulder," consider the following testimony given this August to the Education Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate by a major national educational association:

"Direct contracts between the U.S. Office of Education and profit-making agencies are inherently wrong . . . the constant effort on the part of the Office of Education to secure authority for the Commissioner to bypass the public and private nonprofit education agencies and deal with profit-makers is in our opinion, the most dangerous educational proposal ever to come before the Congress."

"This danger lies in the potentiality for federal control and direction of the entire education effort of this country, in direct violation of the American tradition of state control of public education. Profit-making agencies are in business primarily to make a profit. If the permission to contract with profit-making agencies is granted, nothing prohibits the Office of Education to hire persons to accomplish objectives and to conduct well financed Madison Avenue-type promotion campaigns to achieve purposes which the public education sector and the ethical private non-profit institutions would never consider becoming involved in. This seems to us not only a totally unnecessary practice, but indeed a frightening one."

Exhibit Two is of even more recent vintage: November 14, 1967, when the House of Representatives was debating private industry's contributions to the War on Poverty, in general, and to the Job Corps, in particular. The views of one intelligent Member of the Congress are food for thought for anyone who contemplates the current uncertain state of government-education-industry relations:

"What kind of a partnership do we have in the Job Corps between the Federal Government and private industry? Is this a partnership in which each is contributing of its talents and its resources? Of course it is not. This is totally federally funded. All private industry does is to contract with the Job Corps to furnish certain services. They are not furnishing, as a part of the partnership, any of the financing. They are not producing anything. They are merely competing for contracts that are available through the Job Corps."

Relationships among the Congress, the world of business, and the realm of education—as reflected in these statements—obviously leave much to be desired.

The need for better communications is all too apparent. It will avail us little to wonder who should take the initiative to bring about meaningful dialogue among the three potential partners. A more fruitful line of inquiry is perhaps to ask what have you, as industry leaders, done lately to express your commitment to quality education? What have you done lately to show others that industry has a constructive contribution to make which will be free of the fearsome consequences that some have predicted would

accompany the entry of business into the educational marketplace? What are your various industry associations doing to dispel the fears, suspicions and misunderstanding that collectively impede a legitimate role for the genius of American industry about which the Commissioner of Education and the President have spoken?

My participation today would be less than satisfactory from my point of view if I did not add to my four general propositions several specific prescriptions for industrial action. So, here are a few thoughts of one observer about ways in which industry can begin to make its impact on the educational system.

1. When was the last time your corporate leadership sat down to talk with rank-and-file educators at the local and State levels about their needs and problems? Possibly it is more comfortable to consult with the eminent professors of our Nation's leading universities, to rub shoulders with the men who regularly offer their advice to the giant corporations and to the Government service—the men who live on commuter airplanes between Washington and their college campuses or between their university classrooms and corporate conference tables.

These authorities, more likely than not, are the ones who most welcome and understand the necessity for industry participation in educational improvement. My recommendation is that your industry associations find ways to communicate with the rank-and-file of our classroom professors and teachers and with the supervisors and curriculum specialists who daily bear the brunt of the educational hurricane. Any efforts you might make to learn more about the "nitty-gritty" of day-to-day educational operations will yield rich dividends in mutual understandings—the essential bedrock of the industry-education partnership which I take it is what we are all after.

2. Not every industry endeavor has to harness the great technological and scientific breakthroughs of our time. Indeed, I suspect that some of the most useful—and profitable—contributions which industry might make will be in the mundane service areas of American education.

Purely as an example, we know that each day well over 17 million children are transported to school, either at public expense or through parental contributions. Yet, how much attention has been given to the design of a truly educational vehicle for the movement of children to and from school? How much thought has been given to the utilization of the millions of hours per year that are spent by children on the road? How much study has been given to the problem of physical safety from the accidents which each year claim several thousand casualties among our children riding school buses? In short, what can be done to make the unglamorous and unheralded area of school transportation a safer, more meaningful, more effective, and more exciting part of the contemporary educational scene?

In similar vein, how much attention has been devoted by industry to cutting the costs of school purchasing, to lightening the administrative burdens of school managers and, indeed, of classroom teachers? Of reducing maintenance costs in our vast educational physical plant? For that matter, of designing a truly controlled physical environment which would maximize educational achievement while passing on to the taxpayer the benefits of new designs, new materials, etc.?

In short, not every corporation need look to great breakthroughs in computer-assisted instruction and dial-access retrieval to make a meaningful impact upon the American educational system. Many far simpler ideas are lying about for the asking—unglamorous but important, unheralded but potentially profitable.

3. Just as we must avoid exclusive focus upon the glamorous, so it seems to me we must avoid a common mistake in assuming that all the important opportunities for industry-education cooperation are tuned in from Washington, that Federal funds must flow into each and every corporate commitment, that Washington will somehow identify all of the areas of priority for industrial attention.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We in Washington have a sense of our responsibilities, but we also know the limits of our involvement. Today, we fund only 8 percent of total elementary and secondary expenditures. It is an important 8 percent, but a sobering indication of the dimensions of Federal power. Thus, we appreciate all the more the efforts of individual corporations to improve the particular educational systems of their community.

In this light, many of us were greatly enthused by a recent description of efforts undertaken by the Michigan Bell Telephone Company with a particular high school in the city of Detroit. I have attached a brief summary of the Michigan Bell project to my prepared statement. I commend it to your attention as a most promising example of some ways in which industry can enter the educational market, gradually learning more about itself while it contributes to the health of its surrounding community.

If it is true, as great Americans have often said, that nothing matters more in the life of the Nation than the quality of our educational system, then the hour is long overdue for the emergence of truly effective partnerships of educators, businessmen, and government administrators. This is what former Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel meant when he said: "Education is too important to be left solely to the educators." Education cannot flourish as the exclusive hunting ground of the professionals. All of us—as parents, as taxpayers, and as employers of the products of the schools—cheat ourselves if we yield to anyone a healthy concern for, and participation in, the affairs of the most critical domestic institutions in our lives—our schools and colleges.

Participation will not come easily. In the area of industry-education-business relations, there are no road maps, no blueprints. Moreover, as indicated earlier, business participation will be greeted neither with universal approval nor enthusiastic welcome by some segments of the educational community. In education, as in business, not everyone believes in "the competition of the marketplace." Businessmen who wait for engraved invitations presented on silver platters would be better advised to look elsewhere than to the promise and the importance of education.

Shortly before his assassination, President John F. Kennedy met with a group of educators at the White House. His visitors were deeply troubled by the continued defeat of Federal aid to education measures in the U.S. Congress. But Mr. Kennedy charged them with the facts of democratic social interaction in this classic statement: "Things don't just happen. They are made to happen."

In recent days, as we have seen, things have truly been made to happen. Almost 40 new education laws have been added to the statute book in the past 4 years. Federal funds for education have tripled in this period, while the budget of the Office of Education has climbed almost 700 percent. New relationships between education and the Federal Government are being forged on every front. Not all of these relationships are smooth and sunny. Some, undoubtedly, will have to be totally recast as we recognize false and possibly costly starts.

But one thing is clear to me beyond

reasonable doubt: Federal aid to education is here to stay and it will grow arithmetically, and possibly geometrically, in the decades ahead. Education and government officials at every level will be defining and redefining their roles for years to come.

And what of industry-education-government relationships? That, ladies and gentlemen, depends on all of us, working together. "Things don't just happen. They are made to happen."

The Draft Constitution for Maryland

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, at my request the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations studied the proposed new constitution for the State of Maryland and commented on its content. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from William G. Colman, executive director of the A.C.I.R., and I wish to commend Mr. Colman for an excellent appraisal.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1968.

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACHEN: This is in reply to your recent letter requesting reactions to the new draft constitution for the State of Maryland. As you know, the Commission and its staff have been most interested in current constitutional revision and reform efforts among the States. The Commission has been particularly concerned that the States and their local governments be strengthened so that they may better serve their appropriate role in the federal system. This concern has been reflected in recommendations by the Commission dealing not only with bolstering the executive and legislative branches of States but also with removing those constitutional restraints on both State and local governments that serve no useful purpose.

A recent House report, *Unshackling Local Governments*, summarizes a number of the Commission proposals dealing with the removal of restraints on local governments. With the thought that this may provide a perspective on some of the analysis which follows, I am enclosing a copy. In this analysis of the new Maryland draft constitution some of the comments reflect a general staff reaction and others relate to specific Commission recommendations. A few general observations should be made at the outset.

First, it would appear that the careful and thorough work of the Constitutional Convention Commission including the development of a complete draft was of particular value in focusing attention on key issues and facilitating the work of the Convention itself.

Second, generally speaking, the final draft approved by the Convention appears to be clear and concise, limited to matters of general policy and the provision of necessary mandates. In fact, part of its great value lies in the elimination of a number of lengthy and detailed restrictions accumulated over the years in response to specific historical situations. This particular feature may not be as apparent without a careful examination of the existing constitution.

Third, the broad objectives of strengthening the executive, legislative and judicial

branches of State government and removing undue and unnecessary restrictions on local governments to permit them to deal with pressing contemporary problems is apparent in the draft.

Finally, while some of the provisions, particularly those dealing with local government, reflect Maryland's particular history, traditions, and practices, the draft constitution as a whole should serve as a significant point of departure and model for other States.

The remaining observations are presented in the order in which provisions appear in the draft. The provision requiring a shorter residence period for voting for President is a salutary recognition of the increased mobility of our population and of the need to avoid disenfranchising voters in Presidential elections. The legislative article incorporates several significant departures from existing practice in Maryland. The provisions dealing with the size of the legislature, districting, and redistricting provide necessary flexibility and lodge responsibility clearly with the legislature. Yet they include an alternative if the legislature fails to act, thus assuring that the basic requirement for representation based on population can be met. Removal of specific legislative salaries from the constitution and the provisions allowing the legislature to be called into special session on its own initiative are steps frequently recommended for strengthening the initiative and prestige of the legislative branch.

Several of the provisions dealing with the executive branch should serve to enhance the governor's position as chief administrator in the executive branch. The lieutenant governor is clearly identified as an assistant to the governor and is elected on the same ballot. The governor's authority to submit proposed reorganizations of the State's administrative structure subject to a veto by either House of the legislature; the clear statement of the governor's appointive authority; and the authority to reduce as well as eliminate items in the supplementary appropriation bills all serve to upgrade the governor's position. The removal of restrictions on the incurrence of State and local debt and the authorization, in effect, of revenue financing for the State should serve to provide necessary flexibility in State and local financial programs.

