military personnel in Europe, leaving an ample force to maintain treaty commitments, and that we should freeze the number of civilian government employees at its present level.

While we are spending $30 billion a year in Vietnam, low-priority programs must be deferred. Then we can responsibly plow back a portion of the savings into urgent human needs such as the rural development, voc-tech education and crime prevention I already mentioned.

RECENT BILL INTRODUCTIONS

Since my last Progress Report, I have introduced a bill to extend the life of radio and television licenses from the present three years to five years. A five-year license period would benefit the broadcasters who spend hundreds of hours making out the lengthy application and would reduce the administrative overhead of the Federal Communications Commission. With less paper work to face, the FCC also might find more time to concentrate its attention on the minority that are known mis-users of their licensed trust. I am confident this will help the nearly 20 television and radio stations in the First Congressional District. They are responsible broadcasters and deserve to have this maturity recognized and their application work load reduced.

I've also co-sponsored a bill to establish a Countryside Development Study Commission. We need more facts on the ironic situation we see of crowded cities and un-used rural resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 9, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Lord is my strength and my shield; my heart trusteth in Him and I am helped.—Psalm 28: 7.

Eternal Father of our spirits, whose still small voice calls us to turn away from the foolish and feverish ways of a wayward and a worried world, help us to draw near to Thee in all humility of mind and with all reverence of heart. With the power of Thy spirit alive within us may we face the duties of this day with clear minds and clean hearts, without pretense and prejudice, in the assurance that the best service we can render our country in these trying times is based on understanding, truth, and love.

Standing in the tradition of our Nation with our faith in freedom for all, may we become united in purpose and strong in spirit as we face this day when plots are made to destroy our birthright by a revolt against the laws of our land and by a rebellion against the kingly virtue of nonviolence.

May we lay aside partisan allegiances that with a deeper loyalty to our country, a broader love for our fellow man, and a greater faith in Thee we may go forth to battle for the good of all Thy children.

In the name of Him who made goodness His aim in life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1418. An act to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force;

S. 2015. An act to amend section 11–1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; and

S. 2884. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad.

CONGRESS IS NOT STAMPEDED ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. OLSEN. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, mourning on the lips of everyone for the loss of a very wonderful Christian person, Dr. Martin Luther King. More than 2 weeks ago I was certain the House of Representatives would approve the civil rights legislation which we are considering tomorrow. I am equally sure today that it will be approved and I do not think the success of this legislation should be credited to the shameless and senseless act of an assassin.

The civil rights bill has already been passed by the Senate and it had been scheduled for floor action this week and before the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Martin Luther King was a truly great and outstanding Christian American. His life helped to inspire this country and helped to inspire this Congress toward moving this bill. He deserves much of the credit for the impetus which had developed behind this bill, but I think it is important to emphasize to all Americans and to the President of this country that the great contribution Dr. King made to passage of this legislation resulted from the work of his life; it did not result from his tragic death. That tremendous loss is not causing a stampede in the House. That is why I take the floor at this time.

The plan for floor action is exactly the same as it was 2 weeks ago. The legislative machinery was ready then and House consideration was scheduled for this week at that time.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. What the gentleman is saying is true. This bill was programed before any of the incidents of the weekend took place.

The program is being followed precisely, as far as we have jurisdiction over it, as previously announced.

Mr. OLSEN. In that regard, I have been planning my visit to Montana during the Easter vacation. I called the majority leader's office more than 2 weeks ago about those plans and the question of scheduling the civil rights bill had been decided that long ago.

The Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, advised me some time ago that he was assured of the votes necessary for House passage. This is not a stampede that is going to be taking place tomorrow. Tomorrow is simply a conclu sion—and I think a very successful conclusion—to the American process of democracy. I am hopeful all Americans will remember this legislation as a tribute to Dr. King's productive and Christian life, not to his untimely and tragic death.

EMOTION PACKED LEGISLATION SHOULD BE DELAYED

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of America who believe in law and order as opposed to mob rule sincerely abhor the violence which has engulfed much of our Nation.

Dissents, no matter how valid, cannot be settled by murder, burning, and pillage. Such conduct is expected only of wild beasts and paranoid creatures completely devoid of conscience. Unfortunately, it has erupted from activistic jungle urgings.

The present climate of great grief, unbridled irresponsibility and disgust with such irresponsibility is too charged with emotion for the production of well reasoned, well debated legislation. Measures passed at such time would be tainted with their own legislative history and fail to do credit to the deliberative body that produces it.

We must have law and order first and calm consideration afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, the peaceful, law-abiding, reasonable, responsible people of this Nation are getting angry, too, and are becoming disgusted, alarmed, and impatient because of the pressures being built up to influence the votes of their Representatives.

All emotion packed legislation should be delayed for the voice of reason to be heard.

RIOTING AND LOOTING MUST BE STOPPED

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the rioting and looting that have taken place the past few days is a national disgrace. This unlawful activity must be stopped. Most Americans are deeply disturbed by the breakdown in law and order. The small minority of rioters, looters, and arsonists must be made to realize that no minority in a free society will ever dictate to the majority. The laws of our land must be upheld. Our society is based on law and order, and when this breaks down our Nation begins to fall apart at its seams.

I personally abhor acts of violence as do most Americans, and I am today urging National, State, and local law-enforcement officers to do everything in their power to immediately put down riotous acts before they have an opportunity to spread. They must also insure that violators are punished promptly and adequately. Certainly, this includes the murderer of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I have said on many occasions that there is no excuse for rioting and there is certainly none for looting. These senseless, criminal acts infringe upon the rights of the rest of us.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT MAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, this is a rare occasion for me. I just came from my office listening to the funeral orations to a great man. I would hope that I never again hear recriminations and incriminations. I would hope that the people of America and the Members of this House only remember that this man who is being interred today advocated nonviolence in this country. I would hope that the Members of this House direct their attention to binding the wounds of this country that we all love.

I have no intention of saying who is wrong or who is right. We know that. Our objective should be in righting whatever wrong there is and working for the preservation of the United States of America. I would ask all of my colleagues to direct their attentions and their energies to that noble purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this: I do know that never in the history of America has the conscience of this country been so aroused to its plight. I do not care how it came about. It is not our concern to know or to consider how it came about, but it is our concern to correct whatever is wrong.

My plea to the Members is to join with me in looking to the future, and in directing our efforts in the effort to correct whatever is wrong in this country.

LYNDON'S LICENSING OF LOOTERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as a witness to the pillaging of the Nation's Capital last weekend, I know I express the shock and indignation of most thinking Americans to this wanton criminal conduct. The actions of the President and Attorney General amount to little more than coddling of a criminal element.

Attorney General Clark gave credence to what many of us had feared; that is, that this administration has little or no concern for property rights. Asked whether the Nation is unwilling to accept unlimited property damage because we do not want to inflict any deaths upon the looters and rioters, Clark replied:

> That is not the issue. I don't think we suffered unlimited property damage here.

He is right to some extent. Portions of Washington still stand but with no thanks to him and his appeasing and coddling practices.

Looters should be dealt with summarily. The Johnson and Clark handling of the Washington riots indicate that discontented Negroes now have a license to ransack and loot everywhere. Black militants can now act without fear of retribution. When the President comes before this body and feigns an interest in law and order he should not be taken seriously by any law-abiding American who is now insecure in his person and property.

TRIBUTE TO DR. KING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, the thoughts of a saddened Nation are turned to Atlanta, Ga., where the body of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King is being interred. However, the cause of human betterment for which he gave his life must go forward.

This tragedy stirs the conscience of all Americans to make right the wrongs which he so vigorously protested. Dr. King did not plead for charity—he asked for the justice of compassionate laws to serve all people in all times.

The Congress of the United States can pay tribute to this good man of peace by carrying out his testament. We can start by enacting laws which will protect the civil liberties of our people and to make opportunity more equal.

These statutes of equality will constitute the finest tribute we can give to the memory of this great American.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since a large number of Members are here at this moment, I think it is appropriate for me to comment at this time on the bill that will shortly be before the House, the Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bill.

I happen to be the ranking minority member of the Committee on Postal Operations. I know of the many problems which face the Post Office Department. There are some things that I do not wholeheartedly support in their policies, but I do know that the Post Office Department is one of the key agencies affecting every single American in this country.

The Committee on Appropriations has cut this budget approximately $170 million below what was recommended by the Budget Bureau. I think this cut is deep enough and perhaps too deep. My purpose in speaking at this moment has to do with rumors that I hear that an effort will be made to chop another big hunk out of this Post Office Department appropriations bill.

I can say to everyone if this appropriation is reduced any further, the postal service throughout the country is going to suffer and there is going to be a curtailment of service. You can imagine the outcry you will hear from your constituents if further service is curtailed because of the rumor that I hear that an attempt will be made to further reduce their appropriation.

I would say there is not any agency of the Government that reaches the people on a personal basis as does the postal service. It would be most ironical and most distressing to the people if a further cut were to be made and service would be curtailed in view of the recent increase in postal rates.

PENALTY FOR GOVERNMENT WORKERS INVOLVED IN RIOTS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans I was shocked to discover that a number of Federal employees were found to be engaged in unlawful activities in the District of Columbia in connection with the recent riots.

The Washintgon Post front-page story on Monday, April 8, stated:

> A large number work for the Federal Government, and many have some college education.

I think most citizens will agree with me when I say that Federal employees are supposed to be law-abiding and responsible citizens, and certainly if they engage in activities related to civil disorders and riots in any community they

are not entitled to the privilege of working for the Federal Government.

Therefore, today I have introduced legislation which provides for the immediate removal of any Federal employee who is convicted of engaging in an unlawful act in connection with any local community disorder. Further, my bill provides that such person shall not be reemployed with the Federal Government for a period of 5 years.

Also, my bill provides that any other person who is convicted of performing an unlawful act in connection with a community civil disorder shall not be eligible for Government employment for a period of 5 years following a decision of the highest court of competent jurisdiction considering his case.

I hope that Federal employees in other parts of the United States are not engaging in these civil disorders which have been reported in great abundance throughout our Nation. But if they are, my bill would apply to them as well as to those Federal employees in the District of Columbia.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION TOMORROW OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1223 TO EXTEND EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the opening of the session, or at any other time, that it be in order for the House to consider House Joint Resolution 1223. The purpose of the resolution, if I may advise the House, is to continue temporarily the excise taxes which the House passed in H.R. 15414 some days ago on automobiles—the manufacturer's excise—and on telephone service. As Members know, that bill, H.R. 15414 is still in conference. We are not going to be able to conclude the conference with the conferees on the part of the Senate before the House's scheduled adjournment for the Easter period. This House Joint Resolution 1223 would only extend those excise taxes for the month of April, so that the effective date for a drop, unless something further is done, would be at midnight on April 30 next.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do so only so that we can have a discussion on this matter and so everyone will undestand what the situation is—I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, my question is this, What will be the procedure for consideration tomorrow under the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MILLS. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the joint resolution will be called up by me when the Speaker recognizes me for that purpose tomorrow for purposes of consideration.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the time consideration? How would time for debate be divided on such a request?

Mr. MILLS. We could agree to that now, if any time for debate is required. I had hoped that there would be no requirement for debate of the joint resolution in view of the fact that it is a simple and easily understood resolution, merely extending until midnight April 30, 1968, the excise tax rates the House had already voted to extend in H.R. 15414, which is still in conference.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And which the Senate has voted to extend.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The problem is with respect to the other aspects in conference. To give us the opportunity to work our will on these other matters, the gentleman proposes we take care of this item—which is rather serious in terms of a sales tax—that the present law says expired on the 1st of April. This proposal extends the tax for 30 days.

The real issue is to avoid the legal problems that could occur as a result of this situation.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, what has happened in the interim, since legal collection of excise expired last March 31, midnight, on the collection of these taxes?

Mr. MILLS. The collections have been going forward as though we had completed action on the bill. If I thought that we would not run into any difficulty by allowing this matter to go beyond the Easter period, I would not be asking the House to pass this House joint resolution. I think, though, that we should obviate any possibility of any loss of revenue in this particular area as a result of our inability to conclude the conference and pass the conference report based upon the initial proposal. I do not know that we would, but there is a possibility, and certainly under these circumstances all of us recognize we need such revenue as existing law would provide.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman correctly, this is to make legal that which has been continued by direction?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct. In the bill that is in conference, H.R. 15414, the extension of these excises is not in issue. It is other matters which are in issue.

Mr. HALL. Inasmuch as it has passed both bodies of the Congress, but the signed enactment is being held up in conference?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is eminently correct. Both bodies have acted favorably on the excise rate extension.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we are now apparently forfeiting the right to ask any questions.

Mr. MILLS. No. I will be glad to take 5 minutes, or any other length of time, striking out the last word, to answer any question.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman expected to call it up and pass it without any discussion at all.

Mr. MILLS. No. I said I hoped to. It is easily understood.

Mr. HALL. This will be the first order of business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will consider that and recognize the gentleman at the appropriate time.

Mr. HALL. As I understood the unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker, that was specifically so stated.

Mr. MILLS. I added to that, or at any other time tomorrow.

Mr. HALL. If and when recognized by the Speaker?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 89]

Adams	Halpern	Reid, N.Y.
Ashley	Hanna	Resnick
Ashmore	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Bingham	Harvey	Riegle
Boland	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Burton, Calif.	Herlong	Rostenkowski
Button	Holifield	Roth
Carey	Hull	Roybal
Carter	Irwin	Ruppe
Cohelan	Jacobs	Ryan
Conyers	Jones, Mo.	Scheuer
Corman	Kastenmeier	Schweiker
Daddario	Kazen	Schwengel
Dellenback	King, Calif.	Selden
Dent	King, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Dow	Kluczynski	Taft
Dwyer	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Tenzer
Esch	MacGregor	Thompson, Ga.
Farbstein	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Findley	Moore	Tuck
Fino	Moorhead	Tunney
Fraser	Morse, Mass.	Whalen
Gardner	O'Hara, Ill.	Wolff
Gilbert	Ottinger	Yates
Gurney	Poage	
Hagan	Rees	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EULOGY TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, more than 300 years ago, the English poet and clergyman, John Donne, spoke these words—

No man is an Island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod be washed away by the Sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a Promontory were, as well as if a Manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind; And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

The bell tolls, indeed, for all mankind as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is buried in his final resting place in Atlanta today.

Sad as we are over the brutal assassination of this good and righteous man, let us be heartened in the realization that though he died young, Dr. King accomplished a lifetime of humanitarian endeavor.

In pursuing the creed of nonviolence to achieve man's goal of equality, justice, and understanding, he often spoke for all mankind. He uttered these words from the Lincoln Memorial in 1963:

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

His dream of racial brotherhood was of a Nation where Americans are judged not "by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

In accepting the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964, Dr. King said:

I accept this award in behalf of a civil rights movement which is moving with determination and a majestic scorn for risk and danger to establish a reign of freedom and a rule of justice.

Dr. King has left with us his dream to achieve a better America for all Americans, and to bring love and understanding among the peoples of all nations. It is a dream that we ought to help fulfill even without his presence and guiding hand.

To Mrs. King and their children, I extend deepest sympathy in the loss of a devoted husband and father. The Nation and the entire world have also suffered a great loss in the tragic passing of this gentle apostle of freedom and brotherhood.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 16489—making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 4 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16489, with Mr. BLATNIK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are very pleased to be able to bring this, the first general appropriations bill of the session, to the House today for consideration. At the outset I want to say that having this bill here today has been made possible only because of the fact that the chairman has had the finest cooperation and assistance from the other members of the subcommittee and the staff and the agency people.

We put in a lot of overtime, and we are pleased we can be here this early in the session with this first appropriation bill.

The Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill is one which deals with agencies probably best known to the Members of Congress generally. These are the agencies which have the longest history in our Government, and it could truly be said that they represent the very heart and core of our Federal Government. They deal not only with the enormous agency of the Post Office Department but also with the Treasury Department agencies, which have responsibility for collecting the moneys that come into the Federal Treasury and for handling of the great Federal debt and all of the trust funds of the Government.

We have brought in what I believe is the tightest appropriation bill for these agencies the Congress has considered in the 20 years I have been a Member. We have made a total cut of 2.2 percent. While that may not be large in terms of percentages, when it is applied to these agencies it represents a very, very heavy impact on their requests for funds.

These agencies give services to the American people which are not under their control in terms of the volume and workload they are called on to perform.

The bill we have here today recommends that appropriations for fiscal year 1969 total $8,155,624,000, which is a reduction of $181,735,000 below the budget estimates.

There is a gross increase, considering the supplementals for this current fiscal year, of $609,983,000. The supplemental estimates for fiscal year 1968 amount to approximately $222,680,000, either pending or proposed for later transmission to the Congress. Approval of these supplemental estimates would reduce the amount for 1969 recommended in this bill, compared to 1968, from the $609,983,000 as shown in the table on page 2 to $387,303,000.

Mr. Chairman, this point I want to stress, because I believe it more clearly than anything else indicates just how tough we have been in making the budget recommendations contained in the bill.

The mandatory increases brought on by workload increase and pay raise increases enacted by Congress would impose $459,892,000 additional costs on these agencies in 1969 over 1968. In the ordinary year these types of mandatory increases are more or less automatically allowed, but this year we have allowed only a total net increase of $387,303,000, taking into account that we assume these supplementals will have to be allowed, since they all deal with the automatic pay raise which was voted by Congress.

When this has been done, the bill we have here today will, in effect, require these agencies to do, on the same unit cost basis, during the next fiscal year the job at a total cost of $72,589,000 less than the present rate of accomplishment. I believe that when we can show a $72,589,000 reduction under the automatic increases, we have demonstrated that this truly is a very, very tight bill. We have made some substantial cuts, but we have not, I think, made any cut that will impair service.

After the decision on the cuts had been arrived at, all of these items were gone over carefully with the people in the departments. We were assured that while they are going to be under rather heavy restrictions in many ways, still they can live with this budget and, if the House approves it, they will not go to the Senate and ask for any of the cuts to be reinstituted which we have made.

If this happens, this will also be the first time since I have had anything to do with this bill that we have had a situation like that. The important thing is that I think I can assure the House without any reservation that any additional cuts made in this bill can only be made if you are willing to curtail the services that these agencies are mandated to perform. We have tried to make all of the savings that can be made without the committee assuming the right to compel these agencies to curtail services imposed on them by the Congress. I want the Members to be very clear in the fact that today, if opportunities to vote for economy amendments are offered, that you do so with the full knowledge that you are accomplishing that economy only through the fact that there is going to be a reduction in service tied in with it.

There is one other point connected with this bill that I want to stress. This is while the total amount provided for is $8,155 million, it only affects the budget that we are all concerned with to the extent of about $1.7 billion due to the fact that $6.377 billion in estimated postal receipts will automatically go to help to pay the operation of the Post Office Department. That means that we are nearer to a pay-as-you-go basis in postal service this year than we have been in many, many years. The total postal budget that

we have allowed is $7.127 billion. When you take the $6.377 billion in postal receipts away from that, you have left $750 million in new obligational authority that will have to be funded out of the Federal Treasury; $634 million of this amount is called public services. They were not ever intended to be paid for from the postage collected by the Post Office Department. These services have been imposed on the Post Office Department and are supposed to be funded by all of the American people. So when you take the public service costs from the amount that the postage does not cover, you have left $116 million, actually, for postal service not involved in the public services and not paid for by postage.