Among the most fundamental changes in the constitution are those dealing with local government. Given Maryland's limited number of independently incorporated municipalities, the emphasis on county governments will provide significant experience with the use of counties as areawide governmental units to provide urban services. The provision of residual home rule powers to counties along with the authority to transfer functions further emphasizes their key role. The removal of several local offices from the constitution should serve to further the objectives of flexibility and home rule. The sections allowing the General Assembly to merge, dissolve, or change the boundaries of counties and to establish multicounty governmental units permit experimentation with additional forms of regional government. The broad general intergovernmental cooperation provision also provides a constitutional basis for interlocal and areawide cooperation and agreements.

In conclusion, it can be said that the new Maryland draft constitution incorporates a number of significant innovations and eliminates considerable archaic, repetitious, and outmoded provisions thereby producing a truly modern draft State constitution reflecting some of the best current thinking.

I hope that these brief observations will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

WM. G. COLMAN,
Executive Director.

A Tribute to the Boys in Vietnam

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Howard Miller, one of this Nation's most beloved and highly respected radio commentators delivered an excellent tribute to our boys in Vietnam.

Mr. Miller has never hesitated to speak out on the burning issues of our time, and it was in keeping with his impeccable record as an American that he took to task those who would malign our great effort in Vietnam.

Mr. Miller and radio station WIND, which carries his broadcast, deserve the commendation of all of us for the stirring message which was delivered over these facilities. The Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., which owns WIND in Chicago, has every right to be proud of the excellent manner in which it has used the Nation's airwaves for the good of our country.

Howard Miller is radio at its very best. As a Chicagoan I am proud that he comes from my city.

Excerpts from Mr. Miller's excellent essay follow:

Now about those draft dodgers and dissenters . . . I know you've been reading about them . . . believe me when I tell you they are few in number. They make a lot of noise and get all the publicity . . . but then freaks always do! Some day these gutless wonders will have to live with a conscience that will torment them to the end of their days. Some defend their cowardice by claiming it is heroism to say NO to a nation's call but as I remember, American heroes are born at places like Chateau Thierry, Iwo Jima, Pork Chop Hill and now Con Thien and Dak To, not at induction centers burning cards, fighting authority and breaking the law. These poor men have forgotten the words of John F. Kennedy when he said ". . . ask not what your Country can do for you, but what you can do for your Country . . .". You Haven't Forgotten!

There's no such thing as a nice war, or a moral war—all of it is hellish and rotten but not nearly so immoral or rotten as forgetting freedom's meaning or an honest obligation, or the little kids of a future generation. Khrushchev said the Commies would bury us. They're trying now, but guys like you are doing the digging! Thank God! You're there for a good and noble cause—you're there because your Country asked you to be—you're there because people everywhere deserve to be free!

The dissenters are a misguided minority. Granted, the motives of some are sincere, but too many seem to believe they have a right to protest in any way they choose, with faint respect for the law or elected authorities. They are being provided for in an orderly process of law. There is room, of course, for honest differences, but it is only by your action that we will heal this Nation's wounds and preserve the historic privilege of freedom for which others before you have fought.

And so today, like yesterday and tomorrow, we are humbly indebted to you who are fighting and dying in Viet Nam for Freedom and for us. We know, as you know, that the iron claw of communism is a spectre above the head of the free world. The blind hunger of our enemy for the complete subjugation of all peoples has made peace negotiations impossible up to now. You know, and we know, that your presence in Viet Nam is a guar-

antee to freedom loving people everywhere that the fighting man of the United States will forever be a bulwark against the tyranny of enslavement.

Americans will sleep tonight because you will be awake to dodge a sniper's bullet in a lousy rice paddy on a hunk of real estate that we really don't give a damn about—except that it has become a symbol of our integrity to a commitment. It's good that this nation has a conscience.

. . . and so it will soon be Christmas Day and, as the early morning sun slants its rays across the icy blue waters of Lake Michigan, and with reverence for the day we worship Him, there will be a special prayer for you, spoken from a heart filled with gratitude.

I join with an entire nation to say:

"God bless you, and thank you, American."

The Brain Drain: Home Grown

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this era of technological advancement and change, our society is constantly faced with the problems of space, defense, transportation, and environmental control. The task of solving such problems falls to those with the technical expertise of scientists and engineers—a group of professionals whose ranks are not increasing to match the needs of the day.

T. A. Burtis, immediate past president of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, in an article entitled "The Brain Drain: Home Grown," which appeared in the January 1968 issue of Chemical Engineer Progress, explains this diversion of talent from the fields of science and engineering and offers some constructive suggestions for solving this critical problem.

I am sure that my colleagues will find this article, which follows, of interest:

THE BRAIN DRAIN: HOME GROWN

(By T. A. Burtis)

Diversion of students into the social sciences in preference to engineering poses a real problem; the concept that they also serve who perform technological deeds must be promulgated to insure needed supply of engineers in coming years.

If you were a young engineer with a brand-new B.S. degree and could choose between a job near home which promised great security but little challenge or responsibility, and one far away with more risk but more compensation and challenge, which would you take?

Suppose you were a practicing engineer with a few years' experience, and you were offered three times the pay to work in a new field of technology—would you take it?

Or put yourself in the position of a new Ph.D. who could have a routine job close to home, or join an advanced research institution far away—what would you do?

THE DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE

In the last 10 or 15 years thousands of men faced with these decisions have made the choice which any self-respecting professional would make. This, then, is the "brain drain." For these thousands of scientists, engineers, and physicians have been foreign nationals who have chosen to come to the United States. Their migration has caused a storm abroad and now engages the con-

cerned attention of our own government, as well as those of other Western countries. Ordinarily the migration of a few thousand people would cause no great alarm, but since this now becomes part of what popular jargon calls the technological gap, warning signals begin flashing all over the world.

Understanding the size, the shape or the impact of this migration is no easy task—not for lack of data or opinion but because of the volume and inconsistency of both. The best documentation seems to be that supplied by the National Science Foundation, which from the period of '57 through '64 kept track of the immigration of engineers, natural scientists, and social scientists to the United States. The social scientists, principally economists, make up a very small portion of the total—generally less than 5%. The NSF data indicate that the influx of foreign engineers and natural scientists declined from a high of about 6,000 in 1957 to about 4,200 in '61, then rose again to about 5,900 in 1963 and again declined to an estimated level in 1966 of 5,400. In the middle years of 1962 through '64, a total of 16,000 are estimated to have emigrated to the United States—a little over half of these from Europe, with the United Kingdom (3,200) being the greatest contributor.

Since 1960 there seems to have been a smaller proportion of engineers entering this country but more natural scientists, and there is a slow pick-up in the number of social scientists. If these numbers are reliable, there is a slow decrease in the number of foreign-born professionals entering this country, but no radical change is to be expected. Directly to the contrary, however, another government agency reports that in 1966 the immigration of "professional, technical, and kindred" people amounted to 30,000, out of a total immigration to this country of 323,000. No definition of "kindred" is supplied. They further report that this is an increase of 58% over 10 years ago. The House Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee published data which said that the influx of foreign scientists increased 77% in 1966 over '66 and 32% in '66 over '65.

WHY DO THEY LEAVE?

Perhaps of more import to us than the precision of the numbers is an understanding of what causes people to leave their countries to come here. On this there is fairly widespread agreement—that the principal lures are higher pay, better conditions of work, better social standings. But most important of all (according to a survey of English immigrants made by Professor Wilson of the University of Pittsburgh), are the greater professional opportunities. There is much evidence to support the validity of this conclusion. A prominent Indian biochemist now in this country has expressed his desire to return to his homeland, but remains, simply because there is no opportunity for him to carry on research in his country. My own limited experience leads me to believe that the lure of higher pay is much exaggerated and that the real reason for the departure of these men from their homes lies in the social and industrial attitudes there prevailing.

About 10 years ago, while sitting around a table having coffee with a dozen senior students at one of the great British universities, I was astonished to hear more than half of them say that they proposed to emigrate when their studies were finished. Not one said he was looking for more money; the overriding reason they all advanced (these were not all scientists by any means) was the fact that they could see no possibility of their having any important impact on the conduct of business or public affairs in their country for at least another 30 years. They simply were not prepared to wait that long and sought opportunities in other parts of the world, not necessarily the United States,

where they could feel that their work would have some measurable meaning.

Whatever the causes, the meaning, or the impact, the whole issue of the "brain drain" and the technological gap is receiving widespread attention. In our own government there is an interagency committee headed by Dr. D. F. Hornig which includes representatives of State, Defense, Commerce, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Authority, and the Council of Economic Advisors who are studying the problem. A parallel study is being undertaken by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris. A number of political figures abroad have proposed various remedies. Among them a Technological Marshall Plan, a gift of U.S. science and technology; and unfortunately, recently repressive measures have been advocated.

THE HOME-GROWN DRAIN

My intent is not to add one more commentary to this international dispute. It is rather to point out another area that needs equal attention—and that is our own home-grown "brain drain." Between 1961 and 1965 the total number of bachelor's degrees granted to male graduates in the United States increased from 256,000 to 320,000, a compounded growth rate of 4.4%. Within the same period the number of bachelor's degrees in engineering increased only from 35,700 to 36,600—a growth rate to all intents and purposes of 0. The physical sciences fared somewhat better, with a growth rate of 2.8%; but this is still well below the rate for the college population as a whole. Surprisingly, education, which one would expect to have shown a healthy rate of growth, achieved only a 1.7% increase each year—only a little over a third the average. Where, then, has the new college generation turned? The answer is clear—to the humanities and social sciences.

In the same 1961-65 period, the number of social science degrees increased from 38,000 to 58,000, a compounded growth rate of 8.6%, nearly twice that of the college population as a whole. In terms of absolute numbers, the degrees granted in these areas account for something over a third of the total increase in the last five years. Here I think is an internal "brain drain" that merits some portion of the attention being given to that on the international scene. This is not to say that we do not need more bright and capable economists or political scientists or sociologists. To the contrary, the state of the world today would indicate that we need as much talent in these areas as we can find. On the other hand, however, if the technological and scientific strength of the United States is so great as to cause concern abroad, if it is so important that our own government relies on this capability for the solution of problems in space, defense, transportation, environmental control, and other public problems, if industry is relying on science and engineering for future growth, some steps must be taken to see that the talent necessary to meet these objectives becomes available. That it is not today is clearly evident. One need only look at the job opportunity ads in any of the journals, including our own. The accepted estimate is that as against the 75,000 job openings for engineers which appear every year, there is available in this country only a total addition of 45,000 trained men.