The operations of the Post Office Department, which are the collection, sorting, and distribution of mail—and that is where the action is—will cost $6.377 billion this year. That means there will be after the postage has been applied to this operation $657 million in receipts to be applied to other postal costs. That brings us back down to this $116 million figure. When you stop to consider in addition to operations you have some $200 million for plant and equipment, almost $700 million for transportation costs, which are beyond the control of the Department, and you have all of the administrative costs, research and development, supplies, and all of these items you fund, I think when you get all of this whole thing down to where there is only a gap of $116 million between the money we are collecting and the total operational cost of the Department, we can see that we have brought the Post Office Department into a closer balance than we have had in a great many years. Certainly at a time when we have such stringent budget problems as exist this year, this impact on the actual Federal Treasury is one, I think, we can all be pleased about.

When one thinks about the Post Office Department and the increase in its costs, and its need for manpower, there are two things I believe we must keep in mind: The increased workload imposed upon this Department comes from two major sources, one is in the increase in volume of the mail—the estimated increase in mail volume in the next fiscal year is set at about 3 billion pieces. If this increase occurs, the Post Office Department is going to be required to distribute 85 billion pieces of mail during the next year, which of course is an alltime high. This not only imposes a very heavy burden on the Department to cope with this extra amount of mail, but it is also tied to another type of impact, that of costs that keep going on apace; that is, the number of stops or addresses that they have to deliver mail. The increase in stops in the last fiscal year alone is estimated at 1.4 million.

Now, since we can distribute the mail to the homes of the people and the stores and places of business only by the use of manpower, and since the average number of drops that one man can cover in a day is about 400, you can see that when they have this large growth in 1 year in the number of addresses to which mail has to be delivered, that they are going to have to add on a lot of additional people. The estimated increase for the coming year is that it will require at least 7,000 additional carriers alone just to cover the new homes, offices, and places of business that will grow up in this country.

These two items, the total number of places to deliver mail to, and the total amount of mail to be delivered, make a double impact on the increased cost of the Post Office Department. Of course, they have other things that increase their costs, supplies keep going up and all that sort of thing, but the other real major increase in the total dollars they are involved with is in the form of the pay raises ordered by the Congress for their employees. Since they employ about 780,000 people, and since about 90 percent of their entire budget goes for wages and benefits and related costs, any percent of wage increase at all makes a heavier impact on the money that the Post Office Department needs than most other agencies of the Government.

Of course, all of the Members are aware of the fact that these extra hundreds of millions of dollars have been added on to their budget this year, because of pay raises.

The Post Office Department has been delivering mail to 67 million addresses. For 200 million people that means that we are at an all-time high in the total number of places to deliver mail to, and in the percentage of places relating to the total population. These all add up to a lot of extra costs for the Department.

I stress these two things because these are matters beyond the control of the Department, and for them and for us to be able to hold this increase for next year to the point we have means that we have accomplished it only by requiring the most stringent of impacts on their budget requests that it is possible to make.

I honestly do not believe that any more cutting can be done on the Post Office Department unless you are willing to give up the services that they are now performing.

I, for one, am not in favor of reducing the services of the Department, especially right now, so soon after we just got through raising the postage rates, which became effective earlier this year. I do not believe the American people would be very happy if the extra costs now imposed on them were followed so soon by a reduction of services that they have had, lo these many years.

As a matter of fact, during all the years that I have been on this subcommittee the stress has been to try to make the postal service more efficient and a more serviceable organization rather than to curtail its activities. I think that is what most of the Members of the House believe in.

In the budget request this year, there was a request for 26,600 additional jobs. We have allowed funds here to cover 22,400 of those jobs. While this is a large number taken by itself, percentagewise compared to the people employed in this bill, it is not so large.

Some 20,000 of these positions are set aside for the operations activities of the Post Office Department. That is the manpower they need to handle this extra mail and to cover the thousands of new homes and offices that are going up in the country. That is less than they actually needed but we think it is about the minimum number of jobs they need to keep giving the people service.

We have allowed 1,600 additional jobs in the Internal Revenue Service—way below what they asked for—and probably too low in the sense that to refuse to give this agency the manpower it has to have to collect the taxes of the country means, more likely than not, you are going to lose more taxes that are uncollected than you are going to save in funds that are denied for manpower.

I want to call the attention of the House to one or two other items in the bill. After the House voted the other day to approve the Reorganization Act which transfers the Bureau of Narcotics from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Justice, we approved a supplemental budget request for the Bureau of $1,300,000 in excess of their original budget request to us. We did this because we assume that the action of the House meant it was approving this new plan for the Bureau of Narcotics to operate and, therefore, they would need these additional funds. Personally, I opposed that, but, since it is the will of the House, we have gone along with it.

The other important thing that I want to call to your attention is that a new agency is included in this bill. It is the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

In the first place, the new Chairman wanted more money than the budget request and he called our attention to the fact that the limited life of this Commission would not give sufficient time for the Commission to finish its work because it was so late in getting it organized and started. Also, he wanted a rather sizable amount of money to be used to make contracts with universities and other research groups to help them in their study. All of the members of the Commission are not appointed yet.

They are operating with contingency funds, but a supplemental of $150,000 is to be proposed for the rest of this fiscal year. After considering this, the committee realized that they were going to have to get legislation to extend their life and they need to have a full commission and some staff to develop the program that they want.

We denied $418,000 of their budget request and allowed them $225,000, which I think is enough to get them in business and to carry them to a point next year where they can come to us with a program, and how long a life they need and how much research and other types of activities that they want.

This will also allow them to have a full commission and a staff of about 10.

So, as we always have, on these new agencies, this business of trying to get organized and get started and to arrive at some set budget, we thought that this was about the fairest and most reasonable way that we could approach that problem this year.

So that is a new function and a new activity, and I wanted to call the Committee's attention to it. There again the committee is trying to yield to the will

of the House and to make it possible for this organization to begin its work and to carry out the mission that the House gave it.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. How much did the gentleman say the increased appropriation to the Bureau of Narcotics would be?

Mr. STEED. Let me answer the gentleman in this way: When we got the original budget figure that we had before us, before we were able to get to the Bureau of Narcotics a supplemental request based upon this reorganization plan came to us which increased the original amount by $1,300,000. After the House voted to approve the reorganization plan, we allowed this additional amount, in addition to their original budget request.

Mr. GROSS. An increase of $1,300,000?

Mr. STEED. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Why the increase? I thought the transfer was to promote economy and efficiency.

Mr. STEED. Transfer of this agency over into the Department of Justice involves getting them into some activities that they have not been engaged in. I think it is a mistake to have done it, but since the House said to do it, we bowed to their will and we have allowed the funds they are going to have if they are going over to the Department of Justice and take on the new functions that I understand they are supposed to have over there.

Of course, we do not handle the budget for the Department of Justice, and I am not in a position to give the gentleman any details as to what the new functions over there, involving the Bureau of Narcotics as well as some other agencies that will be set up, will be. So I wanted the House to know that even though I personally was opposed to all of this transfer, we felt we had to acquiesce in the allowing of the funds if this new agency is going to be placed in that Department.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say that I did not vote for the transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics into the Justice Department. Therefore, I am particularly curious to know why this increase when we were told that the transfer was designed to promote efficiency and economy.

Mr. STEED. The information we have is that the new Bureau of Narcotics will take on some additional duties they have not heretofore had. If they are going to do so, they will have to have more money than they had in their original budget.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that there would be a saving, then, in some other areas where those duties had been previously performed that the Narcotics Bureau is now going to undertake?

Mr. STEED. I do not know whether the Bureau's functions will replace some function performed someplace else or will be some new thing that will be done that had not been done before. The Bureau of Narcotics has always insisted that it remain a small, very tightly operated agency, and they have a very tight budget. They always have had. I think for the money spent their record shows that the American people have had returned to them more dividends for the $8 million it cost to operate that Bureau all over the world to avoid the evil of narcotics than we have received from any other Federal dollar that we have spent.

The reason I opposed the transfer is that I am afraid this high record of efficiency they have been giving the American people all these years may be impaired.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will bear with me for one further observation, I find it most interesting that in the short time that has elapsed since this transfer was made, the Bureau of Narcotics into the Justice Department, the increased cost is already $1,300,000. This ought to make those who supported that measure authorizing the transfer feel proud of their part in the so-called economy program, if any, in the Federal Government and the austerity that is allegedly being called for by the President.

Mr. STEED. The gentleman may be correct. The fact of the matter is that since the budget came out before the reorganization became effective, it fell to the lot of my subcommittee to handle their budget again this year, since previously we had handled it. I understand that now this will be the last time this item will appear in this appropriation bill, since henceforth it will become a part of the appropriation for the Department of Justice. There are many other agencies involved in this transfer that we have never had any jurisdiction over.

The only little part of it that ever came to our attention was this one bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 90]

Adams	Halpern	Poage
Ashmore	Hanna	Quie
Bingham	Harvey	Rees
Boland	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Bolton	Herlong	Resnick
Burton, Calif.	Hicks	Reuss
Button	Holifield	Riegle
Carey	Holland	Rosenthal
Carter	Hull	Rostenkowski
Cederberg	Irwin	Roth
Cohelan	Jacobs	Roybal
Conyers	Jones, Mo.	Rupe
Corman	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Daddario	Kazen	Scheuer
Dellenback	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Dent	King, N.Y.	Selden
Diggs	Kirwan	Steiger, Wis.
Dow	Kluczynski	Stubblefield
Edwards, Calif.	Landrum	Taft
Esch	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Farbstein	MacGregor	Tenzer
Findley	Mailliard	Thompson, Ga.
Fino	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Fraser	Moore	Tuck
Gardner	Moorhead	Tunney
Gilbert	Morse, Mass.	Whalen
Gurney	O'Hara, Ill.	Wolff
Hagan	Ottinger	Yates

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLATNIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 16489, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 344 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, before I speak on the appropriation itself, I wish to clear the air of some misconception and some propaganda that I am sure all Members of the House received this morning from Federation News, April 5, 1968. In that it is stated the Appropriations Committee defeated amendments offered in committee, in executive session, to eliminate 2,000 post offices, to cut mail delivery to 5 days a week, to cut rural delivery to 3 days a week, and to cut parcel post delivery to 5 days a week.

Mr. Chairman, this is not so. Never was such an amendment as these offered in subcommittee or in the full committee.

There was some discussion in committee, but no amendment was offered, there is a possibility here on the floor of someone offering an amendment to cut out Saturday delivery of mail, to cut parcel post delivery down to 5 days a week, and to cut parcel post delivery out on Saturday. There was some discussion, but no amendments were offered either in the subcommittee or in the full committee.

I am sorry this happened, and I do not blame the Federation. Most likely it was someone on our committee or on the full committee who passed out this erroneous information.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman have any comment to make on the subject of rural mail delivery?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I just mentioned it. I said there have been no amendments offered, either in subcommittee or full committee, on any of these subjects. There is a possibility that someone may offer such amendments on the floor here today, but time only will tell what will be done on this. However, no amendment was ever offered in the subcommittee or full committee on it.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity as the ranking minority member of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee to add my thoughts on this appropriation bill to the views just expressed by our chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

We find ourselves in troubled times these days, as troubled as any I can remember. In our darkest days during World War II, when we stood as a nation attacked from without, we were a nation united within.

Today, we find ourselves involved in a tragic and most difficult war abroad and deeply divided over that war. We find, more significantly, a division among our people related to the race question which threatens to split our country apart.

We find our financial situation in an incredibly precarious state of affairs, de-

spite the fact that economic conditions throughout the country for most of our citizens give the appearance of good times.

This Nation has always been its strongest during times of greatest crisis. I see no reason to believe that the same will not hold true today.

However, I do believe that it is absolutely critical to the well-being of this Nation and its citizens, for every man and woman to realize that more is required of them.

We are in need today of total effort, total effort on the part of all of us to meet the great challenges of our times. This requires sacrifices and it requires strength and it requires courage.

It requires more of us as a nation than we have been willing to give, and it requires it from us now, today; not in the future, not in the near future—but today.

All of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and all of the Members of this body are faced this year with exceedingly difficult appropriation tasks. The intensity and complexity of the problems that we as a nation are facing, the great demand on our available resources, and the present critical financial posture all combine to present us with most difficult decisions concerning fiscal 1969 expenditures.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 91]

Adams	Hanna	Poage
Ashmore	Harvey	Rees
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Boland	Herlong	Resnick
Burton, Calif.	Holifield	Reuss
Button	Holland	Riegle
Carey	Hull	Rosenthal
Carter	Irwin	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Jacobs	Roth
Conyers	Jones, Mo.	Roybal
Corman	Kastenmeier	Ruppe
Daddario	Kazen	Ryan
Dellenback	King, Calif.	Scheuer
Dent	King, N.Y.	Schwengel
Diggs	Kirwan	Selden
Dow	Kluczynski	Steiger, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	Landrum	Stubblefield
Esch	Leggett	Taft
Farbstein	McClure	Teague, Tex.
Findley	MacGregor	Tenzer
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Ga.
Fraser	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Gardner	Moore	Tuck
Gilbert	Moorhead	Tunney
Gurney	Morse, Mass.	Vander Jagt
Hagan	O'Hara, Ill.	Whalen
Halpern	Ottinger	Wolff

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLATNIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 16489, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed with the remarks on the appropriation bill, I certainly appreciate my colleagues on this side of the aisle calling all the quorum calls to get an audience out to hear me, but I would not feel it an affront if they would not call any more quorum calls, so we can get on with the debate and get through with the work of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend this subcommittee for their industrious performance and for the diligent and conscientious approach which they have taken in formulating the recommendations presented today.

Budget requests for fiscal year 1969 by the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies totaled $8,337,359,000.

We have recommended cutting these requests by $181,735,000, some $70,000,000 more in cuts than our fiscal 1968 recommendations, and some $145,000,000 more than our fiscal 1967 recommendations.

Our recommendation to lower Post Office requests by $170,710,000 is the largest Post Office reduction recommended in the last 20 years.

Assuming all estimated fiscal 1968 supplemental requests are enacted, the amount of increase recommended in this bill over 1968 is some $387,303,000.

This increase would be a smaller amount as pointed out in our report, than the aggregate amount of workload increases and other mandatory requirements imposed upon the agencies involved such as pay raise costs, postal increases and other factors over which essentially no control can be exercised administratively.

Our increases in expenditures have never been considered to involve particularly controversial determinations. They repeatedly have been the direct result of mandatory increases and huge workload increases which despite substantial increased productivity has necessitated larger budgetary costs.

The areas covered by these appropriations are of great importance to this country. It has been estimated that 80 percent of the Treasury Department appropriations, this year recommended at $1,006,650,000, are for the function of revenue collections. Treasury's collections furthermore are estimated to account for about 94 percent of total Federal revenues projected for 1969.

The importance here of effective and efficient operations is of direct relation to the size of the revenues which this country will collect in fiscal 1969. If ever there was an area where the old proverb "penny wise and pound foolish" had potential application it is within the realm of this appropriation.

The major amount appropriated under this bill deals with the Post Office where the level of mail delivered for fiscal 1969 is estimated to be at the astounding level of over 85 billion pieces. The increases provided here are accounted for in the most part by mandatory increases such as pay raise costs, increased mail volume, and programs authorized by Congress which are not subject to Post Office discretion.

Some 26,000 total new jobs were requested in this bill for fiscal 1969. Our committee has recommended increases of some 22,400 positions, the major portion of which is accounted for by 20,000 positions for Post Office operations. This postal operations increase is directly related to the increase in workload estimated for fiscal 1969.

Some 1,600 additional positions have been recommended for IRS to meet the needs created by the substantially increasing number of income tax returns projected for 1969 as well as additional reporting complexities.

The Treasury Department contains some of the most outstanding examples to be found in the Government of the effective use of mechanization to increase productivity. This subcommittee has consistently given strong backing to what it considered to be the absolute necessity for adoption of mechanization processes.

In the Bureau of Accounts during fiscal 1951 the average production per employee in their major area of responsibility, central disbursement operations, was 60,000 units per man. In fiscal 1966 it was 343,000 units per man, while for fiscal 1969 it will be, according to estimates, 403,000 units per man. In fiscal 1967, the average operating unit cost was 2.78 cents, an alltime low as of that time. For fiscal 1969 it is projected at 2.64 cents.

A 4-percent increase of 17 million items is projected in central disbursing activity for fiscal 1969, yet this increased workload will be handled without increase in manpower.

The Bureau of Public Debt has consistently been able to reduce staffing needs while facing increasing workloads.

The Bureau expects to handle in fiscal 1969 a 43.5 percent larger workload than it handled for 1957 with 35-percent less man years. If productivity had not increased from the 1957 level, it would be requesting for fiscal 1969, 2,372 more man-years than it is now requesting at an added cost of some $16 million, in terms of 1969 pay rates.

For fiscal 1969, the Bureau estimates a 6½-percent increase in workload while at the same time it is requesting only a 2⅔-percent increase in program costs.

More than two-thirds of the funds requested for the Office of the Treasurer, will be used in paying and reconciling 588 million checks drawn on the Treasurer and in handling the hundreds of thousands of claims arising due to loss, theft, and forging of Government checks. The workload in these areas is completely governed by the number of checks issued under programs administered by other Government agencies.

Employee production in check operations has increased each year since 1956 and according to estimates this will be true in fiscal 1968 and fiscal 1969.

While checks processed since 1956 have gone from some 350,000,000 a year to well over 550,000,000 a year estimated for fiscal 1969, the number of employees during that period has gone from nearly 700 in 1956 to less than 600 estimated for fiscal 1969.

The Bureau of Printing and Engraving has also consistently demonstrated increased productivity. The Bureau's dry-print currency printing method on 32

subject plates has been responsible for substantial improvements in productivity.

The actual unit cost rate of $8.14 per thousand notes for fiscal 1967 is $1.78 less than the unit cost rate in 1951 despite large price increases for labor and materials during that time.

The Bureau accomplished a notable feat earlier this year in its second major area—the production of postage stamps. In response to the great need for new postage stamps created by the postal rate increases, the Bureau in around-the-clock operations delivered 7 billion 200 million stamps during the month of January. This amount was one-fourth of the total number of stamps originally budgeted for fiscal 1968.

The Internal Revenue Service is the key to the collection of U.S. Government revenues. Gross Federal tax receipts in fiscal 1967 were $148.4 billion, an increase of $19.5 billion over fiscal 1966 or a rise of over 15 percent. The total amount collected and the percentage increase were the largest in our history. Over 105 million returns were filed in 1967, 1.4 million more than in 1966.

The successful operation of IRS is critical to the Government maximizing its revenue collections. There are no agencies in the Federal Government that can compare with IRS and with the Customs Bureau as agencies where the amount of Federal revenues received is so directly the result of the amounts expended.

It is for this reason that I have opposed any blanket reductions being applied to IRS. The results of Public Law 90–218 being applicable to IRS clearly demonstrate, I believe, the inappropriateness of such action. There were so-called savings of $15 million, as a result of these economy reductions, while the costs to the Government in revenue collections were estimated at more than $50 million and probably closer to $100 million.

It has been estimated, furthermore, that possible revenue losses in fiscal 1969 could reach some $256 million if the $22 million increase requested for compliance was fully denied.

Involved here, however, is not just the question of the loss of millions of dollars in direct revenues. The indirect effect on voluntary reporting which may occur from lack of adequate supervallance efforts is potentially enormous.

A dropoff in compliance of a single percentage point would reduce tax receipts by $1.7 billion, according to estimates.

Our subcommittee, I believe, has by its recommendation, recognized the importance of providing a meaningful compliance program.

The Bureau of Customs continues to be faced with increasingly overburdening workloads. In 1967 more than 202 million persons entered the United States. This figure is expected to reach 213 million in 1968 and 223 million in 1969.

Aircraft passenger increases have been averaging some 20 percent a year and in 1968 are expected to exceed this amount. This problem is of particular concern with the development of large capacity passenger aircraft and the overwhelming pressures that it will place on our present system.

The Bureau of Customs collected a record $2.7 billion in duties and taxes last year and this is expected to reach $3.2 billion in fiscal 1969. The application of Public Law 90–218 to this agency was equally nonproductive and self-defeating in my opinion. There will be an estimated $20 million loss in revenues in fiscal 1968 as a result of the $2 million savings through economy reductions.

Of particular interest was the results of a custom study made during fiscal 1968 in which 100 percent of the mail arriving at New York and San Francisco on 1 day was examined. The results were almost unbelievable.

More than 63,000 packages were examined. Of this amount, more than 13,000 packages were found to involve one or more violations of U.S. law. This amounts to some 21 percent of the packages examined that day as compared to the 3-percent average of violations found under the normal spot checking procedures used.

More than 1,200 of the packages contained stolen Government property including 90 weapons such as live grenades, Thompson submachineguns, grease guns, and handguns. More than 6,000 violations of food and drug, meat, and plant quarantine laws were found.

For every $1 spent in mail examination, some $10 in revenue is brought in. The additional $419,000 requested for mail examination thus would bring in over $4 million in increased revenues.

Commercial importations increased some 7 percent last year. Customs averages some $50 in collections for each dollar expended in this area. Applying this to the fiscal 1969 request of an additional $2.8 million for commercial importations, we would wind up with over $100 million in additional revenue from this increase.

Narcotics seizures continued to significantly rise. Fiscal 1967 saw nearly 4½ times as much heroin seized as fiscal 1966. The first 6 months of fiscal 1968 saw twice as much heroin seized as in 1967.

Marihuana seizures have gone from less than 1 ton in fiscal 1963 to more than 5 tons in fiscal 1966, 13 tons in fiscal 1967 and nearly 18 tons from July to December 1967.

Last year I informed the Members of this body that the increases recommended for Customs for fiscal 1968 did not even begin to cover the budget increases that would be needed in future years because of the extraordinary growth in traffic which we will experience. I give this same warning today regarding fiscal 1969 recommendations and would point out that steps must be taken soon to prepare for the great workload increases which we have in store.

The need for coordination among all of the various agencies which presently process incoming passengers and cargo is one critical area and hopefully studies being conducted in this area will soon produce some positive steps to be taken.

The amount recommended for the Bureau of the Mint is approximately the same level of funding as in 1968. The proposed production program for fiscal 1969 called for the minting of some 5,752,000,000 coins, some 75 percent of which would be pennies. Our subcommittee recommended a $500,000 reduction in this coinage program. Testimony has indicated that substantial coin inventories are now being built up at Treasury and in Federal Reserve banks.

The continuing use of our limited supplies of silver in the production of silver half dollars has been a matter of concern. The half dollar is a noncirculating coin which does not serve its utilitarian function as a medium of exchange. Silver is vitally needed for industrial purposes and yet we have continued to place more silver in these coins than we have been mining in this country. Our committee has expressed its strong belief that the coinage of 50-cent pieces for fiscal 1969 should be no more than 100 million pieces or 15 million ounces of silver.

This is the last year in which the budget for the Bureau of Narcotics will be found in this bill. The Bureau, a part of the Treasury for some 37 years, is to be transferred under an executive reorganization to the Department of Justice and merged with HEW's Bureau of Drug Abuse Control.

The Bureau of Narcotics is an excellent agency with an outstanding record of achievement. It has seized, for example, over $615,000,000 worth of narcotics in international cases alone over the past 5 years.

I opposed this merger because I believe its potential losses outweighed its potential gains. Specifically, the Bureau's main function is in intercepting narcotics at the source level. In carrying out this principal responsibility, the Bureau has maintained a close liaison and operating relationship with its sister agency, the Customs Bureau.

The excellent coordination which presently exists and which is important to narcotics operations could be severely hampered by moving this agency to Justice and this was the basis for my objections.

I would note, however, that the substantial increase in size of the Bureau under its new status will be extremely beneficial in the crucially important fight to control our ever-increasing narcotics problem.

The Secret Service has one of the most important and one of the most difficult jobs in the country to perform in safeguarding the President and the Vice President of the United States. We have recommended for fiscal 1969 an increase of some $2,250,000 over the proposed levels of spending here in 1968. Although some reductions were made in fiscal 1969 requests, we have emphasized that these reductions should not be imposed in areas of critical operation.

The committee has shared in the past the Service's concern about the lack of adequate training facilities for its personnel. We are, therefore, pleased to be able to recommend the independent $1,000,000 request for the construction of Secret Service training facilities. This will be used to construct an outdoor training range for the Secret Service and

other Treasury law-enforcement agencies.

Before moving to a discussion of the Post Office Department, I would like to point out to the Members that during last fiscal year, the Treasury Department saved $145 million from its cost reduction program exceeding its previous record by $100 million. This is an outstanding accomplishment and certainly deserves our recognition and congratulations.

The Post Office Department, as I mentioned earlier, projects mail volume for fiscal 1969 at some 85.2 billion pieces, which represents an increase of 3 billion pieces on top of a 3-billion-piece increase for fiscal 1968.

More than 75 percent of the Post Office Department's total expenditures in fiscal 1969 will be for labor costs and the 1969 budget includes $329 million to pay the cost of higher salaries approved by Congress effective October 1, 1967.

After adjusting for potential supplementals which will apply to fiscal 1969, the estimated postal deficit for that period is $1,104 million, of which $651 million is considered public services loss and $363 million is the net deficit for ratemaking purposes.

Expenditures attributed to public service loss have reached this figure starting from $37,400,000 in 1960. Our committee has expressed concern about these costs reflecting accurately the cost of public services and has requested the Post Office to study the problem and recommend remedial legislation for any appropriate changes.

The higher postal rates approved by Congress last year will bring in $874 million in fiscal 1969.

Postmaster General O'Brien has testified that the downward spiral of productivity is being stopped. Specifically, he pointed out that the Post Office is budgeting a 1.2-percent increase in productivity in the clerk account at a savings of some $26.7 million and a 1.7-percent increase in productivity in the carrier account at a savings of $27 million.

Nevertheless, the postal situation remains extremely difficult, and I would like to quote from the testimony of the Postmaster General this year:

> Time is running out on the U.S. postal service. Our greatest danger is that we will be overrun by obsolescence—by archaic facilities, by outmoded ways of processing our product, by anachronisms in our organization that can no longer meet the challenges, that can no longer meet the needs of our economy and our society.

The President's Commission on Postal Organization is presently reviewing the entire postal system and is to report to the President this month.

Whatever their recommendations, and whatever changes may be made, a—if not the—key to overcome our very difficult postal problems is the Department's Office of Research Development and Engineering.

This office, under the outstanding leadership of Dr. Leo Packer, has requested $36,800,000 for fiscal 1969, representing a 55-percent increase over fiscal 1968. We have recommended $34 million, and it is imperative in my opinion that this amount be fully made available.

The importance of these operations can neither be understated nor underestimated in terms of whether we will win the Department's "race with catastrophe" as described last year by Postmaster General O'Brien.

Testimony this year has indicated that the post office is in the process of adopting a systems approach in the application of modern technology to the postal service.

The successful development of a truly operational optical character reader presently being undertaken holds in store tremendous potential for postal operational improvements.

Dr. Packer has stressed the extreme importance of the present Post Office program to expand inhouse research and development capability.

The largest single item by far in the bill pending today is the appropriation for Post Office operations. Our committee has recommended here an appropriation of $5,720 million, a reduction of $63,989,000 below the budget request, and an increase of $228 million over the 1968 level after allowing for a $185 million supplemental.

Our committee feels that, based on past experience, the estimated mail volume increase of 3.8 percent may not be quite as high as predicted and has therefore refused some 2,077 of the 22,077 new positions requested for operations.

I personally believe that further savings can be made here and intend to offer an amendment later on to further reduce the number of new jobs to be allowed.

It is of interest to note that approximately 52 percent of all mail volume originates in 75 of our largest post offices. The 1,164 work measurement post offices, furthermore, process 92 percent of all mail leaving only 8 percent of the mail for processing at the remaining 31,642 post offices.

The problem of high personnel turnover at the Post Office is a very difficult one to solve. We have asked the Post Office to study this situation and report to Congress any recommendations which may alleviate this costly situation.

Our committee's assumption that mail volume may be lower in fiscal 1969 affects the transportation appropriation which, like the operations account, is directly related to the volume of mail which the Post Office must handle.

In addition, we were advised at our hearings that a proposed transportation supplemental of $17,521,000 for fiscal 1968 would not be necessary and that the savings would also accrue in fiscal 1969.

These factors, plus a $4.5 million reduction in transportation costs to result from certain airline rate reductions has led our committee to recommend a reduction of $29.5 million from transportation's requests for fiscal 1969.

The single biggest change in transportation has been the interconnecting of more than 500 cities in a nationwide airlift network for the movement of first-class letter mail. Our committee was informed at the hearings that we are very close to a full airlift of all first-class mail.

The appropriations for building and occupancy and supplies and services are for the most part, either direct fixed obligations or else absolutely necessary as support and housekeeping items. Accordingly, there is not much room for expenditure postponements and deferments.

The areas of plant and equipment and postal public buildings however are two areas where such deferments and postponements can take place in postal appropriations.

Our committee, realizing the importance of these appropriations to modernizing the Post Office, has nevertheless, recommended cutting $38,252,000 from postal public building holding them to last year's level and cutting $25 million from plant and equipment, bringing them to $5 million above last year's level.

In doing so we have given priority here to the important need in these critical times for reduction of Government expenditures in all areas where such steps can be feasibly taken.

I personally believe that further reductions can also be made here specifically with respect to the vehicle program, and I intend to introduce an amendment on this later.

Last year at this time, I stated my view that it would be very helpful in improving postal operations to take the appointment of local postmasters out of politics and make the job one to be earned by merit. My feelings remain the same concerning this matter on which I have introduced legislation along with many of my colleagues.

Hearings recently have been held on this legislation and I certainly hope that this body sees fit to enact as soon as possible this valuable and necessary reform.

I would like to take this opportunity, before concluding, to point out a problem facing the Tax Court which is within our committee jurisdiction and which is of particular concern to me.

This court has again been faced with a postponement of the construction of a Tax Court Building. The 1969 budget contains no construction item for this building.

The Tax Court is the only Federal court in Washington not provided with suitable permanent quarters.

This problem is especially significant because of the fact that the court is presently located in the Internal Revenue Building while the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is a party to every single case in the court.

This is certainly an inappropriate situation at best and the American Bar Association has urged and requested that Congress provide suitable permanent housing for the court which would separate it from the Internal Revenue Service.

I believe that it is very important even with our present financial difficulties that steps be taken for the construction of this building as soon as possible.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The gentleman will recall that during consideration of this legislation last year, I raised the question of the utilization of foreign-made vehicles by the Post Office Depart-

ment. This was because I had had a communication from the Post Office Department indicating that they were leasing some 1,160 foreign-made vehicles to deliver the U.S. mail. In the report last year the gentleman will recall that the committee had language stating that—

The committee specifically desires that none of the funds made available by this Act shall be made available for the purchase, lease, or rental of foreign-made vehicles for Post Office purposes.

I would say to the gentleman that I have examined the report this year and I find that there is no language addressed to this problem. I would like to ask the gentleman if he could advise us as to whether or not the practice of leasing vehicles is still being continued by the Post Office Department.

Mr. CONTE. I can answer with regard to the purchase of vehicles because I recall asking that question during the hearings. In answer to the question—there are no foreign vehicles being purchased by the Post Office Department.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I noticed that in the hearings, and that was why I was directing my question to the leasing of vehicles.

Mr. CONTE. I have no knowledge of any.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. As a Member coming from a district that depends almost entirely on the good economic health of the American automobile industry, I can assure the gentleman that, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have taken every opportunity to check into the policies they are following. I am satisfied that conditions that existed in 1966, when this question first came to our attention, have now been corrected and that the policies being followed are eminently fair to our American auto worker.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I say I am grateful, indeed, for that information, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I know that in the past he has persisted in his presentations to the Appropriations Committee in doing everything possible to prevent this from happening.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What contribution has the Administrative Conference of the United States made to the cause of good or bad government, or anything else? What contribution has it made, or is it anticipated it is going to make?

Mr. CONTE. Are you directing your question to the new Commission which has recently been established?

Mr. GROSS. The one that was set up in 1964, and apparently is now getting underway with a fast takeoff.

Mr. CONTE. As you know, if you read the committee hearings, up to this point, they had not appointed someone to run this agency and the money had been cut out by this committee in previous years. In answer to the gentleman's question, in all frankness, I would say at this point that they have made no contribution because they have not organized or gotten started as yet.

Mr. GROSS. But they have a staff of 11 people, 3 of whom are supergrades, as I understand it. Out of the 11 employees, six received $16,000 and up to $30,000. This I say is a pretty fast takeoff. It must be all chiefs and practically no Indians.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman will see further in the hearings where I questioned them about these supergrade employees. They are also planning to make all kinds of contracts with outside consultants to do some of their work. I said, "You aren't going to have your cake and eat it, too. You are either coming in and do the work yourself or have outside agencies do it. I do not see why you need all the supergrades if you are going to have outside agencies do the work."

Mr. GROSS. I noticed that the gentleman had something to say on that score, but I am afraid the gentleman did not lay down the law hard enough to this outfit, and I doubt very much this is going to stop them from going out and hiring consultants, despite the fact that they have this highly paid in-house staff to do the work.

Mr. CONTE. Certainly we did not put a limitation on it. I can assure the gentleman, on my part, as an individual, I will watch this with a jaundiced eye next year, and if they come in here with a large tab for the consultants, they will do it without my vote. Furthermore we did cut them this year.

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid the camel has his nose in the tent already, and it may well be a little too late next year.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for including in this measure funds for the important work of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography which was established by approval of Public Law 90–100 last session. This Commission is charged with studying the cause and effect relationship of postal traffic in pornography and anti-social behavior and must report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress by January 31, 1970.

Thousands of American parents have been waging a losing battle against unsolicited, obscene material due to the permissive decisions of the Supreme Court in this area. Within the past few months, I have been contacted by understandably irate constituents whose children had received unsolicited mailings from the same company. While the Post Office Department officials expressed willingness to cooperate, their scope of action is strictly limited.

However, I am hopeful that as a result of the work of the Commission receiving funds under this legislation, meaningful guidelines will be established to prevent the future intrusion upon the decency of our citizens by selfish commercial interests.

In addition, under the provisions of Public Law 90–206 which we approved overwhelmingly last October, citizens may prohibit mailers from sending obscene material to their homes. Subsequent to April 14 when the law becomes effective, any individual may submit the advertising matter received with a statement that he considers it erotically arousing or sexually provocative and further advising he would like to have the mailer stopped from making further mailing to him. The Postmaster General would then issue a prohibiting order to the company involved.

I believe this remedy coupled with new, effective guidelines which should emanate from the Commission can provide a significant beachhead against the rising tide of filth literature which presently flows unhindered through our mails. I wholeheartedly support this goal and will continue to work for its accomplishment.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I consider it a privilege to work with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], my ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the other members of the subcommittee and our very capable staff, in preparing this bill for the consideration of the House. All members of the subcommittee have worked diligently to bring this first of the regular appropriation bills to the House before the Easter recess.

Since others on the committee have already outlined the major provisions of this legislation in detail, I merely wish to add some of my thoughts on the bill. The activities encompassed in this measure deal with some of the most sensitive of all Government activities. The Post Office Department is of course a service organization which today touches the lives of almost every American and every business enterprise in the country. Without this service, our economy could not operate—and I think all of us appreciate the dedicated efforts of our postal employees.

Those who work in the Treasury Department likewise perform an essential service. Indeed, this year the Treasury will collect over $146 billion in taxes and tariffs of various forms. One of its agencies—the Internal Revenue Service, which is familiar to almost everyone—will process about 109 million income tax returns. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing will produce some 30 billion postage stamps for the Nation's mail service, in addition to millions of pieces of Government securities, savings bonds, and new currency. The Bureau of the Mint will produce close to 6 billion new coins.

The Bureau of Narcotics deals with illicit drug traffic and, as Commissioner Giordano testified before our committee, we are experiencing a very serious rise in narcotic and marihuana problems. What is particularly disturbing is the fact that a high percentage of marihuana users now are under the age of 25, with almost 40 percent under 21. In my judgment, the additional $2,305,000 the committee has allocated for this Bureau is more than justified.

The Secret Service guards the President and Vice President and their families, another indispensable service; and in the light of recent developments, certainly the additional $2,250,000 for this purpose is understandable.

Then, too, the office of the Treasurer

now issues over 600 million checks to Americans each year, and the Bureau of the Public Debt must manage financing for the $349 billion our Government owes today.

When we consider the tremendous operation of the Treasury Department, therefore, it is surprising that its annual operating budget is one of the smallest by modern standards. As the various Treasury officials appeared before us, I was immensely impressed by their ability to handle heavy workloads with good management techniques. In my judgment, they set a good example for others throughout the Government to follow.

As the committee's report points out, there are certain continuing activities of the Government which are funded by permanent law but are no less important. One of these items is the interest on the national debt—and you will note on page 22 of the committee's report that once again this item has substantially increased by an additional $850 million this year, to an estimated new high of $15.2 billion. It seems to me, therefore, that as we proceed to consider the remaining appropriation bills this year—keeping in mind the continuing demands of the war in Vietnam and the critical situation here at home—we have an even greater obligation to inspect each budget request carefully. We have tried to do this in this instance, and I think the fact that we have been able to reduce the budget request by $181,735,000 without seriously curtailing essential services is significant.

Admittedly, the task of setting priorities is a difficult one at best. However, this year in particular we know we must set spending priorities—and it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to review these priorities in the light of the overall budget.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] in the hope he may clear up this matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, particularly with regard to certain language on page 7 of this 27-page committee report on this pending bill.

Consideration of this bill was had before the full Committee on Appropriations on Thursday morning last. At that time each Member did have a copy of this report. However, there was no mention whatever made in the explanation of the bill by any member of the subcommittee on either side with respect to the following language, which is contained at the end of the third paragraph on page 7, following the chart with respect to salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Customs:

> Furthermore, the Committee feels that the Bureau of Customs is not now organized or staffed to cope with this tremendous increase. Along this line the Committee urges the acceleration of the study to provide some single agency coordination for processing incoming passengers and cargo through Customs, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Public Health Service, and Agriculture. The Committee feels that the Bureau of Customs could provide highly desirable overall coordination of these essential services.

Did the distinguished gentleman's subcommittee—I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED]—intend that the Bureau of Customs take over supervision from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Public Health Service, and the Department of Agriculture insofar as admitting passengers and cargo to this country is concerned?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman, as the gentleman knows, there are about 14 agencies of the Government which deal with incoming passengers and cargo as they enter the country, and as far as I know they have always been able to work very effectively together.