WHAT ARE THE REASONS?

We have figures to tell us problems, but we lack understanding of causes and thus we lack solutions. Why does engineering and science in the U.S. attract the skilled men from abroad, but not our own young brains. Can the reason be economic? Apparently not, because all of the figures available to us today show that engineers and scientists are paid well above the average of the general population and generally have the advantage

of all the advanced programs in fringe benefits. Even more indicative of this is the fact that the medical profession, traditionally one of the best compensated in this country, is having increasing difficulty in attracting students to the medical schools.

Is it possible that lack of opportunity is preventing the bright young high school students from choosing science and engineering? This also seems hardly believable. The resources we devote to research and development are increasing at almost an exponential rate, and these depend almost entirely on technically trained people. One need only look at the rate of capital formation in this country, at the growth of the technically-oriented industry, and at the burgeoning technically-based institutions to understand that opportunities abound.

Can it be that science and engineering in the universities are just too difficult, too demanding of application, of discipline, of high individual performance to the young people? Hopefully not, because if this were the case it would be a great tragedy. As John Gardner wrote in his book *Excellence*, "When an institution, organization or nation loses its capacity to evoke high individual performance, its great days are over."

Or could it be that the challenge and the opportunities for personal growth and personal contribution through science and engineering are either absent or misunderstood? The latter I think is likely to be the case.

HOW SERVICE CAN BE RENDERED

It has become a platitude to say that young people today are impressed with the need to serve their neighbors, their community, and humanity itself, and hopefully this idealism is not strictly confined to the college generation. But is there really an understanding of how this service can be rendered? One must note that nursing, one of the most selfless of professions, is in desperate straits for new recruits.

Is it true, for example, that the government agency which distributes new seeds to the farmers of a developing country better serves humanity than the chemical company which through its research provides the pesticides that will insure that a crop is reaped from this seed? Does the diplomat who negotiates a tariff treaty make a greater contribution than the men who design and build the vessels in which international trade flows? I know it is almost like being against motherhood to offer any criticism of the Peace Corps, but does the Peace Corpsman who teaches an Asian peasant to use an iron plough do more for humanity than the engineers who in the last few years have halved the cost of agricultural nitrogen fertilizer? When the injection of an antibiotic saves a life, does all the virtue reside with the hand on the syringe, and none with the engineers who ran the fermentation plant? And can the teacher who saves a child from illiteracy have any confidence in his contribution unless someone produces the machinery, the paper, even something as prosaic as the ink and the distribution system to bring the written word to the literate child?

One could ask an endless list of such rhetorical questions and I think would have to conclude that both kinds of contributions are not only valuable but indispensable. Somehow, however, our values are skewed and only half the story is being told.

THE TIME IS NOW

Now is the time to start giving serious attention to our own "brain drain," the diversion from engineering and science of the talent we will sorely need in the future to maintain the growth of our economy and insure its security. When the Interagency Committee comes to some conclusion about the international "brain drain," perhaps it will turn its attention to the pressing matter

of securing future scientists and engineers from our own plentiful resources. Perhaps industry in the face of the shortage of engineers will respond not only by bidding fiercely for the available talent, but also by carrying to the high schools the message of its needs, its challenges and opportunities. Let government agencies and our academic institutions turn some of their zeal to promoting a wider understanding of the physical and economic realities of the modern world, so that the challenges and opportunities of science and engineering are known to our most able youngsters. And we who are already engineers must individually and collectively make known our own pride in and dedication to this honorable profession.

Quoting once more from John Gardner, I suggest that we take these words to heart. . . . "No society can reach heights of greatness unless in all fields critical to its growth and creativity there is an ample supply of dedicated men and women. Whether any particular field will have enough such men and women depends partly on morale within the field itself and partly on how highly the society as a whole values dedication. If the society understands, expects and honors dedication, the incidence will be high, but if it assumes that dedicated men are exceedingly rare and probably a little foolish, then the incidence will be low."

Let us not permit society to come to this disastrous conclusion. *The foregoing was the Presidential Address presented on the AICChE 1967 Annual Meeting, New York, N.Y.*

Connecticut Loses a Stalwart Citizen

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut and the city of Stamford are in mourning this week for one of its most distinguished and stalwart citizens, Mr. Frederick M. Lione.

I am in wholehearted agreement with an editorial in the Stamford Advocate which declared that Mr. Lione "was the type of man of which good communities are made."

Fred Lione was a product of the community which he served so faithfully in so many ways. He contributed to the business, political, social, spiritual, and sports life of Stamford.

And he served for 27 years with understanding and compassion in the thankless job of chairman of the draft board. Mr. Lione likewise was a worthy public welfare commissioner.

The Stamford Advocate's editorial put it like this:

Mr. Lione was a builder. The city is spotted with important structures which he built.

It is possible to suggest that these monuments are not Fred Lione's most important contribution to his community.

He was the personification of the home town boy who made good. He was an honest businessman, a dedicated public servant, a devoted family man and a fair-minded sportsman. It is on the characters of such men that a community distinguishes itself, not on the elegance of its buildings.

Our Nation can ill afford to lose men of the caliber of Fred Lione. They are the ones who made this country great.

The Importance of Border Taxes in International Trade

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, border taxes, not a new issue, have been a subject of recent concern because of their relationship to our aggravated balance-of-payments deficit position. Thus there has been a sudden urgency in dealing with a problem which is both difficult to understand, and which will be difficult to change quickly. Because of the importance of the border tax, I am placing in the RECORD an article prepared for the February 19 NAMA Reports magazine. This article discusses the theoretical and practical consideration inherent in the border tax problem and proposes several steps the United States might take in order to address the problem.

A clearer understanding of the border tax, both in Congress and in the business and economic communities is necessary particularly because the Treasury has been preparing a bill for an "Import Equalization Tax" which would establish a U.S. border surcharge on imports and rebate on exports of 1.95 percent. Treasury sources indicate that this is the weighted average of figures representing the indirect tax burdens of 61 product groups. In measuring the indirect tax burdens, Treasury is said to have included such taxes as Federal excise taxes, State sales taxes, license fees, personal property taxes, and other indirect tax charges.

The article referred to follows immediately:

BORDER TAXES: NEW URGENCY ON OLD ISSUE
(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS)

Recent developments abroad and at home have made the border tax problem urgent. This is ironic. Border taxes have been in use, and under study and discussion, for years. It is only in the context of certain immediate problems and pressures that the border tax issue is now considered by some to be an "urgent" problem, that, in spite of its great complexity and considerable delicacy, "must" be solved quickly.

What factors have caused border taxes to be considered urgent and even critical by some U.S. government leaders and others?

The present concern about the effect of European border taxes on U.S. exports and imports derives from the U.S. balance of payments problem, and from this Administration's notions about how to solve it. But even this framework is not broad enough. The balance of payments deficit (and border taxes as they might affect U.S. payments through the balance of trade) is itself fundamentally the result of Administration expenditure policy.

The balance of payments can only suffer from the effects of a spending-stimulated domestic inflation which raises the prices of our exports, makes imports more attractive, and increases foreigners' doubts that dollars will retain their value and that dollars can thus safely be held instead of gold.

Administration expenditure policy affects the balance of payments in another way, U.S. expenditures abroad for the troops and their support, A.I.D., Public Law 480 and other commitments, are the immediate cause of the deficit in the balance of payments. Thus gov-

ernment performance must rely on the private accounts (return on U.S. private foreign investments over repatriated returns on investments of foreign capital in the U.S., and the surplus of U.S. exports over imports) to create balance.

Though government spending is the root of the problem, the root problem has not been tackled. Government spending at home will be increased by the Administration rather than be diminished. Spending for foreign programs beyond our foreign earnings will continue with no apparent willingness to re-examine such issues as the need for continued widespread U.S. foreign troop commitments abroad, or the proper extent and nature of foreign "aid" and lending programs.

Americans have been asked to accept the government's claim that its self-defined objectives are so necessary that the private sector, including students as well as businessmen, bankers and tourists, housewives and American investors, should sacrifice their own objectives and best interests which collectively are some measure of what is best for our society, for those of the Federal government.

This discussion may seem far from the issue of border taxes, but it is closely related indeed. The Administration's "cure" for the payments deficit has been to restrict various sectors of our private transactions. Businessmen know much better than I just what these programs have been, and I will not cite them in detail here. Suffice it to say that the encroachment upon private initiative and a freely operating international market began in 1963 with the interest equalization tax and has continued since that time to the extent that, under the Administration's program as presented to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 5, all aspects of the private international transactions would be controlled except trade and what Dr. Kindleberger refers to in his Feb. 1 testimony in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee as the "foreign securities gap," the \$14 billion of U.S. corporate, state and local securities owned by foreigners.

Some in the Administration, particularly in the Treasury, and some members of Congress are compelled by the hobgoblin of consistency for consistency's sake. They insist that, if measures are taken to manipulate all other private accounts, then measures must also be taken to manipulate the trade account. Such manipulation to increase the amount of the trade surplus should be taken, they argue, even though the trade account is now in surplus (though there is dispute about how the trade surplus should be measured) and has been since the late 19th century. They hold to this position even though the Administration's expenditure policy is making attainment of a greater trade surplus more difficult, by increasing price levels and damaging the competitive ability of exports and by failing to realize that exports themselves depend on U.S. foreign investment.

Now, the reasoning goes, in *what ways* can we manipulate the balance of trade? Several possibilities have been considered. One would have been to enact a tariff surcharge for balance of payments reasons, as the British did in 1965. Another would be to develop a U.S. border tax that would be "legal" under the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and would in some measure tax imports and encourage exports by means of a subsidy or tax rebate. Both would be ways of raising U.S. tariffs without directly offending the rules of the GATT. These considerations, and others, were discussed in the days immediately prior to the President's January 1 emergency balance of payments statement, which did, at Treasury's insistence, contain a sort of Presidential commitment to do something about border taxes. Other devices considered are export subsidies, government-

sponsored export cartels and reduced duty free allowances for tourists.

But when its representatives appeared before the Ways and Means on Monday, February 5, the Administration's proposals did not include action on the trade account. After a hard-fought internal struggle, the Administration view, as expressed by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, was that intensive international consultations on the border tax issue would be pursued on the basis that had been laid by several years of study in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and by discussion of the border tax issue in the context of the Kennedy Round.

But at the conclusion of the two-day hearings the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Mills, expressed a view that "something" had to be done on border taxes. He indicated his wish to consider action on border taxes in the context of the Administration's travel package.

Chairman Mills' statement provides a major element of the now "urgent" situation. Then, two days later in his speech at the National Press Club, M. Jean Rey, President of the Commission of the European Economic Community (EEC) expressed the Common Market's view that the U.S. balance of payments problem was not a balance of trade matter but a matter of domestic economic policy. He said the EEC considers the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to be the correct measure of its conduct on the border tax issue, and he said that the adverse effects of border taxes on U.S. foreign trade had not yet been proven. He also said that Americans had for years known about the border tax system that was being formulated in the EEC, and had taken no action until the present "emergency."

These are the reasons why the border tax issue has suddenly become urgent. Congressman Mills' indications, very likely backed by the Treasury, are responsive to, and supported by, the view of some of American industry that the border tax does in fact disadvantage them and that an easy solution to the problem is in fact a unilaterally enacted U.S. border tax.

At the same time M. Rey's remarks indicate a stiff reluctance to change the EEC's newly-forged "TVA" (Taxe sur la Valeur Ajoutée) system of border taxes, even though M. Rey indicated that the Community would be willing to discuss with us this and other problems.

THE GUTS OF THE BORDER TAX

A border tax is a tax on imports equal to the amount of internal "indirect" taxes on domestic products during the manufacturing process. It is accompanied by a rebate on exports of the same amount. This tax and rebate are permitted under the fair trade rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to allow for equalization of the cost of the imported product with the domestic product.

The principle on which the system rests is one of classical economic theory that has been seriously questioned only since the GATT was written in 1947. The theory is that all direct taxes are completely absorbed by the producer and are not reflected in higher prices, and that all "indirect" taxes, or taxes on products, are absorbed by the consumer.

In operation this would mean that a corporation would not reflect the cost of its direct (income) tax bill in the price of its widget, that it would take the cost of the tax primarily out of its profits, rather than calculate a higher price for the widget that would include the cost of the tax as well as a reasonable profit. In other words, the theory would have it there is no forward "shifting" of the tax to the consumer in a higher price. It would also mean that the corporation whose products were taxed indirectly would set a price for its product regardless of the

cost of the tax, so that the final price of the product would be raised exactly by the amount of the tax, and thus be entirely absorbed, or "shifted" onto, the consumer.

These classical assumptions have been very strongly questioned. Dr. Milton Leontides, former Director of Tax Analysis, National Association of Manufacturers, concludes:

"A review of American economists would probably now indicate general acceptance of partial forward shifting of the corporate income tax as well as some backward shifting of the excise tax. The extremes of full shifting in either direction are for the most part rejected."

What is the meaning of this theoretical flaw for the instant problem? It is this. To the extent that indirect taxes are even partially shifted backward, a border tax adjustment equivalent to the full internal indirect tax has the same effect on international trade as a subsidy for exports or an additional tariff on imports. To the extent that direct taxes are even partially shifted forward to the consumer, the lack of a border adjustment for direct taxes constitutes a form of discrimination in international trade against this form of taxation, and those countries that rely in major part upon it.

It is fair to conclude that the theory of taxation on which the GATT's border tax rules are written is faulty. If this is indeed true, then the GATT rules should be revised. In my view the requisite factual basis for a U.S. response to M. Rey's invitation to discussion based on fact does exist.

There is another reason for joint U.S.-EEC examination of the border tax rules in the GATT relating to a discrepancy between GATT's definition of direct and indirect taxes and their actual application. Theoretically, a direct tax is a tax on profits and is therefore taken out of profits, and an indirect tax is a tax purely on the cost of a product at point of sale. In practice these two taxes do not appear to work strictly as defined.

Take, for example, the value added tax (TVA) employed by the French and being adopted by the other five Common Market countries. The TVA is assessed on the difference between each firm's sales and its purchases. This difference is made up of the costs of transforming what it buys into what it sells, including a profit. From this "value added" in the course of production EEC producers are allowed to deduct the amount of the taxes that are paid on inputs at earlier stages of production.

According again to Dr. Leontides: "The important characteristic shared by the value-added tax and the corporate profits tax is that they are levied directly on producers. Although the tax base of the former is costs plus profits while the latter is profits only, they are both taxes on businesses rather than products." . . . "In the literal sense, the GATT articles for border price adjustments include only taxes which apply directly to goods or products and therefore would exclude the value added tax."

This pointed questioning of the application the value added tax indicates another area of uncertainty present in the accepted system. This is well pointed out by Helen Junz in her study published in the Joint Economic Committee's compendium of papers titled *Issues and Objectives of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy* (October, 1967):

"It could be argued that the distinction made in international practice between direct and indirect taxes may essentially be arbitrary and seem to be based more on prevailing practice than on theoretical reasoning. For example, it is not at all clear whether employer contributions to social security fall into the indirect or the direct tax category, although GATT practice specifically places them with direct taxes. Conversely, value added taxes, according to GATT classification, 'are considered to be indirect taxes.' However, value added taxes

fall on both costs and profits of the producer . . . and to the extent that they fall on profits are not always clearly distinguishable from a profits tax in their effect. Nevertheless corporate profits taxes are classified as 'direct' and value added taxes as 'indirect' taxes."

In sum, there are apparently two valid grounds for questioning the continued applicability of the present taxation system. First, there is the apparently faulty theoretical basis which posits that direct taxes are not at all shifted forward, and that indirect taxes are entirely shifted forward. Second is the evidence that GATT's rules regarding indirect taxation are applied incorrectly in practice. In fact, it is argued that the only basis for establishing a border tax adjustment mechanism in any country depends on the extent to which its indirect taxes are actually shifted forward. There can apparently be no dogmatic assumptions about the extent of shifting, and shifting is itself difficult to measure, even if it is possible to agree on what types of taxes are indirect and direct.

If the system established under the GATT and followed by our major trading partners is incorrect, then a strong case exists for changing the system to be more equitable to the U.S. But a case can also be made that the international economy had already adjusted to the border tax system (as it existed prior to 1968) and thus action to correct past practice would be futile.

This argument is well-stated by Sidney Weintraub, former Chief of the Commercial Policy Division of the State Department, in a paper prepared for a symposium of the NAM on Taxes and International Business, in 1965.

"Since the present complex of exchange rates gradually emerged during the late 1940's and the 1950's when the present structure of taxes and corresponding border adjustments were in large measure already established, the latter must implicitly have been accounted for in the present structure of taxes and corresponding border adjustments in the exchange rates. In other words there is every reason to believe that if the system of border adjustments for indirect taxes had not been in effect during these years, the rates of exchange would be different from what they actually are."

Though the international trade system may indeed have already adjusted to the border tax, changes in border tax adjustment rates such as the Common Market is now undertaking cannot be adjusted by exchange rates under our present fixed exchange system. In fact, according to Helen Junz, "possible trade distorting effects of new border adjustments now are of much greater concern than they were in the past. . . ."

Action has in a sense been "commanded," and the revisions of the border tax system do give ample cause for well-considered U.S. corrective action.

WHAT DO WE DO ABOUT THE BORDER TAX PROBLEM?

1. The U.S. could impose a border tax that would reflect our domestic Federal manufacturers' excises, and other indirect taxes that become costs of business, such as state excise taxes, and perhaps property taxes. Summing up the cost of these taxes, which differ not only among states but among individual firms in separate industries, would be very difficult to do accurately and perhaps would be difficult to justify in terms of the existing GATT rules. Even if it were legally possible, estimates put such a tax merely at about 2 to 3%. If imposed at the border such a tax might give certain industries a slight margin of relief, but it might also distort supply relationships by increasing the cost of certain raw materials to industries already facing rising costs in an inflationary economy.

Another uncertainty in this course of action would be the response of our trading partners. Other countries, such as Canada

and Japan, could justify a border tax equal to, or higher than our own, because their indirect internal tax burdens are said to be greater than ours. Canada is said to have indirect internal taxes that total more than do those of the U.S. Canada is reported, in fact, to have informed the U.S. that it could and would match any U.S. border tax "point-for-point." Thus any advantage we might gain in our trade with this major trading partner would be immediately removed.

2. The U.S. could obtain changes in the GATT rule so as to be able to reflect our direct taxes in border tax adjustments. Helen Junz indicates that, in her view, such a course "would meet with considerable administrative problems. Even if the degree of shifting, which to complicate matters may actually vary from product to product and from country to country as well as over time, can be accurately determined, it would be virtually impossible to determine the precise amount of tax embodied in the price of a specific product."

But there are other aspects to this possible course of action that are more sobering. The OECD has presented statistics to indicate that the total tax burden of the United States is lower than that of either the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, or the Netherlands in terms of general government expenditures as a percentage of gross domestic product in 1965. Thus a case is made that, because Europeans rely as extensively as the U.S. on direct taxes on profits, they could be able to reflect their direct tax burdens in border tax adjustments also.

If the U.S. should not adopt either of these two courses of action, I would propose certain other approaches that might prove an acceptable way of addressing the problem. For, even though the new concern with the border tax issue may be stimulated by external matters such as the balance of payments and Administration expenditure policy, it is a very real problem for which workable solutions must be found. But these solutions must be responsibly selected, or we might find that we could actually damage our own position both in the short and the long term. For there seems to be no question that in an escalating retaliatory situation the U.S. could justify a smaller burden of taxation reflectable at the border than any of our major industrial trading partners.

Discussions with the EEC must be continued based on U.S. conviction that the rule and the practice on the border tax system have both theoretical and operational shortcomings. Negotiations imply that a quid pro quo, a balancing of interests and offers, must be undertaken. I would argue that, if the system is wrong, and if indeed it can be shown to be wrong, then a negotiation per se should not be required. The EEC's recent assurance in Washington that they are willing to reason with us in our attempts to solve our problems should be tested on this point particularly.

Initially, I suggest that the basis for assessing the border tax be changed. Presently the EEC levies its border taxes on the duty-paid (cost including freight) cif value of imports while the U.S. adjusts for its indirect taxes (our few remaining manufacturers, sumptuary and regulatory excise taxes), on the duty-paid fob (freight on board) basis. The U.S. should seek to have the EEC assess its border adjustment on the cif basis adjusted downward by 10% to represent an fob value, and the U.S. should also assess its border adjustments on the fob value.

Secondly, the U.S. should attempt to reach a standstill agreement with the Common Market until a resolution of the problem and an appropriate change in the system is obtained.