Customs already has complete responsibility for performing the primary screening inspections for the following agencies in an acceptable manner, and it would not be in the public interest to disturb many of these effective working relationships:

Office of Munitions Control—State;
Neutrality laws—State;
Food and Drug Administration—Agriculture;
Office of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations—Treasury;
Office of Foreign Assets Control—Treasury;
Bureau of Narcotics—Treasury;
Atomic Energy Commission;
Bureau of the Census—Commerce;
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—Commerce;
Export Control—Commerce;
U.S. Coast Guard—Transportation;
Fish and Wildlife Service—Interior;
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—Interior; and
Security Operations—CIA, State.

The committee has no intent of going into the matter of one agency taking over any of the prerogatives or duties of any other agency in connection with these passengers and cargo. Our hope is that the Bureau of Customs, along with the others, will continue to be able to work together in performing the duties assigned to them, so that the traveling public will have the benefit of the very best service possible. Our only concern was one of coordination of a number of activities in order to give the public the very best service possible.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, of course we are all interested in that result. There are a great many members of the full Committee on Appropriations, whose report this is alleged to be, who had no knowledge of the insertion of this language therein, and many members of the committee thought that the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice could provide highly desirable overall coordination of the essential services which deal with the admission of passengers and cargo to this country.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, to really make any serious changes in these areas would require legislation which would be beyond the prerogative of this committee in any event.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with with the gentleman from New York. I had no knowledge of this language in the report until it was printed, and I agree with him that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has done a magnificent job along this line of trying to expedite people into the country, and has also cooperated with Customs and Public Health in their services. I would hope no effort would be made to disturb that situation.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16489.

I take this opportunity first to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CONTE] for their wonderful work in bringing before this Committee of the Whole today this bill, cut to what I believe is the barest necessities.

We are again taking up the appropriation bill here involving billions of dollars, but I believe the key word this afternoon is "service." This appropriation covers to the great extent appropriations for men and women giving service to the people of this Nation. The people of this Nation pay for it through postage, income tax, incoming duty.

Any cuts made today would be cutting services.

We passed in the last Congress a postal rate increase. If we should cut the bill in any way today we would be telling the people of America, "Thank you for giving us this increase, but in addition to the increase we are now going to take away services."

The men of the Treasury Department, Customs, Narcotics, and the Post Office actually are our Government's closest contacts with the people of this Nation. I commend them for an outstanding job—working under the most severe conditions. If we do not give them the proper means and the proper salaries to work in their jobs then the people of this great country will not be receiving the best of services to which they are entitled.

Therefore, today I say this is the most we can cut. These Departments have absorbed as much of the salary increases and as much of the cuts as possible. Today, if we cut this bill further, we are saying to Mr. and Mrs. America, "Thank you for your dollars, but we are taking away part of what you are paying for."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to devote my preliminary remarks to the background against which this bill comes before us and then, as I now do, ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks with respect to certain items or features in the bill in which I have a particular interest.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, as we meet to consider this, the first of the annual 1969 appropriation bills, we do so under some of the most unusual and dif-

ficult circumstances imaginable, for we meet not only in the midst of what is undoubtedly the most serious fiscal and monetary crisis this Nation has faced since 1931, but also at a moment of heightened racial crisis and of certain budgetary and procedural uncertainties of a kind seldom if ever previously experienced by a Congress.

Touching upon those uncertainties first, they have centered around the fact that the other body did adopt, as we all remember, a rather surprising "package" combining the President's surtax proposal with an expenditure limitation, of the sort long recommended by the ranking minority member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

As we now know, of course, this "package" is not going to survive the current conference—or presumably will not—and what may come of it now I do not know, and I believe it would be unwise to speculate about it too much one way or the other. But still it is obvious, I believe, that the President, even before he cast off his political garments, as he did a week ago, was having some serious second thoughts about the budget he sent us in January. When we received that budget the President said in his budget message, and I now quote:

> The budget I send you today reflects a series of difficult choices. . . . Faced with a costly war abroad and urgent requirements at home, we have had to set priorities . . . (for) we cannot do everything we would wish to do.

These words—though I recognize they are taken somewhat out of context—represented a rather sharp departure from the prior Presidential attitude, as exemplified by this key passage from his 1966 budget message, and again I quote:

> We are a rich nation and can afford to make progress at home while meeting (our) obligations abroad.

Did they, however, represent as well a complete break with the former guns and butter philosophy—as it is generally known—which, in my judgment lies at the heart of our current fiscal and monetary crisis?

As to this, on January 30 of this year, the Washington Post—a paper not generally known as a critic of the current administration—had this to say, editorially:

> Taken alone, the abandonment of the Great Society slogan and the statement about the need to set priorities, would imply austerity. . . . But the figures simply do not support that impression.

Apparently, the President has by now come to the same conclusion for, in his speech at Minneapolis, a couple of weeks ago, he was calling upon all Americans to join him in—and again I quote—"a program of national austerity to insure that our economy will prosper and that our fiscal situation will be sound."

In that same speech, to the National Farmers Union, Mr. Johnson said:

> If I can get the help of Congress—and it is their will—we shall make reductions in that budget.

And his reference was, apparently, to that same budget he sent us in late January, the first installment of which—insofar as the budgetary process is concerned—is now before you.

And now, finally, we come down to Mr. Johnson's historic speech of a week ago Sunday night, when he said, among so many other things:

> One thing is unmistakably clear: Our deficit must be reduced. Failure to act could bring on conditions that would strike hardest at those people we are striving to help.
>
> The times call for prudence in this land of plenty. I believe we have the character to provide it, and I plead with Congress to act promptly to serve the national interest, and all the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those were strong words—and good words—and I have repeated them here largely for the benefit of those Members on my right from so many of whom, last week, we heard appropriate words of praise for the apparent sacrifice the President was making in order to better serve the Nation.

Many of you then pledged him your full loyalty and support during the remaining difficult days of his term—and now, today, you have an opportunity to begin to redeem that pledge.

The concern that our President now exemplifies springs out of such facts as these:

For 31 out of the past 37 years, the Federal Government has experienced a budgetary deficit. As a result of these persistent deficits, the national debt now stands at somewhere around $350 billion, and interest on that debt—as provided for in the bill now before you—will cost us $15.2 billion during fiscal 1969, an all-time high, and a burden that consumes 10 cents, now, out of each general-fund tax dollar taken in by the Treasury.

Strongly related to those persistent deficits—especially those of recent years—is the fact that our rate of inflation is now far in excess of that long-term upward creep in the cost of living which we were experiencing at the tolerable level of about 1.6 percent per annum from 1948 to 1965. For, in both 1966 and 1967 the Consumer Price Index was advancing at an annual rate in excess of 3 percent and, since the last half of 1967, has been advancing at about an annual rate of 4 percent per annum.

This inflationary spiral must, somehow, be checked for it, in turn, bears a strong relation to the fact that our actual trade surplus is close to zero which—coming on top of the fact that, internationally speaking, we have had an unfavorable balance-of-payments situation in 17 out of the last 18 years—explains why those beside De Gaulle who hold our dollars abroad now prefer our gold.

And, with our gold reserve now standing at its lowest point since 1936, it is no wonder that we teeter on the brink of devaluation, that the dollar-based international monetary system has been brought close to breakdown, and that many of our friends abroad—as well as those not so friendly—have been forced to reevaluate their own monetary policies on the hunch that, mighty though our economic strength may be, we are indeed an "Achilles" and that internal indiscipline is our "heel."

In any event, we now come to the bill before us—and to a moment of decision.

At the time of the markup of our bill, I asked our chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], if—under the existing circumstances—it might not be better for us to delay our bill for a time to see what might happen to the surtax and expenditure-limitation "package," and also to see if the administration might not now be sending us up a modified budget, indicating the areas for reductions from the January figures in order to put before us a truly "austere" budget, which adjective the dictionary defines as meaning "rigorous, stern, severe, or strict."

It was, however, their joint opinion that we should proceed as usual, as best we could—so, here we are.

Was it an "austere" portion of the budget that we were asked to consider?

In my opinion it was not—even though the various witnesses we heard from all told us their requests had been pared to the bone and said they considered their requests as reflecting a "tight" or "lean" budget.

And, in my further opinion, even with the recommended reductions we have made in the bill as now reported—which reductions are the result of our unanimous agreement—this is still not an "austere" bill, and further reductions can be made in it, as the President apparently wants us to do, if we are but willing to make them.

The question is, Where can those cuts be made?

In my judgment, we must direct our attention to the operational request of the Post Office Department, and thus to the area of postal service, to find an area where further meaningful cuts can be made.

At this point, a recapitulation of some recent history might be useful.

Most of you will remember that, last fall, when the so-called Bow amendment achieved some temporary success, that our chairman [Mr. MAHON], argued that it would be more in keeping with the congressional responsibility over the budgetary process if, instead of adopting a simple expenditure-limitation resolution, we first tried to agree among ourselves upon the specific areas where spending could be cut down or deferred.

Accordingly, he directed those several appropriation subcommittees who had finished their work—and ours was one of these—to hold further hearings, and to go over the result of their labors to see where cuts might be made, with the thought in mind that we might eventually come in before you with something in the nature of a budgetary-recision resolution.

Our subcommitte held 2 days, I believe, of such hearings and witnesses came before us from the Post Office Department telling us that cuts of the magnitude we were looking for could only be made through actual curtailments in postal service. Unhappily, they gave us a list of such possible cutbacks in service, with the amounts that could thus be saved, though they recommended no such cutbacks and were even most reluctant to give us any idea concerning the priorities between the items sug-

gested insofar as public inconvenience and disruption of the orderly handling of the mail otherwise might be concerned.

Nothing eventually came of these hearings, as you know, largely because of the eventual passage of Public Law 90–218, last fall's so-called Economy Act.

But they did serve a useful purpose in our case, at least, for on October 5 of last year—the day after our hearings—the Post Office Department did take immediate action, on its own, in the words of the Deputy Postmaster General, "to reduce expenditures and to husband funds." The tightening-up process that ensued, as we were subsequently told, involved such actions as arranging for the presort of all classes of mail, for the recapturing of positions saved by the introduction of new equipment, the judicious use of overtime, and the avoidance of premium pay.

And the result was a $49.2 million saving in operational costs for the current fiscal year—a most commendable result, even though one might well ask why such an effort had not been made before.

Incidentally, the Post Office Department was exempted from the provisions of Public Law 90–218, for what that might be worth—on the theory that its operations were not "controllable", apparently, or at best "relatively uncontrollable."

In any event, the Department is showing that same $49.2 million as a "savings" that has been carried forward into its 1969 budget—and I have deliberately put quotation marks around that word "savings" because, though I do commend the Department for its efforts here, they seem to be considering the results of their efforts as the same kind of "savings" that the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, so often talked about.

But, the point is this was probably a one-shot effort—at least, we were told by the Department that it could not again be repeated and, considering the reductions we have already agreed upon in this bill for their operations, this is probably the case.

Therefore if any further significant cut can be made in this bill we must, I believe, look again at that area of postal service.

Now, none of us are happy in suggesting such a difficult and politically risky course for you to consider.

And none of us who may feel obligated to do so would yield to anyone here in our desire to give the American people the most efficient and most comprehensive mail service possible.

However, these are not normal times—and we can no longer afford to act as if they were. The events of this past weekend adequately demonstrated that fact if nothing had before—and they cast long shadows now before them.

Therefore, I have evaluated the priorities among the several curtailments in service that might be made, as best I could from the standpoint of public inconvenience and disruption of the orderly handling of the mail otherwise, and am prepared to offer—or support—amendments to eliminate, for the time being—and I would like to stress the temporary nature of the holding action I feel needs to be made—the Saturday delivery of mail in residential areas, at a saving of $96.4 million, the elimination of 1 day's delivery of rural mail service, at a saving of $16.2 million, and going back to 5-day-a-week parcel post delivery service, at a saving of $8.5 million.

The total saving that could be thus made, in fiscal 1969, would be $121.2 million, and it would be a direct and immediate saving or reduction in expenditures, eliminating pay for less-essental service—and services that are frequently now being provided at premium pay since the Post Office Department, like the rest of the Federal Establishment, operates largely on a 5-day, 40-hour week basis.

There is precedent for what we suggest, in that in 1950, at another time of budgetary stress, the second delivery in residential areas was eliminating, as some of you may remember. There was, of course, a hue and a cry over that for a time from the public, but the roof did not fall in and we do not believe it will this time.

To the contrary, we believe that the American citizen, by and large, will understand the urgent need behind this kind of belt-tightening—understanding that these, as I have said, are not normal times and that all of us must share in some small way in the ultimate sacrifice that has been made, now, by some 20,000 American families as a result of the war in Vietnam, and share perhaps, too, in some larger way in the measures necessary to restore peace to our cities.

I can already hear what some of you may be preparing to say in response to my suggestion—which is: Is not that Vietnam war soon, now, to be over?

Well, I pray with you that this will be the case, but I also believe that we cannot continue to go along as we have in the past on the assumption that all our troubles are merely passing ones, and that if we wait until tomorrow they will all be gone, for it is exactly that kind of wishful thinking that has gotten us into the mess in which we now find ourselves.

One final thing: This is, as I have said, the first of the annual 1969 appropriation bills. It is the first opportunity we have to get our noses bloodied—and the action we take on this bill will undoubtedly set the pattern for much that is too follow.

The moment to stand up and be counted—as the President suggests—has arrived.

Will you stand with me?

Now, Mr. Chairman, permit me to run through some other matters pertaining to our bill that are of concern or of special interest to me.

The first of these relates to the new, so-called postal public buildings program. This is a program that has been growing "like Topsy" since its inception in December of 1966.

To understand what is happening, it is important to have this background: In recent times, as we all know, most postal facilities—with the exception of those larger Federal buildings built by the General Services Administration, and a portion of the space in which is devoted to postal use—have been built by private enterprise under a lease arrangement with the Post Office Department.

This latter arrangement has served us well in that it has permitted us to replace obsolete postal facilities in many, many communities—and to have new post offices in many newer communities—that could not possibly have been reached yet if we had been required to appropriate the funds to construct them in the regular fashion.

Of course, as a result of going this route, the postal rent account has increased substantially over the years—standing at over $156 million for fiscal 1969, to cover some 26,000 active leases, both large and small, to which account about 1,000 new leases are being added a year.

The Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Post Office Department itself, have been studying this problem for some time and the conclusion has now been reached that the larger postal facilities can be constructed as Federal buildings—meaning with Federal funds—more economically than under a lease arrangement.

Interestingly enough—though there are sometimes other factors—the major reason why this is so is because the Department has to pay local taxes on leased facilities whereas it does not pay any such taxes, of course, on buildings it owns outright.

Well, this makes some sense to me, and I can see why the Department ought, under appropriate congressional controls, to have the flexibility necessary to permit it to procure the buildings it needs under both such approaches. However, it also seems to me the Department is showing altogether too much eagerness—especially in a time calling for budgetary restraint—about expanding this new program.

The Department, last year, asked for $55.8 million for these purposes and, after some hesitation, we finally recommended $45 million which was the figure adopted by the House only to have it increased, in conference, to $50 million.

In last year's subcommittee report, if you care to refer to it, we said:

> The committee feels that this would be a desirable program if pursued within reasonable bounds.

However, as this year's report will show you the Department is now asking for $88.2 million, in addition to which it unveiled for us a 5-year plan for building postal public buildings under which Congress, next year, would be asked to provide nearly $450 million, which was such a substantial increase that I felt obligated to ask the departmental witnesses if they were assuming—as have other administration optimists in recent years—that the war in Vietnam would be over and done with before the end of fiscal 1969. Perhaps it will—and we all pray this will be so—but I believe we have to continue to operate on the assumption that it may not and on the further assumption that, even if it did, we would have continuing obligations toward the reconstruction of South Vietnam that we may be required to consider a year from now.

In any event, our subcommittee has reduced this request to $50 million—the same as for the current year—and, much to my personal pleasure, has inserted

language in the report requesting the Department to indicate priorities for us, from now on, on a building project by building project basis, which is something it declined to do this year despite my urging that this was something we ought to have.

For instance, although it received less for the current year than it had requested, the Department went ahead, presumably at a reduced level, on all authorized projects, trying as it said to "get them all moving." Now, I can recognize the Department's desire to move ahead on all fronts toward a modernized postal plant as fast as possible but—when we are in a fiscal crisis such as we are—this is the equivalent of a military strategy of trying, with too few troops, to capture every hill in sight just because they are "there."

There are two other points about this program that also deserve notice on your part.

As to the first, purely by coincidence—or so it would seem—after leaving out the new postal public buildings planned for several larger cities where there is, presently, "mixed" congressional representation, of the remaining 17 currently receiving consideration only two are located in congressional districts now represented, here, by a Republican, while 15 are in districts having a Democrat as its Congressman.

I would not like to think that the Department would play politics with such a program—or in any other fashion—so I was glad to have Mr. O'Marra, head of the Bureau of Facilities, tell me he had not even been aware of that kind of geopolitical breakdown with respect to the location of the planned, new facilities until I had called it to his attention, and I believe him.

For my last point, I have to go back to that statement I made, a few minutes ago, about why the Department has decided it is more economical, now, to build its major facilities with Federal moneys, rather than through the lease program; and the major reason behind this was, if you will recall, that it thus can avoid paying local taxes.

I had a colloquy about this with the very able head of the Department's Bureau of Finance and Administration, Ralph W. Nicholson—and this appears on page 603 of part 2 of the hearings, if you are interested—over the social and political questions involved in shifting from a lease program to a Federal building program just to save paying local taxes, and overdoing so at a time when, as we all know, there is a short-fall in local municipal revenues to meet local problems and provide local governmental services, leaving a void that the Federal Government has partly tried to fill by a wide-ranging variety of categorical grant-in-aid programs of one kind or another.

There is, of course, no easy answer to this overall problem; but I do believe that Congress, and the Public Works Committee, along with our subcommittee, should keep an eye on this program to assure that it does stay within reasonable and practical bounds. This would particularly be the case, it would seem to me, when other Federal departments are thinking about going in new budgetary directions for maintaining progress under certain existing Federal programs because, apparently, they feel we simply do not now have enough funds to do so directly. One example of this would be the Department of the Interior and its water-pollution program where, in order to sustain a massive attack on the sources of pollution, the Department is asking for new legislative authority to commit the Federal Government to the future payment of principal and interest on local municipal bond issues made to finance waste-treatment works, thus holding the cash demand on the Treasury at a minimum for the time being.

I do not think it speaks of wise or sound fiscal planning to have one branch of the Government retrench in this fashion, while another—the Post Office Department, in this instance—makes plans to greatly expand its construction plans with directly appropriated moneys.

Be that as it may, I would like, at this time, to commend the Post Office Department for the successful effort it has been making toward the hiring of employees from so-called minority groups—the Negro, the Spanish-speaking American, American Indians, and so forth. It is impressive to note that the number of Negroes, for instance, in the postal service has now reached a total of over 132,000—and that this is an increase of over 40,000, or over 43 percent, since June of 1965. In percentage totals, this also means that Negroes now make up 18.9 percent of all postal employment, a percentage substantially over the ratio of Negroes in our overall population.

Finally, I am also glad to note that the subcommittee has indicated, in our report, our concern with the interest the Department seemed to be showing in invading the existing private-enterprise stamp-vending machine business with counter-type vending machines of its own. There is ample room for such machines in post office lobbies and the like, and while one can understand the Department's desire to sell stamps at their face value to anyone who wants to buy them, there is no reason why those familiar stamp-vending machines one sees on drugstore counters, in bus terminals and the like, need to be consumed in an eagerness to carry that desire too far.