Thirdly, the U.S. should declare as its long term objective change in the GATT rule to take account of the practical shortcomings of the full-forward-shifting of the indirect

tax. The shifting assumptions of GATT could be modified to reflect the different characteristics of different types of indirect taxes. Shiftability could be calculated according to the U.S. excise tax and the U.K. purchase tax, the cascade type of turnover tax, and the value added tax. Thus similar shifting assumption for similar taxes would be defined, even though the process of definition would still be difficult. A tighter definition of any "indirect tax" also appears necessary.

What if the EEC were completely intransigent and refused in any way to alter the basis of its assessment of the border tax, or to slow the time table for its movement to a unified TVA, or to consider opening the GATT for a change of rules to reflect differences in shiftability?

U.S. options in this event are several. One would be to use the clause U.S. negotiators inserted in the memoranda accompanying final Kennedy Round protocols and demand a concession under GATT's nullification and impairment procedure, or unilaterally adjust its own tariff to effect compensation. In the Kennedy Round we reaffirmed our right to seek compensation if the proposed border tax changes in the Common Market impair the value of the tariff concessions we received in the Kennedy Round.

Proving impairment of concessions, however, would require that we demonstrate to the EEC in concrete trade terms how the increase of their border tax adversely affects U.S. exports. This could be a difficult burden of proof. Even if we could prove it, the EEC itself reaffirmed its adherence to the GATT's border taxation rules as the authority on which to justify any effect of the border tax, adverse to U.S. trade or not.

Another option suggested is use of the countervailing duty permitted by Section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and permissible under GATT. But even this course is fraught with complications. One is that the U.S. countervailing duty has never been applied against the rebate of an indirect tax. However, the Treasury's interpretation of Section 303 could be changed by legislation which would simply require application of a countervailing duty to indirect taxes that are rebated, or that are "inequitably" applied on the basis of faulty forward shifting assumptions. This could mean than an Administration "travel package" could be amended to include such a provision. I must observe, however, that such an amendment would probably be contrary to GATT's countervailing duty rule, and would certainly run against the intent and the interpretation of GATT's border tax rule.

CONCLUSION

The above discussion should be adequate to demonstrate that this is a most complex, and even dangerous issue. If the U.S. were to act too hastily, we could in fact be confronted with foreign retaliation that would really hurt. The best solution is unquestionably to secure immediate European willingness to alter their system. In terms of proportion of GNP related to foreign trade the Europeans by and large have more to lose than we, though our present balance of payments problems would make very serious any European action sharply to affect our present favorable trade balance.

The Monetary Problem

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the weakness of the administration's program to

bolster confidence in the dollar is reflected in the column of John Chamberlain as printed in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on January 13, 1968. As Representative UNALL and I said in an appeal to the NATO governments on January 1:

The international monetary system will continue to hang by the slender thread of national self-interest until some sort of federal governmental structure brings nations together. No one can accurately forecast the durability of that thread, nor predict with certainty the circumstances or hour when it will break.

Even a hopeful step toward the establishment of such a federal structure would in itself ease the worry and nervousness that now plagues international monetary affairs. It might retard or even halt the movement toward devaluation of currencies, and European demands for U.S. gold.

The Atlantic Union resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 232, now sponsored or supported publicly by 97 Members of this body, can be the means of initiating that hopeful step.

The text of the Chamberlain column follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Jan. 13, 1968]

THREE MUSKETEERS OF DOOM

This column should perhaps leave financial predictions to the wizards of the market pages, but it is disturbed by the judgments of some of its most respected friends that the administration's program for saving the dollar is a too-little, and-too-late business. The reason for worry is that the judgmental critics were right all along in predicting the downfall of the British pound, and now see the dollar following along in a couple of years.

When George Schwartz, the London Sunday Times financial writer, concurs with Clarence Streit, the crusader for a true political union of the Atlantic nations, and when Elliot Janeway, the hard-boiled analyst who has just written "The Economics of Crisis," agrees with both of them that trouble can't be sidestepped by such things as cutting down on foreign travel allowances, then it is time to stop, look and listen.

Clarence Streit is the most willing prophet among the three musketeers of doom. Since 1963 he has been forecasting the downfall of the pound and the dollar (in that order) if something weren't done to bring about a more perfect union of the Western world. Mr. Streit has all along insisted that the Communists expect to win without a military fight, merely by waiting for a monetary crash and depression to undermine their victims from within.

Now Clarence Streit says, "I stick my neck out again, as regards 1968, despite the prevailing forecasts of the economists." Moscow, he reminds us, has not been as blatant as De Gaulle in its attack on the dollar. But "by rattling from time to time its armed power, it has kept the U.S. giving foreign aid that weakens the dollar," and "by backing North Vietnam and Egypt, it weakens the dollar still more, and adds to Atlantic disunion and distrust of the U.S." All this, says Streit, has made a monetary crash possible that would see the dollar following the pound within a year.

Janeway thinks that Johnson's "dollar gamble amounts to a bet on the bludgeon." The administration's idea is to frighten Europe into taking dollars without calling for gold. When De Gaulle sees his big summer take from U.S. tourists drying up, so the theory runs, he'll come to heel along with most of the European central banks. But

Janeway doubts that the private holders of the "Eurodollar" will cooperate. A new cycle of worldwide contraction is now in motion.

George Schwartz, the London Sunday Times financial man, was one of the participants in the Mont Pelerin Society economic policy discussions held last September in Vichy, France. As an observer in Vichy, I was particularly taken with his sweet way of phrasing the most gloomy prognostications. He points out that the U.S. shows no desire to learn from what has happened in Britain, and is therefore doomed to repeat all of the Labor government's mistakes.

The British have operated on the theory that anything can be afforded at home, since you pay for it in paper that is "owed to yourselves." And they have tried to stave off external insolvency by such dodges as the prohibition or limitation of foreign travel. The dodges didn't work, and the pound collapsed for the far more fundamental reason that British industry had become inefficient at home, thus making it difficult to export.

The dollar, so the three musketeers of doom that have been mentioned in this column agree in thinking, will hit the toboggan because of a combination of domestic and foreign reasons. A \$2 or \$3 billion annual deficit on our external balance of payments could be digested, but a \$30 billion domestic budget deficit must cause every dollar holder abroad to distrust our financial sanity. We may owe it to ourselves," but why should the private holder of the "Eurodollar" be caught in the switches when gold is an available alternative?

Rationale for Areawide Hospital Planning

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, an extremely interesting article entitled "Conversations: The Rationale for Areawide Hospital Planning," appears in the February 1968 issue of *Trustee*, the journal for hospital governing boards. It is a transcript of a roundtable discussion of the past experiences, current problems, and future purposes of areawide hospital planning. The article is the second in a series of publications sponsored as a public service by Automatic Retailers of America, Inc., hospital food management division and appears in *Trustee* by permission of ARA.

The distinguished participants in the roundtable discussion are: Donald R. Newkirk, executive director, Ohio Hospital Association; Harold M. Graning, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Ray E. Brown, executive vice president, Affiliated Hospitals Center, Boston; Frank S. Groner, administrator, Baptist Memorial Hospital, Memphis; Leroy E. Burney, M.D., vice president for health services, Temple University, Philadelphia; and Harvey T. Stephens, executive vice president, ARA Services, and president, ARA-Slater School and College Services and ARA Hospital Food Management Divisions.

Mr. Speaker, since much of the impetus for areawide planning derives from legislation that has been developed in Congress during recent years, I feel that this interim and unofficial progress report will be of interest to my colleagues:

CONVERSATIONS: THE RATIONALE FOR AREAWIDE HOSPITAL PLANNING

Ray E. Brown: The purpose of our discussion is to point up some of the major reasons why so much attention is being directed to the need for communitywide hospital planning, and why results in this direction have not been as great as might be expected. To define our topic, communitywide hospital planning is concerned with the way hospitals fit into the total health care system of the community, as opposed to the way they are fitted together internally.

In recent years great progress has been made in internal hospital planning. The results are improved effectiveness and efficiency in the individual hospital's internal operations. This does not mean, however, that the hospital is doing the best job for the community. Doing a thing well is not the same as doing the best thing.

When is a hospital doing the best things for its community? The answer to that question should be about the same as a statement of the purposes and goals of communitywide hospital planning. Dr. Burney, could you lead off our examination of the aims and goals of this movement?

Leroy E. Burney, M.D.: The major responsibility of the hospital as a community health center rather than an isolated entity is the delivery of health care to the population. Under that concept, communitywide planning should be aimed at helping each of the hospitals, as part of the whole, to achieve its greatest potential in the delivery of high quality health care with the greatest economy in the use of resources and people.

Donald R. Newkirk: Mr. Brown implied in his opening remarks that the accomplishments of areawide hospital planning have not been to date as great as its promise. Perhaps what should precede this question is the motivation of the hospital. Is doing the best job for its community a part of its motivation? If the hospital board sits around the table and says, "We want to plan because we want to do a better community job," that's fine. But many times the planning process comes about when the hospital board says, "We need money and the only way we can get it is to cooperate with this planning organization which has been set up in our area."

Dr. Burney: I agree. Whether it's a hospital, a board of trustees, a medical staff, or a university, it's only human nature to resist coordination and integration. There is the fear of destroying the freedom, the security of what they've done in the past. However, we aren't actually performing our function as a part of the total health care system in the community unless we do overcome some of these traditional restraints and plan jointly. In this way we preserve the very freedom that we believe is threatened.

Mr. Brown: Before we discuss this very important factor of motivation, could we describe the individual hospital's role within its community, given the best sort of planning?

Frank S. Groner: We all know the hospital board does its best job when it fulfills the needs of that segment of the community for which it has accepted responsibility. But one of the difficulties a hospital board faces is having at its command the information necessary to know what truly are the needs of a community. Here is where a planning agency finds its role. One of the deficiencies in the voluntary hospital system is that we, administrators and boards of trustees, build up tremendous loyalties to a given institution. These loyalties very often become much greater than loyalties to community needs.

Mr. Brown: A common statement is that the hospital serves its role best when it fits into the overall system of medical care by providing resources at the proper level—at the proper time, in the proper place, at the proper cost. In this sense hospital planning is a systemization or rationalization of the

total medical care picture and the role that the individual hospital plays in this rationalized system.

Why doesn't this occur automatically? What is inherent about the hospital system that calls for something beyond individual decisions by individual enterprises? For instance, the supermarkets have no formal planning mechanism. Why should the hospitals need a communitywide planning device?