Permit me to close, Mr. Chairman, on the same note on which I began these remarks, by drawing your attention back again to our fiscal problem and its relation to the kind of inflation we are already experiencing here in America—inflation of the type that Arthur Okun, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently called "Public Enemy No. 1."

One does not need to be reminded of the fact that this "enemy" strikes the hardest at the poor in this land—and at the aged—and particularly at those forgotten Americans, the middle-class, middle-income American who bears the brunt thereof, along with ever higher taxes—school, local, and State—as well as now, perhaps, Federal income taxes.

It is this last-mentioned type of citizen who, loyally and patriotically, signs up for those bond-a-month plans that are promoted by the U.S. Savings Bonds Division of the Treasury, for which operation funds are provided under this bill.

As of the end of January, this year, there were some $50 billion worth of such bonds outstanding—bonds generally of small denominations, held by small investors, by people who want to put something aside for that proverbial "rainy day" which, now, may not be so far off as it usually seems, and people who do not dare take chances on a risky stock market where inflationary trends do continue to reward their more affluent and aggressive neighbors.

These—for such persons—have been good investments, these bonds. If such people did not continue to buy them I do not know how we would handle our national indebtedness. But, unless inflation can, itself, be checked more and more of them may begin to decide that they are not, after all, such good investments.

This is because, during last year, the dollar lost almost 4 cents in purchasing power. And this, in turn, means that the $50 billion-plus investment these good citizens had made in their Government's own securities dropped about $2 billion in value—before, that is, they received their guaranteed return on their investment—in just 1 year.

And this, Mr. Chairman, states the case for fiscal responsibility, now, better than in any other way I could think of to summarize it.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on this subcommittee for 20 years. I think I know something about this legislation. I would be remiss in my duty as a Member of the Congress if I did not say forthrightly that in my considered judgment this is the tightest bill that has ever been reported out by the Treasury and the Post Office Subcommittee.

Without a doubt this subcommittee is chaired by the most astute, able, and detail-minded Member of this body. I have never known of a man who could master as many facts and statistics as the chairman of this subcommittee. I do not think there is any question about this bill or about its many titles that you could ask this man that he could not come up with an answer.

I think we should approach this matter realistically. I am known as a cutter. I believe that I have voted against as many authorizations, if not more, than any other Member of this body and that stands for 22 years.

I have voted against many appropriation bills, but this bill is a service bill. This is a bill that raises revenue to run this country. I am convinced—and certainly the statistics over a period of many years support me in my position—that for each dollar you cut the Bureau of Customs, we will lose about $8.

The statistics are equally as good and factual that each dollar you cut the Bureau of Internal Revenue, our Government will lose at least $10 in collections.

Any person who has studied the record is bound to recognize that without a doubt the most efficient business in America is that of the Post Office Department. If I recall the statistics cor-

rectly, in 1944 in America we had some 10,300 trains moving the mail and there were 45 billion pieces of mail.

In 1968 and in fiscal year 1969 we will be moving 85 billion pieces of mail, actually with only about 800 trains. So it is necessary for the Post Office Department to seek out other modes of transportation. Certainly this bill can be cut, but if you reduce the amount of money provided in this bill, you are going to have to reduce services. I am not going to support any amendment to cut one dime out of this bill unless it is specifically indicated where it would apply. I reserved on two amendments which were discussed in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and may I preface this next statement by saying that in my district of 10,700 square miles there are 124 post offices, 32 of them enjoying residential mail delivery. I will support an amendment which would eliminate residential mail deliveries on Saturday and take my chance with my constituents. I do so in the interest of economy I shall likewise support a single amendment, not one cluttered up with a lot of unenforceable and unwise recommendations, but I will support a specific amendment which would eliminate Saturday rural service. I think that those services are desirable, but in this time of dire need, this time when we are confronted with a $26 billion deficit, we must find some places to cut. Those are two services that could be dispensed with without doing great damage.

But that does not mean that I am not supporting this great chairman in what I believe to be the tightest bill that has been reported out by a subcommittee chairman during the 20 years that I have served on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that the membership, if they have not already done so, would take the time to familiarize themselves with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Bureau of Customs so that we will make sure that these two agencies that we look to to raise money are not further reduced, and to give thought as to the specific type of services that they are willing to dispense with before making cuts in this bill which would surely be reinstated later and, in all probability, sustained in conference.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of some 14 regular appropriation bills which Congress is called upon to enact to continue operation of the Federal Government during fiscal year 1969. What we do here today will have a direct impact on our actions with respect to other appropriation bills that will follow in the days and weeks ahead. In the light of that impact, portending either restraint and sanity or irresponsibility and insanity, I think we should take a moment to review the perspective of our overall fiscal situation.

We are faced with a $25 billion budget deficit in the current fiscal year.

We can look forward to a deficit of $25 billion or more in 1969 if we do not alter the fiscal course this Government is now on.

The dollar is under attack all over the world and more than half of our gold supply is now in the hands of other nations.

Just a week ago last Sunday, the President, informed the Nation that the cost of the unpopular war in Vietnam had gone up an additional $2.5 billion this year.

Even worse is the fact that although the ink was then hardly dry on his budget for 1969, he said that Vietnam would cost $2.6 billion more in 1969 than had been estimated in the January budget.

Jobs are going begging all across the land and yet we have riots in the streets, said to be caused by poverty and frustration.

Inflation is gnawing away at the income of all Americans and that covert and insidious tax continues to hurt most those persons least able to pay—the poor and those on relatively fixed incomes.

And although the administration has requested a 10-percent surcharge on the tax liabilities of individuals and corporations to fight inflation, to restore confidence in the dollar, and to finance the war in Vietnam, it still insists upon its spend-and-spend, business-as-usual policy here at home.

If the United States is long to continue to be the land of the free and the home of the brave, the administration and this Congress soon had better give some leadership to the causes of fiscal frugality and responsibility and of law and order. Time is running out on the opportunity we have to avert worldwide financial catastrophe and anarchy in the cities of America.

The bill before us proposes the appropriation of $8,155,624,000 for the operation of the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies. These same agencies received $7,545,641,000 for their operations in the current year; thus, this bill gives them $610 million more spending authority in 1969 than they have in the current year.

These agencies have requested new obligational authority of $8,337,359,000, which the committee has reduced by $181,735,000. Of course, that approximate $182 million cut is a savings from the amount requested, but I wonder if it would startle anyone here to learn that the $182 million cut made by the committee will mandatorily reduce the agencies' planned expenditures in 1969 in only three instances which add to a meager total of $350,000. The items making up the total expenditure reduction of $350,000 are:

First, $100,000 for air conditioning at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing;

Second, $115,000 for the Administrative Conference; and

Third, $135,000 for the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and possibly other members of the subcommittee, will argue that 91 percent, or about $170 million of the $182 million cut, will accrue in 1969 because these agencies spend that percentage amount of their appropriations in the first year. Despite that conclusion, it is still true that except for $350,000 the committee has recommended sufficient funds to permit the agencies, if they desire to do so, to spend at the precise level planned in the budget and still have $564 million to be carried over into fiscal 1970.

I have in my hand a table which I shall ask when we are back in the House to have inserted at this point in the RECORD. The table follows:

	Fiscal 1969 appropriations		Proposed expenditures in 1969 out of funds now being appropriated	1969 expenditure reductions effected by the Appropriations Committee	1969 appropriations in excess of planned spending out of 1969 funds
	Requested	Allowed by the Appropriations Committee			
Treasury Department:					
Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses	$7,780,000	$7,688,000	$7,099,000	----------	$589,000
Bureau of Accounts, salaries and expenses	42,999,000	42,999,000	34,800,000	----------	8,199,000
Government losses in shipment	500,000	400,000	248,000	----------	152,000
Bureau of Customs	98,215,000	97,700,000	91,631,000	----------	6,069,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Air conditioning the Bureau buildings	500,000	400,000	500,000	—$100,000	----------
Bureau of the Mint, salaries and expenses	15,020,000	14,200,000	13,533,000	----------	667,000
Bureau of Narcotics	7,685,000	8,985,000	7,285,000	----------	400,000
Budget amendment, H. Doc. 259	1,300,000	----------	1,240,000	----------	60,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	56,987,000	56,900,000	52,100,000	----------	4,800,000
Internal Revenue Service:					
Salaries and expenses	21,967,000	21,700,000	21,180,000	----------	520,000
Revenue accounting and processing	188,563,000	187,000,000	178,016,000	----------	8,984,000
Compliance	547,551,000	541,500,000	511,735,000	----------	29,765,000
Total, Internal Revenue Service	758,081,000	750,200,000	710,931,000	----------	39,269,000
Treasurer of the United States	6,878,000	6,878,000	6,480,000	----------	398,000
Secret Service:					
Salaries and expenses	19,871,000	19,300,000	18,606,000	----------	694,000
Training facility	1,000,000	1,000,000	800,000	----------	200,000
Total, Treasury Department	1,016,816,000	1,006,650,000	945,253,000	—100,000	61,497,000

	Fiscal 1969 appropriations		Proposed expenditures in 1969 out of funds now being appropriated	1969 expenditure reductions effected by the Appropriations Committee	1969 appropriations in excess of planned spending out of 1969 funds
	Requested	Allowed by the Appropriations Committee			
Post Office Department:					
Administration and regional operation	$123,802,000	$119,000,000	$118,781,000		$219,000
Research development and engineering	36,386,000	34,000,000	17,129,000		16,871,000
Operations	5,783,989,000	5,720,000,000	5,504,006,000		215,994,000
Transportation	713,500,000	684,000,000	640,500,000		43,500,000
Building occupancy	216,000,000	210,000,000	171,835,000		38,165,000
Building supplies and services	110,781,000	110,000,000	79,691,000		30,309,000
Plant and equipment	225,000,000	200,000,000	60,359,000		139,641,000
Postal public buildings	88,252,000	50,000,000	33,242,000		16,758,000
Total, Post Office Department	7,297,710,000	7,127,000,000	6,625,543,000		501,457,000
Executive Office of the President:					
Compensation of the President	150,000	150,000	150,000		
White House Office, salaries and expenses	3,229,000	3,229,000	3,036,000		193,000
Special projects	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,469,000		31,000
Operating expenses, Executive Mansion	823,000	823,000	809,000		14,000
Bureau of the Budget	10,310,000	10,000,000	9,620,000		380,000
Council of Economic Advisers	886,000	880,000	842,000		38,000
National Security Council	664,000	664,000	556,000		108,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Management improvement	350,000	350,000	350,000		
Total, Executive Office of the President	18,912,000	18,596,000	17,832,000		764,000
Independent agencies:					
Administrative conference	250,000	125,000	240,000	−$115,000	
Advisory Commission of Intergovernmental Relations	551,000	551,000	484,000		67,000
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography	643,000	225,000	360,000	−135,000	
Tax Court	2,477,000	2,477,000	2,356,000		121,000
Total, independent agencies	3,921,000	3,378,000	3,440,000	−250,000	188,000
Total for the bill	8,337,359,000	8,155,624,000	7,592,068,000	−350,000	563,906,000

This table details, agency by agency, the appropriation requests made under this bill, the individual amounts recommended by the committee, the individual agency amounts the President's budget indicated would be spent in 1969 from funds appropriated in the bill, the cuts which I have detailed heretofore, and finally, the individual agency balances of funds in the bill that will be carried over into fiscal 1970. All of these are official figures, and my statement that planned expenditures in fiscal 1969 will not be adversely affected more than $350,000 by the committee's $182 million cut is irrefutable. The $182 million cut will reduce planned spending in fiscal 1970 and subsequent years, but it is the spending in fiscal 1969 that is of paramount importance now.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, at this time when our fiscal situation probably has never been more critical, we could make some greater reductions in actual spending by these agencies than the $350,000 I have detailed.

It was just last week, on April 2, that the Senate approved, in H.R. 15414, an expenditure ceiling for fiscal 1969 which would reduce total proposed Federal spending by $6 billion next year. If the ceiling in that bill, or a similar bill, should be enacted, and I hope it will be, the departments and agencies being appropriated for today will have to share in the $6 billion reduction and share to a far greater extent than $350,000.

This appropriation bill should not have been reported until after the Congress had determined what expenditure ceiling and appropriation cutbacks we are to have this year. That course of action was not followed, and now we must either recommit the bill to the committee or amend it and message it on to the Senate today.

In the light of the existing situation, I am prepared to offer an expenditure limitation amendment which will bring this bill into line with the subsequent actions that Congress probably will take on an overall expenditure ceiling.

The departments and agencies covered by this bill are expected to spend $7,689,380,000 in the current fiscal year. They have detailed to the committee some $185,774,500 of mandatory increases in 1969 which result from the pay increase of last October, the full-year costs of employees on the rolls during only a part of 1968, within-grade salary increases which cannot be absorbed by lapses, increased postage costs occasioned by the postal rate increase of last January, and other uncontrollable increases. When these mandatory increases are added to the expected expenditures in 1968 and adjustment is made for $6,684,000 of savings being affected by the agencies in 1969, we arrive at a figure of $7,868,470,500, which I am prepared to suggest should be the expenditure ceiling for these agencies in 1969.

I have a table detailing the expenditure ceiling which, when we are back in the House, I shall ask to have inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The table follows:

Estimated expenditures in either 1968 or 1969 (whichever is lower)

Title I—Treasury Department:	
Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses	$6,908,000
Bureau of Accounts	33,137,000
1969 expenditure from 1968 supplemental	2,279,000
Payment of Government losses in shipment	250,000
Bureau of Customs	90,164,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing: air conditioning building	500,000
Bureau of the Mint, salaries and expenses	15,890,000
Bureau of Narcotics, salaries and expenses	6,759,000
Bureau of the Public Debt: administering the public debt	52,679,000

Estimated expenditures in either 1968 or 1969 (whichever is lower)—Continued

Title I—Treasury—Continued	
Internal Revenue Service, salaries and expenses	$19,303,000
Revenue accounting and processing	180,203,000
Compliance	488,031,000
Total, Internal Revenue Service	687,537,000
Office of the Treasurer, salaries and expenses	6,567,000
Secret Service, salaries and expenses	16,985,000
Total	919,655,000
Title II—Post Office Department:	
Administrative and regional operations	107,449,000
Research, development and engineering	21,659,000
Operations	5,488,309,000
Transportation	679,334,000
Building occupancy	185,526,000
Building supplies and services	93,323,000
Plant and equipment	151,054,000
Postal public buildings	16,000,000
Total	6,742,654,000
Title III—Executive Office of the President:	
Compensation of the President	150,000
White House Office, salaries and expenses	2,915,000
Special projects	1,350,000
Operating expenses, Executive Mansion	702,000
Bureau of the Budget	9,352,000
Council of Economic Advisers	861,000
National Security Council	648,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000
Management improvement	400,000
Total	17,378,000

Estimated expenditures in either 1968 or 1969 (whichever is lower)—Continued

Title IV—Independent Agencies:	
Administrative Conference	$50,000
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	494,000
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography	130,000
Tax Court	2,335,000
Total	3,009,000
Subtotal	7,682,696,000
Mandatory increases	185,774,500
Total for the bill (gross)	7,868,470,500
Deduct: 1969 postal revenues to be applied against postal operations	6,378,000,000
Total (net)	1,490,470,500

This ceiling would allow for a 2½ percent increase in 1969 spending, which approximates the average increase in productivity generally. Increases in personnel costs, and particularly those in the Post Office Department since 1964 have far outstripped the increases in productivity over the 10-year period from 1954 to 1964. As a matter of fact, if the increases in personnel costs since 1964 had been held to the level of productivity increases, the Post Office would need some 62,000 fewer employees than they have budgeted for fiscal 1969.

If my proposed ceiling should be adopted, it would reduce the overall spending of these agencies by $331,491,500 or 4 percent below the planned level of $8,199,962,000.

The amendment goes to the total bill and not to individual items therein; thus, it gives the President the same flexibility to make necessary adjustments in individual accounts that was granted to him last year in House Joint Resolution 888—Public Law 90–218—and was proposed in the Bow expenditure limitation amendments which this House approved on six occasions last year.

Mr. Chairman, a 4 percent reduction in these agencies' overall planned spending is small enough indeed but this is a difficult bill to cut since it appropriates for those services which collect the taxes and deliver the mail. If it were some other bill that we had under consideration, I would suggest that the proposed cut would be substantially larger than 4 percent.

If other economy amendments should be adopted, and I have heard some discussed, the $331 million savings that accrues under my amendment would, of course, be reduced to the extent that other economy amendments affect actual spending in 1969.

The time is long since past, Mr. Chairman, for us to put our fiscal house in order. The time remaining in which we can do so is short; therefore let us today tighten our fiscal belts and make a start toward that end. We can do so and still provide for all of the essential services performed by these agencies.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department's appropriation for fiscal 1969, as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, provides a total of $7.1 billion.

This represents a cutback of 18.6 percent, by the committee, in new obligational authority requested in President Johnson's budget message to Congress.

A cutback of this magnitude by the committee represents a record reduction. Yet, it is made without requiring any significant curtailment of postal services.

If any substantial reduction in postal service would result, I could not agree with this budget recommendation by the committee.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am acutely aware of the demands upon our postal system today and the difficulty which the Department is experiencing in trying to cope with the never-ending avalanche of mail.

Hardly a day goes by that I do not have a complaint about some phase of the postal service. It is difficult to explain to the individual involved why his letter was delayed en route. It should not have been delayed, of course. Understandably, perhaps, he could care less about the fact that millions of other pieces of mail are being delivered on time every day.

The Department is trying hard to eliminate delays in the mail and to otherwise improve the service. Our committee is giving the Department full cooperation in this effort.

I understand that amendments will be offered here today to further cut the postal budget. Any further cut would require reductions in service.

Just last December, the Congress approved increases in mail rates of all classes. The first-class mail rate was increased 20 percent.

Now there are suggestions that Saturday deliveries of residential mail be eliminated. What a whopping load of mail that would give the carriers on Mondays. Do you believe American citizens would accept a weekly lapse in mail deliveries from Friday to Monday? Except in an emergency, I doubt that they would.

Another suggestion is to reduce rural deliveries to five days a week. True, that might save some mileage costs, but it would not save a nickel on the major item of pay for carriers. Rural carriers are paid on an annual basis and receive the same amount whether they work 5 days or 6.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended a reasonable budget for the Post Office Department for fiscal 1969. I urge my colleagues to support it without change so that the Department can continue in the job of delivering the mail and improving the service in every way possible.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] gave the committee some figures in support of a motion which he intends to make, I have some figures bearing on that same point that I think the Committee ought to have for its consideration before it acts on this proposal.

The gentleman from Ohio is talking about the amount of money proposed to be expended during the fiscal year 1969 based on the original budget request which came to the committee.

That original request was $8,337,359,000, of which $7,592,068,000 would be expended during the fiscal year.

Based on those figures, the committee would have done what he said, but due to the interest and the importance of this, I have had made by the staff and the departments a new consideration of this point based on the bill after the committee had acted.

The committee made a total cut of $181,735,000, bringing the bill to a total of $8,155,624,000. This brings a revised estimate of expenditures for the upcoming fiscal year of $7,461,423,000, which happens to be $132,206,000 under what the original proposal was, and which is a savings on the expenditures in the upcoming fiscal year by action of this committee.

Under this expenditure proposal, as based on what the committee has presented here today, of that $694,201,000, of that $8,155,000 will not be expended during the current fiscal year. So this means that a major portion of the $181 million we have cut will be a real expenditure savings during the upcoming fiscal year, this savings being $132,206,000. And I say this is a substantial contribution this subcommittee has made to the impact in the expenditure budget. And before this Committee is led down the primrose path of false economy, or a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy again by the gentleman from Ohio, as his amendment last year did to this year's budget, I believe this Committee should give this some serious consideration.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JONAS was allowed to speak out of order.)

AID TO VETERANS A PRETENSION

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and the Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. McMillan, beginning on page 291 of the hearings, and I would invite the attention of the Members of the Committee to what was said there.

I have in my hand a very elaborate brochure prepared by the Veterans' Administration, containing the substance of the President's message to the Congress on January 30, 1968, entitled "Our Pride and Our Strength."

In that message the President related all of the debts and obligations we owe to our veterans for the services they have rendered to the United States in the wars of our history, and outlined the many benefits that have been provided veterans. These things are reincorporated in the brochure entitled "Our Pride and Our Strength."

But I would like to relate an incident which has occurred in my State which makes a mockery of the pious pronouncements about veterans' rights and our Nation's obligations to them.

Let me tell the Members what happened down in North Carolina recently. On September 13, 1967, following a vote of the people, three adjacent, incorporated cities in North Carolina—Leaksville, Spray, and Draper—were consolidated under the name of Eden.

Mr. N. D. Shively had been appointed acting postmaster of the Spray Post Office back in 1953 and was later appointed postmaster in 1955.

Spray was a first-class office. Mr. Shively is a five-point veteran.

Mr. N. D. Redman, Jr. had been appointed postmaster of the Leaksville Post Office in 1955. Leaksville was a first-class post office.

Mr. Redman is a disabled veteran of World War II with 10 points to his credit.

Mr. G. C. Stegall had been appointed postmaster of the Draper Post Office in 1961. Draper was a second-class office. Mr. Stegall is not a veteran.

In order to eliminate the postmasters of Spray and Leaksville, both of whom are not only veterans—with Mr. Redman being a 10-point veteran which means he is a disabled veteran—but senior in point of service to Mr. Stegall, and for the purpose of transferring the nonveteran from the second-class office at Draper to the position of postmaster of the new office at Eden, N.C., the first-class offices at Leaksville and Spray were consolidated with Draper effective January 12, 1968.

The very next day, the nonveteran who was postmaster at Draper, was designated as postmaster of Eden and transferred to the post office quarters at Leaksville, which had been occupied by Mr. Redman, Jr., as postmaster of that office.

The former postmaster of Leaksville, Mr. Redman, Jr., who not only is a 10-point veteran but senior in service to Mr. Stegall, was given 5 days to accept appointment as assistant postmaster at Eden.

Mr. N. D. Shively, who in addition to being a five-point veteran was also senior in service to Mr. Stegall, was given 5 days to indicate acceptance of the position of superintendent of mail at Eden.

On the face of it, these actions seem arbitrary and capricious. Many responsible people of the community feel that it was a neat trick by the Post Office Department to demote two senior postmasters of first-class offices, both of whom are veterans and one of whom is a disabled veteran with 10 points credit, and to favor the nonveteran postmaster who was junior in service to the two demoted postmasters.

If a department of the U.S. Government is permitted to get by with this sort of treatment to veterans, and disabled veterans, it makes a mockery of the pious pronouncements about veterans' rights and our country's obligations to them.

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

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. I want to join with the gentleman from North Carolina. I know he has presented his case well and accurately. This is exactly what did happen. I am familiar with the area. I know the post office in that particular area very well and I am very familiar with the problem.

I think it is a mockery to the veterans of the United States when you think of what they did here. It is not only a mockery to the veterans but a mockery to the postal service, to take a man out of a second-class post office and put him in charge of three post offices, where the other two post offices were first-class post offices. Yes, it is a mockery to the people of North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Yes, it is a disservice to the patrons of the post office and makes a mockery of the pious pronouncements about the obligations we owe to the veterans of the country.

I think the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—the legislative committee—and the Civil Service Commission should go into this matter. As a matter of fact, I understand the two demoted postmasters have filed notices of appeal to the Civil Service Commission. I certainly hope the Commission will correct what seems to be a very unfair and unreasonable action on the part of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CONTE. I agree with the gentleman and I do hope that the Civil Service Commission will overturn that action.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. I wonder if you would not agree that it would be a very good idea to eliminate the residence qualification for postmasters as well as eliminating political qualifications and that we take out of the law the requirement for the Senate to approve the appointment of postmasters and that we take out of the law any recommendation of individuals by the Congress for postmasters as well as taking out the residence requirement so that people within the Post Office Department could rise to positions of leadership in the Department without political influence and without regard to residence.

Mr. JONAS. I do not know about residence. I have not given any consideration to the subject of residence. My first reaction would be to believe that a postmaster should come from the area which is being served. But I would agree 100 percent with what the gentleman has said about taking the postal service out of politics. I hope I am never again called upon to recommend one person for postmaster when there are several acceptable candidates. I would like to see the entire operation removed from politics. I I do not think I would favor converting the postal service into a corporation. There are some obvious problems involved there.

But my idea would be to give the Postmaster General a long term in office, similar to that, perhaps, of the Comptroller General, a 15-year term, not permit him to succeed himself, and tell him to operate the postal service as efficiently, economically and in as businesslike a manner as possible.

Mr. OLSEN. The point I have in mind is that the residence requirement is not imposed upon any other utility. If a person goes to work in another utility of this country—as, for example, a lowly electrician in the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—he could aspire to the highest job and he would not be confined to the residence that he is a patron of. I think that practice would be well to establish in the Post Office Department. I thought perhaps you might agree to that.

Mr. JONAS. I have not considered the question of residence. But I will be glad to consider it after your committee has conducted hearings and makes a recommendation.

Mr. OLSEN. Do you not think it is difficult for the Post Office Department that they cannot take the finest out of the lowest office and graduate them perhaps to the postmastership of the biggest city in the country?

Mr. JONAS. I would say in this particular instance, on the face of it, the postmaster at Leaksville should have been named postmaster of Eden; he was senior to the one who was promoted; he was a 10-point veteran; and he had been operating a first-class office. His office was transferred to the other place for 1 day and then transferred back in order to demote him. It is that kind of unfair discrimination that I am talking about here today.

Mr. OLSEN. I find myself in agree- to go a little further. I want to say that ment with the gentleman. I would like the residence requirement is the wrong thing. Inside the postal service, on the merit system, people should be able to aspire to the highest office because of merit.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with that.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman from North Carolina would agree that in North Carolina, as in Iowa—I do not know about Montana—but in North Carolina, as well as Iowa, competent people can be found within the jurisdiction of the post office, people who can well serve the needs of the postal service, and certainly they can be found within the counties of North Carolina and Iowa. Again, I say, I do not know about Montana.

We are not yet ready for New York to ship us their unwanted manpower to man the post offices in the State of Iowa. I am absolutely unwilling to go outside county lines in recruiting employees for local post offices.

Mr. JONAS. In this particular instance, both men were in the same postal area of the man that was promoted over them. My objection is they were both senior to him, they both had good records, and they were both veterans.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. So the record will be absolutely clear, regardless of how we feel about how postmasters should be appointed; in this particular case, we have to work within the framework of the present law and the present rules and regulations, and a shell game was played

in this instance by the Post Office Department in order to get this nonveteran postmaster of the second-class post office to head up the new first-class post office in Eden over the two veterans, one a 10-point veteran, the other a 5-point veteran, both postmasters of first-class post offices.

Mr. JONAS. And both of them, according to my information, had excellent records as postmasters.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. McMillan said in the hearing they all had good records. They are all good postmasters.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, as much as I favor Government economy, I cannot agree with suggestions that Saturday mail delivery be eliminated in the interest of cutting the postal budget. Saturday delivery is important to many individuals and many businesses.

In many American households both the husband and wife work. No one is home during the week. But someone is home on Saturday and that is the only day when mail which must be personally accepted by the addressee can be delivered.

Ending Saturday service will not reduce the amount of mail that must be delivered. All mail ultimately must be delivered. If there is no Saturday delivery mail will have to be stored over the weekend in already overcrowded post offices.

Checks, valuable papers, and periodicals will be delayed in delivery until Monday.

Halting Saturday delivery will substantially increase the Post Office workload for Monday. This will slow service on Monday possibly even Tuesday and the added Monday volume could very easily require overtime. Slow service and overtime certainly would not contribute to postal efficiency and economy.

The Appropriations Committee did an excellent job in pruning the postal budget without eliminating essential services. It reported a tight budget to the floor—a budget that recognizes the need for austerity to get the Nation's economic house in order. I support the Appropriations Committee's report and urge its adoption.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to rise and speak out against this hasty move to eliminate Saturday mail deliveries. In my mind, this is false economy. Worse than that, this is a most unfair approach to trimming the Federal budget.

Last year, during consideration of the postal rate bill, there was much discussion of the fact that mailers of first-class mail paid their own way, and in fact, carried part of the postal-rate burden of other lower classes of mail. Some Members pointed out at that time, that the service which first-class mailers were paying for was not as good as that which the Post Office Department had provided in past years for lower rates.

Now, in the wake of substantial rate increases for all mailers, but especially for first-class mailers, it is proposed that we cut back mail deliveries to 5 days a week. This is simply unjust. In effect, it is Government-imposed inflation if we take this step. After raising first-class rates from 5 to 6 cents, we are asked to cut back mail deliveries from six to five per week, so that 120 percent of last year's postal rates will buy only 83 percent of last year's postal service. The cost-benefit factor for the first-class mailer would look dismal, indeed, if we ushered out the Saturday deliveries in the interests of economy—we would be imposing 37-percent inflation on the mailer in the interest of economy.

Another serious aspect of this proposed cutback is its devasting effect on the members of the postal field service. Through the years, the volume and value of material Americans send through the mails grows and grows. Through thick and thin, and by that I mean throughout both lean and plentiful Federal budgets and postal pay raises, the career postal employees of this Nation have carried successfully this terrific burden. But, it seems to me, that these same postal employees are the last to be considered when decisions are made on Federal action affecting them. For years, they were without any semblance of true salary comparability with private employees, and this worthy goal, while it is much closer, has still to be achieved fully. Postal employees work under work rules, overtime provisions and working conditions which compare unfavorably with employees with similar skills working in private industry. Further, the grievance procedure through which a Postal Field Service employee can obtain a fair solution to a work-related problem is antiquated—so antiquated that often letter carriers and clerks must work through a Member of Congress to get action.

Now, to compound the low priority we have allotted to postal workers, and hand in hand with the inflation we would impose on mailers, we seek to cut by nearly one-sixth, the duties of many of these workers, and thus the need for keeping over 13,000 of them on postal payrolls. The result of cutting out Saturday deliveries would be for heavier mail deliveries during the 5-day week, less service for mailers and mail recipients, and hardship on the postal work force.

Mr. Chairman, I implore my colleagues to reject this false economy, and to consider the very real priorities that would be compromised by an elimination of Saturday mail deliveries.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there seems to be some differences of opinion concerning the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and accepted by the committee to the bill (H.R. 16489) which was passed by the House on Tuesday, April 9, 1968, I think it would be well to set the record straight.

The expenditure limitation originally contemplated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] was $7,868,470,500. I informed the gentleman that the departments concerned had advised the committee that their expenditure estimates from funds appropriated by the bill (H.R. 16489) would be $7,461,423,000 in fiscal year 1969. The gentleman then revised his figure and adopted the committee figure as shown in column 5 of the following table:

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

[In thousands]

Agency	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1969	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates, fiscal year 1969	Revised 1969 expenditure level (estimated)	Estimated expenditure reduction [1]	Estimated expenditures which will be expended in future years
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Treasury Department	[2] $1,016,816	$1,006,650	−$10,166	$936,071	−$9,182	$70,579
Post Office Department	7,297,710	7,127,000	−170,710	6,503,378	−122,165	623,622
Executive Office of the President	18,912	18,596	−316	18,596	−316	
Independent agencies	3,921	3,378	−543	3,378	−543	
Total	[2] 8,337,359	8,155,624	−181,735	7,461,423	−132,206	694,201

[1] This column compares with col. 4.
[2] Includes budget amendment of $1,300,000 for Bureau of Narcotics (H. Doc. 259).

Note: Since this bill does not propose to establish any expenditure limitations and deals only with obligational authority, the expenditure figures shown above are set forth only for informational purposes as provided by the major agencies involved.

This expenditure estimate of $7,461,423,000 did not, and, of course, could not be interpreted to go beyond the scope of the bill under consideration to restrict expenditure of funds from previous years appropriations to liquidate legal and legitimate obligations previously entered into by the Government. Such an amendment would clearly have been subject to a point of order.

As a matter of fact, under such a strained interpretation, payments of interest on the public debt amounting to $15.2 billion in fiscal year 1969 would have been repudiated. That debt, of course, is guaranteed by the Constitution itself. Naturally, the Committee could not have accepted such an amendment under any other interpretation than that it applied only to funds covered by the bill. It was with that clear understanding that the amendment was accepted.

I am certain that neither the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] nor any other responsible person would advocate the repudiation of the interest on the public debt or any other legal and legitimate obligation which has been entered into by our Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For necessary expenses connected with any public-debt issues of the United States, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $56,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask about the appropriation for administration of the Bureau of the Public Debt of almost $57 million. What kind of increase is that over last year, and why is this increasing all the time? Is it because of the size of the debt, or what is the story?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. As the gentleman well knows, the public debt keeps going up each year. The activities involving the Bureau increase along with it.

Mr. GROSS. Is it simply because the debt goes up?

Mr. STEED. The workload the Bureau handles keeps going up because of the number of instruments they have to handle to refund the debt, and so on, and there is workload involving cancellation of bonds that people cash in. All these things cost money, and they just have this volume of new items they have to handle.

Mr. GROSS. Have they bought no automated equipment in the Treasury Department?

Mr. STEED. They have automated equipment. In this one little part of Treasury, with the bookkeeping that is involved, and this is the largest part of it, if they did not have automated equipment they estimate they would have to have 18,000 more employees than they have now.

Mr. GROSS. In the Bureau of Public Debt?

Mr. STEED. This Bureau with the Bureau of Accounts, where all these things are handled. This year the improvement in their use of electronic equipment has resulted, in this particular agency, in a cut of staff by 22. They propose to have 22 fewer people in 1969 than this year.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say how much the administrative costs of the Bureau of Public Debt has gone up since President Johnson took over the reins of management? How many millions of dollars has it gone up just to administer the debt?

Mr. STEED. It was $55 million last year. It was down around $48 or $49 million in 1962. It was as low as $45 million in 1959.

Mr. GROSS. So just to administer the public Federal debt, it is now costing the taxpayers $57 million, and that is an increase of $8 to $10 million since President Johnson took over the reins of office in 1963.

Mr. STEED. That takes account of obvious increases represented by a variety of pay increases and some other costs have gone up, but there has been a very substantial increase in the volume of instruments they have to deal with to handle the larger debt.

Mr. GROSS. I guess there is not very much we can do about it except to try to find somebody, next November, who will help put the brakes on some of this spending.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on the House floor, and I do not want to involve him in this colloquy, but I am sure he has a deep interest in the rocketing Federal debt.

The ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee said a few moments ago that we were looking at a $25 billion deficit for this year alone.

I do not know whether we will be confronted this year with a tax increase for the purpose of providing more money for President Johnson to spend on every Tom, Dick, and Harry who comes down the pike or runs down a back alley, some with Molotov cocktails in their hands. I do not know how much more we have to spend this year, or how much more we will be asked to increase taxes to take care of these individuals and the depredations they carry out. It will be interesting to see.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he might be interested in knowing that in 1953 this Bureau handled 178.3 million instruments. In 1967 this had gone up to 239.2 million instruments. Since they have no control over the volume of their workload, about all they can do is try to improve productivity and efficiency. I believe the record they have made would please the gentleman from Iowa very much, if he has time to study it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for postal operations, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902) and services as authorized by title 5, United States Code, section 3109; for repair of vehicles owned by, or under control of, units of the National Guard and departments and agencies of the Federal Government where repairs are made necessary because of utilization of such vehicles in the postal service; and for other activities conducted by the Post Office Department pursuant to law; $5,720,000,000: *Provided*, That functions financed by the appropriations available to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year and the amounts appropriated therefor, may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, between such appropriations to the extent necessary to improve administration and operations: *Provided further*, That Federal Reserve banks and branches may be reimbursed for expenditures as fiscal agents of the United States on account of Post Office Department operations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBISON

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBISON: On page 9, line 5, strike out "$5,720,000,000: *Provided*," and insert the following: "$5,598,800,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this bill shall be available for expenses of delivery of mail on Saturdays in residential areas; for expenses of rural delivery of mail in excess of five days per week; nor for expenses of delivery of parcel post in excess of five days per week: *Provided further*,".

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with no sense of pleasure, but I do so because I believe this is a reasonable and practical and necessary step for us to take at this time in order to somewhat relieve the budgetary pressures we are all facing.

The amendment is a simple one. It would reduce the total appropriation under this bill for postal operations by $121.2 million. That amount is arrived at by eliminating for the time being, during fiscal year 1969 at least, Saturday deliveries of mail in residential areas, for a total net budgetary saving of $96.4 million; by eliminating 1 day's delivery of rural mail, at a savings of $16.3 million; and, finally, by reducing the delivery of parcel post back to 5 days a week, at a savings of $8.5 million; for the total of $121.2 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, cutting back to a 5-day delivery of mail in residential and rural areas will be of some inconvenience, of course, and if we decide to do it some of our constituents are bound to be annoyed with us—maybe even our wives will, for I have had some trouble with my own wife about this proposition.

As she said to me over the breakfast table this morning, "But, I like to get mail on Saturday."

And, of course she does, although some Saturdays there are only bills and no letters in what the mailman brings around to our house, and, of course, everyone likes to get mail on Saturday, but is it essential in a time of financial and budgetary crisis such as this that the mailman comes to our homes 6 days a week?

All of us got, in the morning's mail here on Capitol Hill, I am assuming, this letter from Thomas P. Costin, Jr., of Lynn, Mass., the president of the National Association of Postmasters—a very fine group, representing a fine body of public servants.

And Mr. Costin tells us in this letter that a reduction of rural and city parcel post service and the consolidation of some 2,000 post offices would—and now I quote—"in effect create havoc that would destroy a vital and necessary service to the American people."

Come, now, Mr. Costin.

In the first place, I do not know where he got the idea that some one of us was going to offer an amendment that would have the effect of consolidating 2,000 post offices. As far as I know, this step has not been contemplated by any of us. Furthermore, the Post Office Department, on its own, has already been closing about 1,000 post offices—usually by the consolidation route—each year in the interest of a more efficient and economical operation and, though there are often complaints from local citizens about this happening in their communities, it has neither "created havoc" nor "destroyed" the postal service yet.

As for a reduction in parcel post delivery service—back to a 5-day week in this instance—this would not create havoc, either, since it was only a few short months ago that the Department restored 6-day a week parcel post delivery service to most communities, for

prior to that we did not have it, and we got along pretty well without it.

Then you will note, if you have read Mr. Costin's letter, that he tells us his organization—and again I quote—"with members in every congressional district of the United States, would be opposed to any such amendments," which is understandable and something we fully expected. And maybe you have heard from your postal unions, as well—and one of their leaders did personally call upon me this morning, a fine man from a fine union and we had a good discussion of this this—but just let me read you now this last line from Mr. Costin's letter. He says:

These are not the times for crisis.