You mentioned the interest each hospital has in its own affairs, its desire to grow—very great values we don't want to destroy. But, at the same time, you made the point, Frank, that these values led into a sort of ad hoc decision-making process by which the parts were responding without relationship to the whole.

Dr. Burney: Doesn't this relate also to planning bodies outside the health field? Most cities have well established city planning commissions. Their activities are largely confined to transportation, communication, location of certain cultural projects, and related functions. But they make a point to include community representation on their planning commission in addition to the professional representation with its vested interest, albeit enlightened. Isn't this part of our problem with regional planning bodies? So often we plan with the same people with whom we work all the time. We don't bring into the planning mechanism some of the community leaders who may have a broader perspective, a more enlightened view than some of us who forget occasionally that we are not an isolated entity but a part of the whole system.

Mr. Brown: At this point, perhaps Harold Graning, who deals with these matters daily, would review how far hospital planning has developed in this country, how it is set up, financed, staffed, controlled.

Harold M. Graning, M.D.: Since 1960 there has been a remarkable growth in the number of areawide planning groups throughout the country. Responding to public need, a great many hospital administrators, boards of trustees, practicing physicians and people in the community have created areawide planning groups whose boards of directors have been essentially made up of a power structure in the community. Supporting Lee's viewpoint, the involvement of people outside the health field does contribute a broader point of view.

At the present time there are some 60 areawide planning agencies that have received some assistance from the federal government and there are an additional 16 in the developmental stage without such support. They vary in size, ability, scope of service, and adequacy of staffing. Their interest has been largely limited to trying to adjudicate, between hospitals in the community, the points of view on expansion plans. Some have considered the adequacy of nursing home facilities. A very few are taking a look at hospital manpower needs in serving the community.

The more enlightened individual hospitals are supporting good areawide planning. They recognize that it is not prudent for each hospital in the community to try to cope individually with the rapid medical advances that make possible very high and specialized levels of care, and that decisions should be made on a community basis in terms of the patient's best interest. Thus we have begun to think about the sharing and purchase of services, the more adequate provision of laboratory and x-ray services to physicians, and the extent to which automation can contribute to better hospital practice.

Mr. Brown: Isn't it true, Harold, that though these planning agencies do receive governmental support in their initial stages, the control remains in the community?

Mr. Graning: Yes, in all instances where federal support has been given, the commu-

nity itself has raised 50 per cent of the operating budget. The federal government makes financial allocation through the state agency and thus the relevance to the community planning of overall state need is assured.

Mr. Groner: Another facet I would like to introduce is timing, why we are sitting here today. The concept of regional planning of health facilities is gaining in popularity, even becoming a shibboleth among the more sophisticated hospital administrators. The interest has been created. Moral obligations on applications follow.

Why haven't we done anything more about it? On examination, this is natural. Our heritage has been to look to individual initiative, to believe in free enterprise, in competition, as the way to build the better mousetrap. The change toward group planning has been brought about by the developments in the last two decades, the tremendous demands on hospital care. No longer can a physician work solely out of his little black bag. Our streets couldn't carry the van necessary to take the equipment to the patient's home if he is to have access to everything he needs.

Another fact is the economic transformation in recent times. Hospitals have become tremendous businesses. The operating cost, just in short-term general hospitals, is \$14 billion now and will increase to \$20 billion by about 1970. The public has a \$30 billion investment. All segments of our society consider health care as an inalienable native right. Having made such a large investment, the public is beginning to take a real hard look at hospitals. It is asking some searching questions of the hospital system. The whole phenomenon of areawide planning for health facilities emerges from this background.

Mr. Brown: Another way to look at it: what are the penalties that a community pays as a result of lack of planning?

Dr. Burney: Not to minimize the importance of the growing number and activities of areawide planning groups, my impression is that most of them are more concerned about the number of beds or modernization and not delving into the real health needs of the total community, the availability of health care, and how a hospital can join with other community agencies in meeting these needs. How many are doing research and evaluation in this planning process? Quality care is seriously affected by this lack of planning, by this isolation of the hospital from the whole area.

Mr. Brown: Regarding quality care, we could think of omissions. We hear so much about too many cobalt bombs, but little is being said within hospital administration and the medical profession about the numerous levels and types of care that are not available.

Mr. Newkirk: A good point. Has the public demand for planning created a crisis situation in many planning organizations which says we must cover our rear, or we must explain certain things, rather than venture into the larger planning aspects?

Mr. Groner: As Ray said, there are so many things bigger than cobalt bombs. Planning councils should look at consolidation of services. In many communities, especially metropolitan areas, there are institutions that should not even be in existence. We should look at who is rendering obstetrical service and who should render it. In towns with a multiplicity of hospitals, virtually all rendering this service, the personnel is spread thin, occupancy is low, costs are high. The same is true about pediatrics. It's unfortunate that some isolated specialty hospitals with a low occupancy have been encouraged to grow. We should take a look at the size of hospitals. The New York City planning agency has said that no metropolitan hospital can do a good job with under 400 beds.

Mr. Newkirk: Coming from an area where

there are six planning agencies, I can say their effectiveness is, in a general sense, directly proportional to their age. The older ones that have successfully fought the brush fires and won the confidence of medical staffs and community are into these deeper problems and doing a very fine job. The newer ones are in on the basis of a crisis operation. They need money, the public is demanding explanations of costs, Congress is demanding justification as regards Medicare and other federal programs. Then the board of trustees, the medical staff still may not be convinced that this whole planning thing is needed because, after all, "we're in Wapakoneta, Ohio, in our opinion doing well for our community, and therefore unconcerned with overall planning."

Mr. Groner: The ultimate penalty to the community of inadequate or poor planning is in the present and future health of the people and the cost they are paying. One of our problems in selling community planning is our negative approach to it. There is a positive approach, for instance, in the modernization of existing facilities, and an all-out attack on the health manpower problem. Also, we have to hurl the challenge back to the public, not to use health service and hospital care unnecessarily.

Mr. Brown: Speaking as the public now, have you as an administrator provided my doctor and me with the range of alternatives? You accuse me of going to the hospital and crawling between the sheets of the acute hospital bed, but have we planned a system of hospital care that would allow the doctor to choose between making me a walking patient, bed patient or extended care patient?

Mr. Groner: In this area, how do you challenge the administrator of the future? The time is past when he or the board of trustees can truncate health care at any one point and say that the patient is no longer our obligation. There are the levels of care, the long-term patient, the intermediate patient and so on. Hospitals must reevaluate not only their outpatient services, but the emergency department which is more and more becoming the doctor's office in off hours. It probably results in a conservation of personnel and dollars. The hospital should look forward to home care programs and even go into construction programs to make it a complete health center, providing physicians' offices and other facilities.

Dr. Gruning: We really haven't given the patient and the physician enough options in good patient care. Our insurance programs are not geared to give the physician the same option in getting diagnostic and x-ray work done on an out-patient basis. True, Option B in Medicare has provided this for people over 65 but the general public does not have it in subscribing to insurance programs. Therefore, there is a financial incentive in becoming an inpatient, whereas in many cases the physician could manage the patient on an outpatient basis. Here's where the hospital could make a significant contribution if insurance covered it.

Mr. Groner: I heartily agree. Hospitals should also join the medical profession in preventive medicine. The hospital more often than the physician has the tools, equipment, the personnel.

Dr. Burney: The concept that a hospital is a community health center doesn't mean that the hospital is the total resource in that particular area for all health services. We have to establish a preventive services relationship with health departments, with health and welfare councils and other groups in the area. This means planning with them. Also, to provide more effective and economical assistance for the delivery of health care systems requires research projects carried on and financed on top of ongoing programs.

We face here the problem of the multiplicity of funding sources in the federal government. If you want to carry out a total

health care system project and go down to Washington with it, you have to see the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Labor Department, Social Security Administration, and so on. It's a little discouraging if one expects the federal government to furnish legislative action, comprehensive planning and a regional medical planning program, to have to spend a week in Washington trying to find someone who can say "We, in Washington, will jointly do some planning which will affect health bills in the local community." So maybe there ought to be a little areawide planning in the federal government.

Mr. Newkirk: Here is one of the fine functions of a planning agency, something that is readily saleable to the individual hospital and can be recognized as an immediate benefit—"grantsmanship." Nothing would be more valuable than to have somebody familiar with these hundreds of government programs. This person would interpret aid programs and translate them into action that would directly benefit the individual hospital and its patient.

Dr. Gruning: Either Lee has overstated the complexity of the situation or he has underscored the unusual competence and intelligence of the group at Temple (Temple University Hospital Philadelphia), as witnessed by their success in being able to get federal grants!

Harvey Stephens: Well, Lee is an experienced visitor to Washington. Another aspect of the problem is what is the *stimulation* for areawide planning? Does it come from hospital administrators who recognize their responsibility to the community beyond their own parochial and historic traditions? Or from the community power structure, a group of concerned citizens, who say, "Before we invest any more community money or resources in individual institutions, we want something to say about what will be done to meet community needs. We want assurance that the delivery of high quality health care for the greatest number of people will be done with a real concern for the conservation of community resources, rather than for the glorification of each individual institution."

Dr. Gruning: In a great many instances the creation of an areawide planning agency has stemmed from concern about anticipated growth of several hospitals in the community. The motivation has appeared to be an interest in conservation of community resources and regretfully, in some instances, when decisions have to be made as to the allocation of funds and which hospital will do what, the continuing involvement and success of the top power structure have not been sustained. These people have been sending their second echelon representatives to the board meetings. This is partly why you see the failure of some areawide planning agencies to face the gaps in service. I'm convinced that you can retain the interest and concern of the power structure where there is something really meaningful for them to work on.

The gaps in health service, the failure of all the hospitals collectively to develop programs that can reach all segments of society have undoubtedly made some contribution to the recent riots in several American cities.

Dr. Burney: Ray, you have for many years been in the forefront of health and hospital planning. Shouldn't we label our discussion areawide *health* planning instead of *hospital* planning? Then we would consider the role that the hospital has in the total provision of preventive, curative and restorative health. Shouldn't we emphasize planning in which a number of related groups would be concerned, not just in the health area, but certainly in economics, education, welfare, and others. Also, how, in areawide health planning, can hospitals improve their contributions to health manpower training?