Well, perhaps not, but just what does he think—or any of you think—we are facing here right now?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, indeed, we have so many crises of one kind or another that it is getting difficult just to separate them, let alone trying to assess their comparative urgencies.

But the overriding crisis we face is a budgetary crisis, a crisis of such dimension that it forecloses all hopes for maintaining a business-as-usual governmental operation in many areas of lesser importance.

And whenever the President does finally decide to come up here and speak to us and the Nation about the racial and urban crisis that was so dramatically played out before our eyes here this past weekend, he will undoubtedly be asking for more funds, not only for such existing programs as he may have to try to deal with this problem, but for money as well for new and, perhaps, "massive" programs of the nature many people are now saying will be necessary.

Well, that money will have to come from somewhere and sometime we have to try to make a beginning at finding out where we can get some of it.

Several weeks ago, I joined with seven other Members from my side of the aisle in urging specific budgetary cuts to the tune of $6.5 billion of which amount if we achieved it, we felt we could responsibly "plow back" some $2.5 billion to meet what we called "urgent human needs."

We did this because we believed that the administration was refusing to exercise the political integrity necessary now to establish what we called positive national spending priorities—and that it was necessary for someone to try to fill that vacuum of leadership responsibility.

One of my friends on the majority side of this aisle scoffed, then, at our motives, saying he was wary of "Greeks bearing gifts," or something of that sort.

Well, to him and to all of you over there now contemplating that great question about how in the world we are going to finance new and better programs against poverty, and new and better programs designed to create badly needed jobs or to build decent housing, argue as you will with us later on about the nature of those programs or how much to spend on them, but help us now to help you begin to find the money needed to finance them.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Members ought to know exactly what they are voting for if they adopt this amendment. This will cut the operations budget of the Post Office Department $121.2 million. It will take out 13,712 employees.

Here is what I believe the Committee ought to keep in mind: You will be cutting this budget and cutting service on rural and city and parcel post delivery that the patrons already pay for. Nothing in the postal budget that is beyond the responsibility of the person who buys postage will be affected by this amendment. There are $634 million worth of free services that the Congress requests the Post Office Department to perform, but that is not affected here. You are taking away from the user of the mails what he is already paying for. As a matter of fact, he not only pays for all the costs of 6 days of collecting and delivering the mail, but he also pays all but $116 million of the total cost for new buildings, expansion of buildings, remodeling of buildings, lease of buildings, all the supplies and material and research and development, and on the administration.

So I believe that to have raised the rates to the consumer and to have him now in a position where in the area of operations he actually pays more than it costs to give him 6 days' service for his mail, to cut that back is probably something that I just do not believe the public is going to approve of or appreciate in terms of the service rendered, or in the terms of the personnel affected as to the carriers where they now need 7,270 new carriers for the increased volume, and increased number of addresses, to just keep giving the same level of service to the American people during the coming year.

If this amendment is adopted they will have to let go 13,712 carriers. That means they will not have the 7,270 new carriers, and will have to give up 6,442 of those they already have on the payroll.

This amendment will not save anything insofar as the rural routes are concerned, because for the service there we pay them on a yearly basis plus mileage.

Further, in terms of parcel post service, just this very year we had to make an adjustment in the parcel post, and we only have the 6-day parcel post service in those routes where there is a definite need for it, and where that need has been demonstrated. They have already cut out all those routes for parcel post where no need was demonstrated. So we now only have partial 6-day parcel post service today, and I believe in those areas where we have it it has been demonstrated there is a real need for it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will defeat this amendment because I do not believe that giving up this kind of service at a time when the patrons are actually paying every dollar of its cost is a good thing for this Congress to do, and I therefore recommend strongly against it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my considered judgment this particular amendment will indicate whether or not we are serious about wanting to make reductions in expenditures. This is the only type of amendment whereby reductions in expenditures can be made, because it is specifically pinpointed.

With the kind of amendment that says we will cut 2 or 4 or 5 percent, in all probability you will wind up spending more money.

I mentioned earlier that in my considered judgment this was a very tight bill. You cannot make reductions without reducing services. Now if you are sincere about wanting to bring unnecessary expenditures under control, this is the place to indicate how strong you are for economy.

Saturday is no longer a workday in America—we go visiting or we go fishing or hunting or we go on an outing—and we could dispense with residential mail deliveries on Saturday. There would be no great harm done.

We can likewise in my candid opinion dispense with rural mail delivery on Saturday without doing any great harm.

All of these things are desirable, but if we were to confiscate all the wealth in America, we would still not have sufficient funds to do all the things that are labeled desirable.

If we are confronted with a $25 billion deficit, we must start cutting where it hurts. There are over 10,000 square miles in my district. There are 32 post offices that have city delivery. There are over 120 post offices. I am willing to take my chances with my constituents.

You cannot have your cake and eat it too. We must start pinpointing where service cuts are going to be made and get away from all this foolishness of across-the-board percentage cuts because they never stand up in the other body and they do not stand up in conference.

I hate to take a different position from my very able committee chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am worried about the financial plight of America. I think we are going to have to make reductions rather than trying to applying across-the-board cuts.

Mr. Chairman, at the expense of being repetitious, earlier today I mentioned that with reference to the Custom Service, every time you cut them a dollar you lost $8 in revenue. The Bureau of Internal Revenue's revised statistics say that when you cut them $1 you now lose $10. I used the figure $4, but the correct figure, as they give it, is $10.

Mr. Chairman, these are revenue-producing agencies and I do not believe you can cut them.

But this is one place that you can save approximately $120 million and you are not going to do any great harm. Furthermore, at some subsequent date when the

war is over and we bring matters under control, then you can reinstate these services.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman says that Saturday is no longer a working day. But is it not true that there are a great many residential people who do have businesses which they operate from their own homes and for whom Saturday, therefore, is a business day?

Mr. PASSMAN. I refer to residential people, and I am sure that in most neighborhoods where you have 400 residenes, you will find two or three little local grocery stores who could just as well get their bills on Monday.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would this not be hurting the small businessman who has to work 6 days a week in order to make a living?

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly, it will hurt that businessman, and if he feels he is going to be hurt, then let me go down to the post office and rent a box.

If you are going to start arguing against cuts of this type where it is absolutely pinpointed and where you can make reductions without doing any harm, I do not see why we just do not give up and go out on a vacation. We either mean what we say or we do not mean what we say. So far as I am concerned, when these recommendations are pinpointed where you know you are going to make reductions, I am going to reserve the right to oppose them or to support them during this entire year.

I am going to say this in conclusion. I am not too sure that we are serious about making cuts. Headlines are one thing but pinpointing cuts where they will be effective is something else. I am not going to support any amendment that says we will cut 2 percent or 4 percent knowing that we are going to have to move 3 billion additional pieces of mail this year and finance 1,400,000 additional mail stops. You are going to have to cut services. You are going to have to cut expenditures, and I will stand up here to vote to reduce these services that can be dispensed with until our financial house is in better order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today in addressing the House under the 1-minute rule, I stated that I expected that this amendment would be offered.

In my remarks at that time I said that this would be a tragic error because the committee has already cut out $170 million from the Post Office Department budget request, and with this further proposed reduction it is going to mean a severe curtailment of postal services.

The postal services during the 12 years I have been here have been curtailed more than it had been prior to that time. We just cannot curtail it any further. I think every Member in this body has heard complaints about the curtailment that has taken place. Now we have a proposal to curtail it further, and this on top of the recent rate increase. I just do not think any Member will want to bear the burden of trying to explain a further curtailment in service on top of that sizeable rate increase.

I am the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Postal Operations. We spend 12 months a year on this business. The Appropriations Committee spends about 3 months on not only Post Office but also the Treasury. I think those of us who spend 12 months each year on Post Office affairs alone ought to know something about what we are talking about. I say to you, the members of this Committee, that it would be a tragic error, in my opinion, to make the proposed drastic reduction over and above what the committee has already proposed in their report.

My economy record in this House is second to none. The postal service is a personal service. The people pay for it. It is something they depend on. It is a major part of our whole economic way of life and the whole economic flow of goods and merchandise depends upon good postal service. The amendment would have a tragic effect upon the economy of this country. I plead with the members of this Committee to reject this amendment. I wish I could have the time to go into some of the other things in the Treasury Department end of the bill where some real and substantial savings could be made.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment to the pay raise and postal rate increase bill that was before the House to not raise the first-class mail rate from 5 to 6 cents. The House saw fit to reject the amendment and raised the rate to 6 cents, even though first-class mail was then paying over 100 percent of its cost.

The American people will not appreciate our raising their rates on first-class mail—and you had already raised parcel post rates and other rates had been raised—and then come along we curtail their service. You talk about Congressmen getting some mail on this question. You have not seen anything if you do this. You go ahead and vote this amendment if you want to, but I am telling you now that the American people do not mind paying for postal service, but they are going to demand that they get the service. If you cut this appropriation out, you are materially cutting their service.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I feel it would be a serious mistake to cut back postal service in the name of economy. I believe it would be false economy at its worst. As the previous speaker has stated I do not believe that the American public would stand for this cut, particularly after last year's increase in the postal rates.

I might point out to my colleagues in the House that during the Eisenhower administration the Postmaster General tried to close down the post offices of the country on Saturdays. He actually did so for one Saturday, and the public expressed its indignation. The outcry was so loud and so great that funds had to be appropriated to permit the post offices to remain open.

If the American people would not stand for this kind of service curtailment 11 years ago, what makes anyone in this House think that they will stand for it today?

It is true that we do have a national crisis, but our citizens are entiled to that for which they pay. I think, Mr. Chairman, the proposed curtailment would be not only unwise but also monstrously unfair to the patrons and users of the mail.

As the chairman of the subcommittee pointed out, the revenues which the Post Office Department collects cover all the expenses for the collection and distribution of mail. The real deficiency in the Post Office lies in the $630 million loss it sustains in the performance of nonpostal functions and public services.

The cost of these activities should be met out of public taxation, not out of postal revenues. This was the whole purpose behind the Kelly Act of 1930, the Postal Policy Act of 1958, and the Postal Policy Act of 1962, which provided for the segregation of nonpostal or public service expenditures from the actual costs of operating the postal service.

If this proposal for drastic curtailments of the service were to gain acceptance, we would be taking away from the public money that it spends for postal service and using that money to cover costs which should, by law, be met through public taxation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I ask my colleagues to vote in opposition to it.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to express my agreement. I think passing this amendment would be adding insult to injury. In order to obtain pay increases for postal employees I found it necessary to vote for the injury in the form of the postal rate increase. I am not going to compound it by insulting the postal patrons and by saying, now that they are paying more, they must get less service.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is decisively defeated.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ROBISON: On page 9, line 5, strike "$5,720,000,000" and insert "$5,690,000,000."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer this as a package amendment, but the other amendment would not be in order at this time. With the substitute, and the other amendment which will be on page 10, there will be a total cut of $50 million, but it will mean no loss in employment, no cut in personnel. The Post Office Department had asked for 22,077 new jobs. The committee gave them 20,000. This would cut it

down to 16,200 new jobs, therefore saving $30 million in that account.

Then, on page 10, there is an account for vehicles, $34,245,000 for replacement of 12,481 vehicles. We do not touch this at all.

There is another program—and I want to call the attention of the legislative committee to this—covering $29,665,000 for additional vehicles for this loop program. I imagine Members have heard about this back home from the employees, who do not want the loop program. I advocate cutting $20 million from the new vehicles, giving them $9,675,000 for new vehicles. We give them everything on replacement. This is merely on new vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the chairman of the full committee speak to us about the financial crisis of this country. We were told by members of the leadership, who had gone to the White House I believe last Tuesday, about the financial crisis this country faces. We heard about the integrity of the dollar.

We heard from one of the financial leaders of this country last week, who told us we were on the threshold of devaluating the American dollar between 10 percent and 15 percent. We were told by this individual, who just came back from Stockholm, that we were on the verge of having European countries refuse to accept the American dollar, and that the the only thing tourists would get for the American dollar in Europe would be what the black market would bring.

The chairman of the full committee made a very passionate plea that we have to cut down on appropriations.

This country cannot afford, and the American dollar cannot afford, a $20 billion-plus deficit back to back for 2 years.

Therefore, where do we go? I wish I could go along with the gentleman from New York, but I cannot. I do not know what the consequences would be, by cutting out Saturday delivery of mail. I have heard all kinds of stories—that the mail will back up, that the mail will back up for Monday, and the consequences will be very severe.

I wish I had more time to look into this and to have the committee and the counsel for the committee look into this, and to study what the consequences would be throughout the country.

I believe that with these amendments I propose—to cut $30 million in some additional new jobs, involving only 3,800 out of the 20,000 they asked for, and cutting out $20 million in this new vehicle program—this would make a cut of $50 million, plus the $180 million the committee cut, for an overall cut of $230 million.

As I debated on the floor of the House today, this is a tight budget. I do not believe it could take any more than this. I therefore oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I hope my substitute amendment will be adopted, along with the amendment I will offer in the near future.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

All of these amendments to cut are very attractive in this year of economy, but I must inform the committee that here again, if this amendment is adopted, the Members have to be prepared to be responsible for cutting postal services.

The committee has already cut $63 million out of operations. This would make a total cut of $93 million. I remind the committee that almost all of the money in this "Operations" account goes for labor.

I do not believe the Department can continue to extend routes to new homes and continue to cover the volume, estimated at an additional 3 billion pieces, if they have to take a cut like this.

The worst thing about this amendment is that this would force the Postmaster General to cut back services. He could select where he would cut back. No one here today can tell us what that selection might be.

I remember a time a few years ago, when we had Mr. Summerfield as Postmaster General, when we denied him some $35 million, and after he used his judgment as to where to cut, the Congress could not get with it fast enough to put the money back. I suspect we might have a situation like that here.

If the committee wants to approve economy at the expense of service, then Members can vote for this amendment. I just did not want any Member to have any doubt about what he was inviting if this amendment is adopted.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. There is no doubt about my amendment on vehicles. That is an additional new program which the Post Office Department is instituting. It is all a part of the record, if anyone wants to dig it out. I would give them every cent they want for replacement of vehicles.

Mr. STEED. I would prefer to go into that item when we get to it.

Mr. CONTE. On the other item, I beg to disagree with the gentleman from Oklahoma. If we are in this kind of economic crisis in this country, then we all have to tighten up our belts.

The main volume in our offices has increased, but we have not hired extra secretaries.

I believe the postal employees of this country are willing to roll up their sleeves and to do their bit a little, to increase their productivity in order to keep going, rather than to cut out Saturday deliveries and the other things under the other amendments offered here today.

Mr. STEED. I can only say the gentleman is going to force the reduction of the new people they need. I do not believe they can continue to give service at this level if they experience the mail volume increases we believe are coming, if this is forced on them.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PASSMAN. We have an amendment and a substitute. If the substitute is voted down, then we will have a vote on the amendment where it indicates specific cuts and places. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York who offered this amendment and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. They presented the issue directly to us, and it is about time that we recognize and face up to the problem that confronts us as we deal with the fiscal affairs of this Nation. The suggestion is made, "Why, you do not dare to cut, because if you make cuts, you are going to reduce some services."

Let me suggest to you that if we are not going to cut back services, then all of the talk about reducing expenditures goes for naught. We might just as well forget about putting ceilings on expenditures or cutting back on appropriations unless we are going to acknowledge that some services are going to be cut back as a result.

Now the argument is made that the American people are not going to appreciate the cutback of services. Let me suggest that we had better ask ourselves whether the American people are going to appreciate what can happen if we do not do something about the fiscal mess we are in. One of the things I cannot understand as I sit here on the floor this afternoon is where are the administration's spokesmen. They have been telling me and have been telling the members of the Committee on Appropriations and have been telling the members of the Committee on Ways and Means and have been telling many, many Members of Congress of the dire consequences of the fiscal crisis we face. They should be in here trying to save this $100 million even though it means a cutback in services. Mr. Chairman, why can we not cut back a service that simply means the delivery of residential mail on Saturdays? If we cannot do that; if that sacrifice is too great; if the people are unwilling to make this small sacrifice, when compared with the sacrifices that are entailed in the war in Vietnam and with the sacrifices that are going to result if you do not face up to the fiscal problems facing the Nation, then I do not know where we will begin. If the dollar—and I wish I could use the expression which is in my mind—gets into the kind of trouble we are told it can very well be in, and be in very shortly, then this is little enough sacrifice to make to protect it. I can't believe that it is too much to ask at least during this time of emergency that the Saturday delivery of residential mail be discontinued.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Louisiana put the issue right on the line. If we cannot face up to this issue, then let us just forget about all of the talk about putting ceilings on expenditures, about saving, about cutting back from the budget as presented by the President. If that is the case, we might just as well make up our minds that this dollar that is in trouble at home is going to remain in trouble. The trouble abroad will also remain. This Congress is just not going to be concerned about protecting the dollar. I think the best message that could go out to the American people and to the world would be that this Congress today stood up and said, "We are

willing to go on record to cut back a specific service, because we think the situation is that serious, and we are going to cut back on other services that are not essential during this period of emergency."

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the time for the Congress to face up to what has been not only a tremendous responsibility, but which in this case is an obligation to the people of the country.

It is not a year yet, it is not even half a year yet that has expired since we raised the rates on post office delivery service. We raised the postal rates, saying that they were going to pay 100 percent of their way for better service and as a matter of fact these amendments would tell us that we should cut back on service. Yes indeed, every speaker on the left-hand side of the aisle here has said that we should cut back on the service of the people who are paying more than all of their way. They were paying more than their way when we raised the postal rates, and now they are paying 125 percent of their own way, and now the Republicans are going to cut back on service. That is the point exactly.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, there is one exception on the left-hand side of the aisle that agrees with me. But the point of the fact is that we had told the American people we were going to raise the rates and that we were going to improve their service.

Mr. Chairman, I believe not only must we support the chairman of the subcommittee entirely in his recommendations here, but we must reject any cut in service, manpower, or vehicles, because as the chairman of the subcommittee would recommend, we have to face the necessary expansion in the number of units of mail, and we have to have the personnel and vehicles to carry this increase.

It is not just a case of cutting back in the lush growth areas where there would be an increase in the number of households, and where we would cause unemployment, because we would not be serving the houses necessary to be served, but let us take the static areas, let us take the areas that are not growing, the unemployment would be greater.

If you cut back on the vehicles, and if you cut back on the Saturday service, you are going to cut back on the employees, and you are going to cause unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], if he would respond to the question on how much unemployment would be caused in the static areas if we cut back on Saturday deliveries?

Mr. STEED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman, I would say on the original amount that it would be a cut to the tune of some 13,712 carriers, and that in the case of some 6,442 of these they would be people who are already on the payroll.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are not only talking about cutting back in service to the people, but we are talking about cutting back in employment, we are talking about cutting employment, we are talking about cutting service in an area where people are paying their own way.

We are not talking about foreign aid now. We are not talking about appropriations because, after all, now, the people who are paying these postal rates are also paying taxes for foreign aid, and they are paying for this postal service, and they are paying for taxes on a lot of other kinds of services that are going to be cut back. We are talking here about postal services which is a service that the people pay for over and above their taxes. That is what we are talking about, and I want every Member to know that when they vote on this issue they are voting not just to curtail service for which people pay for in taxes, but if they vote for a curtailment here, they are voting for a curtailment in service for which people are not only paying taxes, but are paying over and above their taxes, and on which they are paying more than their own way.

I do not think there is any inclination on the part of the public to pay more in postage for less service. But that will be the result if there are further reductions in the postal budget.