Mr. Brown: Yes, hospital planning simply cannot occur in a vacuum. It must fit into

total community planning. In its document on communitywide hospital planning, the Public Health Service felt that the complexity of getting hospitals into the total of the community medical care system was still such that at least now we should have institutional planning as a unit with specific purposes and that later in history we might move into a more generalized and inclusive arrangement. I share that opinion at this point in time. Admittedly, hospitals can do very little on their own to achieve the proper coordination in the total medical care system. For instance, Harald Graning implied that prepayment actuaries have actually been the architects of the hospital and medical care system.

The hospital has not gotten deeply into extended care because the prepayment mechanism, whether insurance, Blue Cross or government agencies, has not provided the funds for the quality care that hospitals can afford to be associated with.

Or maybe the architecture of our hospital system has been dominated by public relations considerations. In order to maintain public support, hospitals have had to do the most dramatic, the most obvious. You'll get a lot more support for an open heart surgery unit than for a well baby clinic, even though the clinic contributes more to the welfare of the community. So the problem is bigger than hospitals. Perhaps one reason that planning has not been effective to date is that hospitals can only plan as far as the controlling environment allows them to plan.

Dr. Burney: I would not disagree, but another example is the Regional Medical Program whose major objective is the delivery of health care on the basis of available knowledge. We also see medical schools taking the major initiative though I'm not sure they're the logical leaders. Fortunately, the legislation requires that there be substantial community consumer group representation on these Regional Medical Program organizations. I strongly suggest the inclusion of these consumer groups in hospital planning so we just don't talk to ourselves or plan in a vacuum. Consumer groups may be more objective and dispassionate in interpreting need and proposing action.

Mr. Newkirk: Unfortunately, I see too many planning agencies, also the Regional Medical Program organizations, being set up with consumer advisory groups which are not being used. In many cases they are window dressing but amount to absolutely nothing in direct and effective communication with this public that's demanding better planning.

Dr. Graning: We should also consider the training of manpower in total health planning. Individual hospitals have traditionally carried the load in terms of schools, x-ray technology, medical technicians, schools of nursing. We need to rethink the appropriateness of this and whether the cost involved should not be shared by others who ultimately will benefit.

We should consider the professional obsolescence problem. All of our acute care facilities should have more meaningful ties in the country through mechanisms such as Regional Medical Programs and ultimately through electronic communication devices. This will enable hospitals, or physicians practicing in community hospitals, to get the consultation services of people in distant cities.

We have not yet developed good administration and control mechanisms to assure that particular health care institutions can provide high quality care. Our statistics show that on this basis of comparing mortality rates in hospitals that have an extensive amount of open heart surgery as against those that have relatively little, the difference is as much as sevenfold. The people on

the boards of the areawide planning agencies haven't got the leverage to make the kind of decision that would protect the public against the creation of an open heart surgical unit where, perhaps, there shouldn't be one.

Mr. Brown: What is the extent of the leverage now? How do you get the medical care system to systematize itself, to respond to planning?

Mr. Newkirk: The dilemma, it seems to me, is that planning people sell their system and often gain hospital and community acceptance on the basis that there will be no control of the individual hospital. Yet when they are set up, the first thing you hear is "the reason we can't be effective is we don't have the muscle, the control."

Dr. Burney: Because so often planning bodies plan for instead of with the institutions. There has not been enough participation and involvement in the whole planning process by the institutions.

Mr. Stephens: Another question is what contribution does the medical profession make to fill the need for continual involvement of topflight people in planning and coordination? Essentially the doctor is the provider of health care service in his office or in the hospital. Does some of the present inflexibility to "have muscle" reside in this area? Is there going to have to be more of a community of interest between the physician and the trustees?

Dr. Burney: The physician is one of the members of the total health care team, which includes dentists, pharmacists, nurses, and other allied health professions. This team concept is now and will become more important in the delivery of comprehensive health care.

Mr. Brown: How do we get the doctor involved in planning, to realize that a better distribution of medical care in this country must begin with the doctor? It is useless to talk of planning for a medical care system unless the key decision maker is in that system.

Dr. Graning: In a certain sense, physicians are clients of a hospital. Physicians' participation on the active staff on a particular hospital ensures the hospital that it is going to continue to have patients, so the hospital plans for this. But this system does not produce good utilization of the existing facilities. For instance, if you merge several OB units into one hospital, then you have the problem that the doctor has been on the staff of one hospital and you have to start considering his staff appointment at another hospital. If physicians had staff privileges in all hospitals in the community, then a surgeon, for instance, who develops proficiency in a certain surgical technique that needs certain kinds of equipment can bring his patient to the hospital that has it instead of pressing the hospital in which he is located to get this equipment.

Of course, the doctors on the active staff like the present staff privilege set up because it assures them preference in availability of beds and they can see all their patients in one hospital.

Mr. Stephens: Should openness of staff privileges in all of the institutions within a community or area be a goal of an areawide planning council?

Dr. Graning: I can cite a specific success story of an areawide planning agency that was confronted with the situation of a "popular" hospital with an expansion program attracting large numbers of people, thus creating a tight bed situation. The agency's analysis discovered that many of the physicians in that particular hospital also had staff privileges at another hospital where the bed situation was not at all tight. By appealing to the physicians to bring some cases to this hospital, they were able to relieve the pressures in one hospital and improve the situation in the other.

Mr. Brown: Don Newkirk stated a fact that must be recognized; that is, that any sort of planning is a matter of subordination. It's useless to plan unless it influences and guides the decisions of those for whom you are planning or for those involved in the effects of your planning. At the same time, we do have a voluntary system in which we are attempting to exploit all of the values of diversified producers, diversified decision making.

A properly conducted planning process could yield both. It could cause the individual hospital to subordinate its own planning to that of the total community and also produce results that make its progress better because of this subordination.

Mr. Groner: To review the advantages to the individual hospital in agreeing to fit into the total medical care system as opposed to going its own independent way: The individual hospital has to return to its original purpose—to render service to the community. Regardless of its ownership, the hospital is a public and social institution. Coordinating services produces higher quality care than if one hospital attempts to cover the whole spectrum. Hospitals as a group can make significant reductions or savings in cost. Coordination should relieve unnecessary waste of professional man or woman hours. This benefits the community and the individual hospital.

Dr. Graning: Good administration is not a popularity contest. There will be some pain in sublimating the hospital's current interest. But if one looks at the primary motive of a whole health care system as being better patient care this pain becomes more endurable.

Mr. Brown: In summary, areawide hospital planning offers a means by which hospitals can have the best of both worlds—growth and dynamic activity in behalf of the individual enterprise and, at the same time, effective linkage in the total system of health care in the community.

Church Statements on Vietnam

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in the national debate on American policy in Vietnam we have consistently heard wise, thoughtful statements from the clergy. International church groups have also provided some interesting comments on the situation in Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to place in the RECORD the following collection of church statements on Vietnam so that my colleagues and all Americans may have the opportunity to examine these important comments.

The statements follow:

CHURCH STATEMENTS ON VIETNAM

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, UNITED STATES

Resolution adopted May 1967

"All men, regardless of nationality, politics or ideology are equal objects of God's judgment and loving kindness in Jesus Christ and this must be recognized in our efforts to seek a just solution. Christians face many dilemmas in seeking such a peace which include:

"1. Whether the use of military means to seek political objectives is justified.

"2. Whether the assumption of authority to direct the government and military forces or another in order to establish a situation which fits it own,

"3. Whether the attainment of legitimate goals through destruction and human suffering is defensible, and

"4. Whether the assumption of authority to direct the government and military forces of another country in order to establish a situation which fits its own national security or way of living is acceptable."

BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
UNITED KINGDOM

Fiftieth meeting, April 1967

"We believe that justice cannot be furthered by the continued prosecution of the war in Vietnam, a war which neither side can reasonably hope to win. The volume of human suffering and the disintegration of social life are out of all proportion to whatever just ends either side purports to serve.

"We identify ourselves with those on both sides who counsel restraint in the conduct of the war and a readiness to end it by negotiation. We feel a particular bond with the many Christians in the United States of America who continue to plead for a more convincing demonstration on the part of their Government of its will to make peace. In this context we support the continuing efforts of the World Council of Churches and of Pope Paul VI to promote a settlement."

BRITISH METHODIST CONFERENCE,
UNITED KINGDOM

Meeting at Wolverhampton, July 1966

"This Methodist Conference: Deplores the decisions already partially carried out by the armed forces of the U.S.A. to bomb installations at Hanoi and Haiphong in North Vietnam.

Condemns the misguided policy pursued by the United States government, throughout this conflict of which this terrible extension of the war is an inevitable consequence.

Calls upon H. M. Government to disassociate completely from this policy so that Britain can play a positive and effective part in bringing about a peaceful solution."

CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN, UNITED STATES
Annual Conference, June 1967

"We protest Government's expansion of bombing in North Vietnam, its widespread use of napalm, which reportedly causes more civilian casualties than military, its practice of land defoliation and food destruction, its continued increase in troops and material, its unwillingness to agree to direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front, its tendency to either 'use' or disregard other Asian countries in the pursuit of war."

DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH, NETHERLANDS

Letter from general synod to National Council of Churches, July 24, 1967

"We would earnestly entreat you to do all you possibly can to induce your people and your Government to create a basis for negotiations by discontinuing the air raids on North and South Vietnam and submitting proposals for a cease-fire. We feel justified in making a particularly urgent appeal to you, since it is upon the American people as one of the mightiest nations, nay perhaps the mightiest in the world, that great responsibility rests in the struggle for freedom, justice and humanity.

"We Dutchmen and Dutch Christians and Churches owe our liberation from the yoke of cruel, anti-Christian oppression partly to your nation's willingness to sacrifice lives and property. Since the war, too, the Dutch and other nations cherished great hopes of the United States contribution to the organization of a new community of nations. In view of this it is all the more regrettable that we are compelled to point out to you that your nation is losing the confidence placed in it, also because of a credibility gap we observe in its pleas for freedom and justice.

"For that reason alone the United States should stop the war in Vietnam without delay by taking new initiatives.

"We beseech you to exert yourselves to the utmost to achieve this end, but we do not do so to exculpate ourselves and put all the blame on your shoulders. We do so because we are deeply moved by the unspeakable sufferings of the millions who for years have lived in fear and tribulation, and because we are gravely concerned about the fate of our world with its many conflicts between classes, races and nations, all of whom live under the constant threat of destruction and death."

EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH,
UNITED STATES

General conference, November 1966

"Regardless of the complexity of the problem and its solution we are agreed that this war is tragic and that a solution to the long-range problems in Vietnam must be found in the economic, political, social and spiritual realms, rather than through military struggle alone. The sooner the war is halted the more rapidly the world can begin to fashion the true security of Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia."

LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA,
UNITED STATES

Third biennial convention, June 1966

"In facing the present situation in Vietnam, Christians must take cognizance of the fact that simplistic solutions are unrealistic. Attempts to bring easy answers to so complex a set of problems may only complicate them. Neither extended war nor immediate unilateral withdrawal by the United States seems to answer the problem. Continuance of the present limited war seems to be no solution. Consequently, it is important that every effort be made to bring all parties to the conflict toward a stance of openness and flexibility with a readiness to respond to whatever beginnings of solutions may emerge . . ."

THE METHODIST CHURCH, UNITED STATES

*General Board of Christian Social Concerns,
April 1967*

"We urge the U.S. government immediately to initiate necessary steps leading to the withdrawal of all its forces from Vietnam in a manner to be determined by negotiation.

These steps should include an acceptance of U.N. Secretary General U Thant's proposals. Specifically, this means:

(a) An announcement by the United States and South Vietnam governments of a unilateral cease-fire and stand-fast upon a specific date.

(b) An announcement that the United States and South Vietnam are ready to negotiate with all parties including the National Liberation Front.

*Board of missions, annual meeting,
January 1967*

"The Board of Missions believes that The Methodist Church as a member of the N.C.C. should, in cooperation with other member churches, work with great urgency at this time to bring an end to the war in Vietnam. Such united effort calls for widespread expanded study, debate and action by local churches based on the concerns and action suggestions interpreted in the 'Appeal' . . .

This responsible action must include such urgent steps as the following: a) Christian sensibilities are offended by the high ratio of civilian to military casualties resulting from all phases of the conflict, but we are especially grieved by the recent disclosures of civilian casualties resulting from the bombing. b) Readiness on the part of the U. S. A. to support the United Nations in negotiations "for a cease-fire agreement (including cessation of terrorist activities) under United Nations supervision, among the governments of the U. S., of North and South Vietnam and other interested parties, in-

cluding representatives from the National Liberation Front; such negotiations are imperative and may be possible on the basis of mutual interest of sparing the population further and frightful suffering." (Policy Statement of the General Board of the NCCUSA, Dec. 1965).

METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND, NEW ZEALAND

1966 conference

"Conference protests to the New Zealand Government and the United States Ambassador against the well-documented and increasing barbarism, terrorism, and disregard for international conventions now taking place in North and South Vietnam by combatants on both sides. We deplore the resultant inevitable debasement of character in the United States and Allied troops and peoples, and the deterioration of trust and respect by Asian peoples for Western nations. We are convinced that peace cannot come to Southeast Asia nor can the spread of Communism be prevented by action which increases the suffering and disruption of the Vietnamese people, and therefore request the Government to withdraw New Zealand troops from Vietnam so that New Zealand can play a positive and effective part in bringing about a peaceful settlement."

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
UNITED STATES

Pastoral statement, November 1966

"While we cannot resolve all the issues involved in the Vietnam conflict, it is clearly our duty to insist that they be kept under constant moral scrutiny. No one is free to evade his personal responsibility by leaving it entirely to others to make moral judgments. . . .

In the conduct of any war, there must be moral limits. Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation. Moreover, as the Council also reminded us, the fact that a war of self-defense has begun does not mean that any and all means may be employed by the warring parties . . .

There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may in time, diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils. Every means at our disposal, therefore, must be used to create a climate of peace . . ."

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
UNITED STATES

General board, September 15, 1967

"We believe that measures designed to set in motion a process of peaceful settlement should be inaugurated at once. We fully recognize that heavy responsibility for the war and the present condition of Vietnam rests with the National Liberation Front and Hanoi. Nevertheless, we believe that a solution achieved by military victory alone, if that were possible, would subvert the interests of security, justice and peace, and therefore would not serve the best interests of the USA. We believe, therefore, that the following steps should be taken:

(a) We ask that the U.S. make clear to the newly elected government in Saigon the necessity of large-scale, convincing efforts to establish social justice in South Vietnam, and the necessity of prompt efforts to secure a just peaceful settlement with the National Liberation Front and Hanoi. It is essential, in our view, that the U.S. declare that the Government of Vietnam should take its own initiatives and make its own decisions to secure an early, peaceful settlement of the future of Vietnam. We urge that the U.S. pledge its support of all such efforts. In the absence of such efforts, we urge the U.S. Gov-

ernment to re-examine its commitments in Vietnam.

(b) As the General Assembly of the UN is about to convene, we ask that there be a shift in U.S. policy at two points. The first is to stop the bombing of North Vietnam for an unspecified period of time. The second is, simultaneously with the first, to request the UN (preferably the General Assembly) or other international agency to take up the question: What steps should be taken and procedures adopted to secure peaceful settlement in Vietnam? The newly introduced Senate resolution concerning reference of the Vietnam issue to the UN deserves popular support.

Such a change in policy, we believe would help create a situation on the world scene and in Vietnam that would assist in securing a peaceful settlement of the war. . . .

PRIESTS AND PASTORS OF FRANCE, FRANCE

Letter to priests and pastors of the United States of America, June 20, 1967

"We know that we carry a share of responsibility in the present conflict; we know, because we have experienced war in Europe, in Asia and in Africa, how difficult it can be in such circumstances to see clearly the demands of our Christian vocation. Our own history prevents us from posing as models or examples. But we believe, nevertheless, that as priests and pastors we must write to you in the name of our common spiritual responsibility.

"Actually, the present American decision to impose peace on Vietnam through victory is embarking your country more and more every day in acts of war which are against conscience. It is leading your people and the world to the brink of disaster. . . .

If it thinks it has the right to do this, it is not making a tragic mistake and should you not, your priests and pastors of America, make it publicly known in the name of Christ?

"And another question. The revolutionary war which the United States wants today to stop by force of arms, is the result to a very large extent of the world order whose inequalities violate individuals and peoples. Those of us who benefit from this world order cannot appeal to its maintenance to crush by violence the revolt of peoples. Does the

United States have the right to stop this revolt by making manifest to the eyes of a terrified world the inhuman warning of the annihilation of a people? Should not you, your priests and pastors of America, also proclaim this publicity to your people in the name of Christ?

"May this witness of our anxiety strengthen you in your spiritual responsibility."

UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA, CANADA

Twenty-Second General Council, September 1966

"request our Canadian Government:

"(a) to continue its present policy of refusing to send military personnel to fight in Vietnam;

"(b) to again issue a statement expressing its opposition to further escalation of the war;

"(c) to use its membership in the International Control Commission to continue to seek reconvening of the Geneva Conference or a similar conference, supporting the proposals of U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations as conditions for negotiations. . . ."

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, UNITED STATES

Sixth General Synod, June 1967

"There has been a sacrifice of some of this nation's greatest assets, including much of its esteem as a humane and peace-loving people, its credibility as between aims and actions, and its will to achieve social justice at home and abroad.

"In sorrow and in moral anguish, we seek now to give voice to the church's witness to justice and peace in the present situation.

"We Believe that there has been an unrewarding and increasingly indiscriminate preoccupation with military assaults upon North Vietnam. There is no meaningful prospect for solving the most basic Vietnamese problems through the pursuit of military victory in the North.

We continue to support a negotiated settlement of the war consonant with justice and security for the people of Vietnam. Where formal negotiations may not prove feasible, we believe that deliberate acts of restraint and renunciation may serve to mitigate the violence on both sides and to encourage the beginnings of a minimal trust

without which no political settlement can succeed. With regard to the United Nations and to other governments, we must affirm that 'a decent respect to the opinions of mankind' is surely as important as to national policy in 1967 as it was in 1776."

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

179th General Assembly, 1967

"There is no moral issue more urgently confronting our church and nation than the war in Vietnam. The hour is late; the church dare not remain silent. We must declare our conscience. . . ."

B. We realize that a decision to change national policy in the midst of military conflict is an agonizing one for the President and his advisors. Nevertheless, in the light of the increasing cost and peril of our present course of escalation we ask for ourselves and our nation:

1. The moral courage to acknowledge our obligation, as the stronger nation to act first taking initiatives that will create a climate of trust leading finally to the negotiating table;

2. The recognition that with such information and such insights as we now possess, it appears that the immediate need is an alternate to the bombing of North Vietnam.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES MEETING IN CRETE

Central Committee, August 24, 1967

"The situation today has changed to include still greater dangers but may also offer better prospects. The hardening of positions and the continued military escalation open an apparently endless vista of horror. By changes in the political situation, both within and outside Vietnam, new opportunities for negotiation may, however, be emerging. Impending danger and present opportunities combine to underscore the urgent need for immediate action. . . .

"This then is the heart of our appeal. Let each party, by its own initiatives and its response to those of others, demonstrate that it is committed to peaceful settlement and is ready to take reasonable risks."

(NOTE.—Statements collected and excerpts made by Vietnam Emphasis Joint Methodist Program, 777 UN Plaza, New York, N.Y.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 21, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.—Psalms 121:1.

Our Heavenly Father, who art the source of truth and the giver of all good, lead us to the hills from whence cometh our help and where in steadiness of thought and stability of feeling we may be secure in mind and heart.

In these moments of prayer help us to receive Thy spirit that the life of this day may be different and this difference make a difference in the day for us.

Strengthen Thou our faith, increase our courage, and stimulate our high endeavors that we may never lose heart in the struggle for the reign of democracy and the right of people to determine their own destiny. In the spirit of Him who never lost faith we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

NORTH KOREAN INTRANSIGENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, for 4 weeks our Government has sought, through diplomatic channels, to extricate the crew of the *Pueblo*. Now North Korea has reacted—by threatening to try these men as war criminals.

North Korea thus reveals the massive contempt with which it regards the behavior expected of civilized nations. The time of reckoning is near. Whatever steps are necessary must be taken without delay to make it perfectly clear to the North Koreans that any punitive action against our men will bring appropriate reprisals.

The threat reported from Moscow yesterday—a threat of war if we take such reprisals—must not deter us. Our only

consideration should be the safety and well being of those 82 sailors.

In my home district last week, I met with 17 different groups—students, businessmen, veterans, minority representatives—even a gathering of foreign born. Almost always, I invited questions and comments from the floor.

From the sentiments voiced at these meetings, I can assure President Johnson that his determined response to North Korea's threat will have the widest support in my community.

ARTHUR GEORGE KLEIN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce to you the death of former Congressman Arthur