One of the announced aims of the postal rate increase approved by the Congress last year was to make it possible to improve postal service. The public and the business community accepted the increase on that basis.

The amount of money that can be saved by eliminating Saturday mail delivery or otherwise reducing the level of postal services would be more than offset by the adverse impact such a curtailment would have on businesses which depend on the mail. About 80 percent of all mail is business mail—and the postal service is the Nation's primary artery of commerce.

We must demand that the Post Office operate on as tight a budget as possible. But there should be no elimination of postal services that the public and the business community want and need.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this observation: I do not think this is a bellwether appropriation bill, so far as what we are going to do in appropriations from here on out, but I would call the attention of the Committee to the fact that at least two of the prominent proponents of this cut in postal service are the biggest boosters of foreign aid—there is where you can make some cuts, and there is where you are talking about some real big money.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. The gentleman from Wisconsin made a statement a while ago, and I hope he did not intend to tell this House that postal expenditures provided for by higher rates paid by the public had anything to do with the budgetary problems facing us.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. I want to compliment the gentleman in the well for the position he takes on this amendment.

I regret that the previous speaker failed to yield to me because I wanted to ask him a question with reference to a bill which I introduced last year pertaining to a review of our tax laws. I think it is about time that the Committee on Ways and Means gave consideration and proper attention to a review and a revision of our tax laws, doing away with such things as the oil- and mineral-depletion allowance which gives the oil companies of this country a great bonanza of 27½-percent depletion allowance.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing the pending amendment, let me express a word of deep appreciation for the outstanding work which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] has performed as chairman of the subcommittee handling the pending legislation.

The gentleman from Oklahoma did everything in his power to present to the House the most acceptable bill possible without interferring with what he considered to be essential postal service. As chairman of the subcommittee, he had to preside over the so-called markup and resolve differences where possible among the various members and work out compromises in an effort to get a bill which he thought was in the best interest of all concerned.

Mr. STEED has labored through the years and successfully in the direction of good government. He has sought to eliminate waste and promote efficiency and he has done a good job. His position on the pending amendment is understandable and I must say these words of commendation in behalf of this distinguished legislator.

Mr. Chairman, this matter of reducing Saturday deliveries was discussed in the Committee on Appropriations. It was decided, and I think properly so, that the issue should best be fought out on the floor of the House.

No one wants to reduce the postal service, but we are confronted with a very difficult national fiscal situation. The postal deficit is now estimated to be nearly $1 billion and when the new pay raise goes into effect on July 1 it will be more than $1 billion for 1969.

The question is, Are we willing to do some sacrificing ourselves in reducing some mail service on Saturday to achieve savings? Are we willing at this time of fiscal stringency and war to dispense with certain Saturday mail service?

In the money markets of the world, the dollar is in trouble. It is said that we do not have the courage or the capability to restrain ourselves and to bring spending somewhat in line with income. But I think we do have the capability to do something about this problem. I am willing to take the criticism which we will re-

ceive. I am willing to take the criticism for saving $120 million at a time when our servicemen are risking their lives every day.

If the economic structure of this country fails, it is going to hurt all of our people—the poor and the rich alike. This is a year of decision. If we go forward with another year of a deficit in excess of $20 billion in addition to the estimated deficit for fiscal 1968, we are going to be in serious trouble.

So I just feel that I cannot remain silent when I am now dealing with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and other officials in an effort to find ways to reduce budgeted expenditures for 1969 in the range of $4 to $6 billion and appropriations in the range of up to $14 billion. Of course, I do not know what final figures may be agreed upon. It is not clear just what the figures should be. I do not know whether we have the fortitude or the courage or the foresight to do what must be done in the way of showing our respect for the dollar at home in order that it may regain full respect abroad.

But we find it very difficult to make reductions in this bill—very difficult indeed. We made about $180 million in reductions; a relatively small sum compared to the billions in savings that we may eventually try to achieve during this session of the Congress.

If our people realize that the Post Office Department may go in the red by about $1 billion and if they feel it will strengthen our country to save $120 million I believe many will be willing to bear the burden of some reduction in service.

Therefore I am going to vote for the original amendment to reduce the Saturday mail deliveries, and I think that is the action which should be taken. There would be some reduction in personnel, a slight reduction in Federal employees, but I would hope this could be achieved in most cases by not filling vacancies which occur.

The great goal of preserving and protecting the economy of the United States and promoting the best interest of all our people is the basis upon which I support the amendment. With a meaningful reduction in spending and a tax increase we will be in a vastly better position as a nation and this would be in the best interest of all employees of the Government and citizens generally.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were—ayes 10, noes 107.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROBISON and Mr. STEED.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For expenses necessary for modernization and acquisition of equipment and facilities for postal purposes, including not to exceed $2,000,000 for increases in prior year orders placed with other Government agencies in addition to current increases in prior year orders or contracts made as a result of changes in plans, $200,000,000; *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall be available for repair, alteration, and improvement of the mail equipment shops at Washington, District of Columbia, the Post Office Garage, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Post Office and Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Flint, Michigan, and for payment to the General Services Administration for the repair, alteration, preservation, renovation, improvement, and equipment of federally owned property used for postal purposes, including improved lighting, color, and ventilation for the specialized conditions in space occupied for postal purposes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 10, line 13, strike the sum named and insert "$180,000,000."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not going to take the time of the Committee. I explained the amendment earlier.

There is $34,245,000 for the replacement vehicles. We are not touching that at all by the amendment.

There is another item of $29,665,000 for 11,405 additional vehicles. I am asking the House to go along with a cut of $20 million in this item, to give the Department $9,665,000 for any new routes they may have, and to hold off this new so-called loop program.

What they are going to do is practically give every mailman an automobile, which he does not want. In my own town of Pittsfield, I am told, they are trying to give the mailmen something like 33 new automobiles to deliver the mail. The mailmen do not want them.

I do not feel that at this time we should be spending this $20 million of the taxpayers' money.

A lot has been said about rate increases. Everyone who has mentioned a rate increase has failed to tell the House of Representatives that the postal budget is out of whack a billion dollars, and the people who are picking up the tab for that $1 billion are the taxpayers of the United States.

I hope the Committee will go along with this amendment.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment applies to a program of plant and equipment which includes a large number of items. The committee has already cut this about $29 million. If another $20 million is cut, it will mean they will be operating at a level considerably less in 1969 than this year.

When it comes to this vehicle business, they must have replacements for 12,400 vehicles this year, if we maintain a rule we have had about trying to keep vehicles on hand that can be use economically.

Most of these replacements are in the city delivery routes, or to get rid of these three-wheeled mailsters we have had, which have proved unsatisfactory.

When it comes to the new vehicles on city routes, I believe there is something the Committee ought to know. A person can take two of these four-wheeled vehicles and cover three routes plus one parcel post route. By consolidating through this system of motorizing routes in suburban areas and other places that lend themselves to this sort of thing one cannot only give better service to the patron but also actually save $2.13 a day per vehicle in the doing of it. This is one way to improve the efficiency of delivering mail, especially in the suburban areas. It is money well spent and well invested, and this more than pays for itself.

They will not be able to motorize that part of their route system this year that will lend itself to this kind of economic treatment.

I want to assure everybody that this will not cost anyone his job.

The other items needed under this heading are so vital that if there is any difficulty in obtaining the vehicles or if there is any slowdown on that, it will be harmful, because the money is badly needed for equipment and other facilities that the Department needs, a lot of which we are denying them here just because of the tight budget situation. We thought this was a place where we could wait a little while until the budget situation improved a little bit. I do not know how you can accept a cut of this sort and still be in the position of giving the Department an efficient program.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend the defeat of this amendment. I believe the $25 million cut we have already made in this item is about all they can take and still have a program that will be in good balance and with good economy. Therefore, I hope the Committee will reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were—ayes 64, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: On page 16 following line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 502. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, only to the

extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in the aggregate expenditure of Federal funds by all agencies provided for herein beyond $7,461,423,000 including the expenditure of postal receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr BOW. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since the amount contained in the proposed amendment is identical with the figures that we have been given by the departments as to what they would expect to spend during the coming year, I have no objection to the amendment subject to a reservation that if later information makes it necessary I would have some opportunity in conference to give it another look.

As of this moment, this is in line with what we were advised they will be doing. Therefore I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BOW. I will say to the distinguished gentleman—and I will give the Members an opportunity to vote in just a moment—I believe we want to save. The original limitation was higher than this. The gentleman from Oklahoma has provided us with a revised statement from the agencies, and his revised statement estimates spending at $7,461,000,000. That is the amount of the limitation. This simply takes them at their word. It is a reduction, or a savings. This new ceiling is a reduction of about $738,539,000. I believe that is a pretty good savings in that limitation. I am delighted that the gentleman has been able to convince the people downtown that they have got to cut this down, and I insist upon the ceiling, and I appreciate the gentleman accepting the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, would my good and distinguished friend from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I would never refuse to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank my distinguished friend for yielding to me.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that over the many years, he and I have heard that word "savings." It is a favorite word, as the gentleman knows, with the bureaucrats in the executive branch of the Government. But when the gentleman uses that very word here, as he has, every Member must well know that it is not a savings to the taxpayer at all, because no money reverts to the Treasury.

I would ask the gentleman: Is that correct?

Mr. BOW. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that it may not revert to the Treasury, but it does not come out of the Treasury. In other words, the appropriation here recommended in the bill is for $8,155,000,000. It is the old story of a penny saved is a penny earned, and we are keeping it in the bank.

Now, if you take it out of the bank and spend it, then it is gone. If you do not do that, then it is savings.

Now, they save it in just the same way in Brooklyn as they do in Canton, Ohio.

I have learned a lot of this information from my distinguished chairman, with whom I served for some 18 years, and I believe we can call it a savings, or keeping the money in the bank for a rainy day. But more properly I believe we should say we are doing something to preserve the integrity of the American dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLATNIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16489), making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROBISON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROBISON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 16489 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 9, line 5, strike out "$5,720,000,000: *Provided,*" and insert the following: "$5,598,800,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds contained in this bill shall be available for expenses of delivery of mail on Saturdays in residential areas; for expenses of rural delivery of mail in excess of five days per week; nor for expenses of delivery of parcel post in excess of five days per week: *Provided, further,*".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 102, nays 250, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—102

Andrews, Ala.	Erlenborn	Morris, N. Mex.
Arends	Eshleman	Morton
Ashbrook	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Nelsen
Ayres	Gathings	Passman
Bates	Goodell	Pelly
Battin	Goodling	Pickle
Bennett	Gross	Pollock
Berry	Hall	Pryor
Betts	Halleck	Quie
Bolling	Hammer-schmidt	Reid, Ill.
Bow	Harsha	Reifel
Bray	Hosmer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brock	Hutchinson	Robison
Broomfield	Jonas	Rumsfeld
Brotzman	Keith	Sandman
Brown, Ohio	Laird	Schneebeli
Burke, Fla.	Langen	Scott
Burleson	Latta	Shriver
Bush	Lipscomb	Skubitz
Byrnes, Wis.	Lukens	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	McClory	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	McCloskey	Snyder
Clancy	McClure	Springer
Clawson, Del	McEwen	Stanton
Collier	Mahon	Steiger, Ariz.
Colmer	Mailliard	Talcott
Conable	Martin	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	May	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	Mayne	Utt
Curtis	Michel	Wiggins
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Ohio	Wilson, Bob
Devine	Mills	Wyatt
Dickinson	Mize	
Dole		

NAYS—250

Abbitt	Dingell	Helstoski
Abernethy	Donohue	Henderson
Adair	Dorn	Hicks
Addabbo	Dowdy	Horton
Albert	Downing	Howard
Anderson, Ill.	Dulski	Hungate
Anderson, Tenn.	Duncan	Hunt
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dwyer	Ichord
Annunzio	Eckhardt	Jarman
Aspinall	Edmondson	Joelson
Baring	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Edwards, La.	Johnson, Pa.
Belcher	Eilberg	Jones, Ala.
Bell	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Bevill	Everett	Karth
Biester	Evins, Tenn.	Kelly
Blackburn	Fascell	Kleppe
Blanton	Feighan	Kluczynski
Blatnik	Fisher	Kornegay
Boggs	Flood	Kupferman
Bolton	Flynt	Kuykendall
Brademas	Foley	Kyl
Brasco	Ford, William D.	Kyros
Brinkley	Fountain	Lennon
Brooks	Friedel	Lloyd
Brown, Calif.	Fulton, Pa.	Long, La.
Brown, Mich.	Fulton, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Broyhill, N.C.	Fuqua	McCarthy
Broyhill, Va.	Galifianakis	McCulloch
Buchanan	Gallagher	McDade
Burke, Mass.	Garmatz	McDonald, Mich.
Burton, Utah	Gettys	McFall
Button	Giaimo	McMillan
Byrne, Pa.	Gibbons	Macdonald, Mass.
Cabell	Gonzalez	Machen
Cahill	Gray	Madden
Casey	Green, Pa.	Marsh
Celler	Griffin	Mathias, Calif.
Clark	Griffiths	Mathias, Md.
Clausen, Don H.	Grover	Matsunaga
Cleveland	Gubser	Meeds
Conte	Gude	Meskill
Corbett	Haley	Miller, Calif.
Culver	Hamilton	Minish
Cunningham	Hanley	Minshall
Daniels	Hansen, Idaho	Monagan
Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Wash.	Montgomery
Dawson	Hardy	Morgan
de la Garza	Harrison	Moss
Delaney	Hathaway	Murphy, Ill.
Denney	Hawkins	Murphy, N.Y.
Derwinski	Hays	Myers
	Hébert	Natcher
	Hechler, W. Va.	

Nedzi	Rodino	Ullman
Nichols	Rogers, Colo.	Van Deerlin
Nix	Rogers, Fla.	Vander Jagt
O'Hara, Mich.	Ronan	Vanik
O'Konski	Rooney, N.Y.	Vigorito
Olsen	Rooney, Pa.	Waggonner
O'Neal, Ga.	Roudebush	Waldie
O'Neill, Mass.	Roush	Walker
Patman	St Germain	Wampler
Patten	St. Onge	Watkins
Pepper	Satterfield	Watson
Perkins	Saylor	Watts
Pettis	Schadeberg	Whalley
Philbin	Scherle	White
Pike	Shipley	Whitener
Pirnie	Sikes	Whitten
Podell	Sisk	Widnall
Poff	Slack	Williams, Pa.
Pool	Smith, Iowa	Willis
Price, Ill.	Smith, Okla.	Wilson,
Price, Tex.	Stafford	Charles H.
Pucinski	Staggers	Winn
Purcell	Steed	Wright
Quillen	Stephens	Wydler
Railsback	Stratton	Wylie
Randall	Stuckey	Wyman
Rarick	Sullivan	Young
Reinecke	Taylor	Zablocki
Rhodes, Pa.	Tiernan	Zion
Rivers	Tuck	Zwach
Roberts	Udall	

NOT VOTING—81

Adams	Halpern	Poage
Ashmore	Hanna	Rees
Bingham	Harvey	Reid, N.Y.
Boland	Heckler, Mass.	Resnick
Burton, Calif.	Herlong	Reuss
Carey	Holifield	Riegle
Carter	Holland	Rosenthal
Cohelan	Hull	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Irwin	Roth
Corman	Jacobs	Roybal
Daddario	Jones, Mo.	Ruppe
Dellenback	Karsten	Ryan
Dent	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Diggs	Kazen	Schweiker
Dow	Kee	Schwengel
Edwards, Calif.	King, Calif.	Selden
Esch	King, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Fallon	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Farbstein	Landrum	Taft
Findley	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Fino	MacGregor	Tenzer
Fraser	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Gardner	Moore	Thompson, N.J.
Gilbert	Moorhead	Tunney
Green, Oreg.	Morse, Mass.	Whalen
Gurney	O'Hara, Ill.	Wolff
Hagan	Ottinger	Yates

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morse.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Hull with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Cohelan.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Mink with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Fraser.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kazen.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Rees.

Mr. ASHLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 342, nays 10, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—342

Abbitt	Cramer	Hays
Abernethy	Culver	Hébert
Adair	Cunningham	Hechler, W. Va.
Addabbo	Daniels	Helstoski
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Henderson
Anderson, Ill.	Dawson	Hicks
Anderson, Tenn.	de la Garza	Horton
	Delaney	Hosmer
Andrews, Ala.	Denney	Howard
Andrews, N. Dak.	Devine	Hungate
	Dickinson	Hunt
Annunzio	Dingell	Hutchinson
Arends	Dole	Ichord
Ashley	Donohue	Jarman
Aspinall	Dorn	Joelson
Ayres	Dowdy	Johnson, Calif.
Baring	Downing	Johnson, Pa.
Barrett	Dulski	Jones, Ala.
Bates	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Battin	Dwyer	Karth
Belcher	Eckhardt	Keith
Bell	Edmondson	Kelly
Berry	Edwards, Ala.	Kleppe
Betts	Edwards, La.	Kluczynski
Bevill	Eilberg	Kornegay
Biester	Erlenborn	Kupferman
Blackburn	Eshleman	Kuykendall
Blanton	Evans, Colo.	Kyl
Blatnik	Everett	Kyros
Boggs	Evins, Tenn.	Laird
Bolling	Fascell	Langen
Bolton	Feighan	Latta
Bow	Fisher	Lennon
Brademas	Flood	Lipscomb
Brasco	Flynt	Lloyd
Bray	Foley	Long, La.
Brinkley	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Brock	Ford, William D.	McCarthy
Brooks		McClory
Broomfield	Fountain	McCloskey
Brotzman	Frelinghuysen	McClure
Brown, Calif.	Friedel	McCulloch
Brown, Mich.	Fulton, Pa.	McDade
Brown, Ohio	Fulton, Tenn.	McDonald, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.	Fuqua	
Broyhill, Va.	Galifianakis	McEwen
Buchanan	Gallagher	McFall
Burke, Fla.	Garmatz	McMillan
Burke, Mass.	Gathings	Macdonald, Mass.
Burleson	Gettys	
Burton, Utah	Giaimo	Machen
Bush	Gibbons	Madden
Button	Gonzalez	Mahon
Byrne, Pa.	Goodling	Maillliard
Byrnes, Wis.	Gray	Marsh
Cabell	Green, Pa.	Martin
Cahill	Griffin	Mathias, Calif.
Casey	Griffiths	Mathias, Md.
Cederberg	Grover	Matsunaga
Celler	Gubser	May
Chamberlain	Gude	Mayne
Clancy	Haley	Meeds
Clark	Halleck	Meskill
Clausen, Don H.	Hamilton	Michel
	Hammer-schmidt	Miller, Calif.
Clawson, Del		Miller, Ohio
Cleveland	Hanley	Mills
Collier	Hansen, Idaho	Minish
Colmer	Hansen, Wash.	Minshall
Conable	Hardy	Mize
Conte	Harrison	Monagan
Corbett	Harsha	Montgomery
Corman	Hathaway	Morgan
Cowger	Hawkins	Morris, N. Mex.
Morton	Reinecke	Sullivan
Mosher	Rhodes, Ariz.	Talcott
Moss	Rhodes, Pa.	Taylor
Murphy, Ill.	Rivers	Teague, Calif.
Murphy, N.Y.	Roberts	Thomson, Wis.
Myers	Rodino	Tiernan
Natcher	Rogers, Colo.	Tuck
Nedzi	Rogers, Fla.	Udall
Nelsen	Ronan	Ullman
Nichols	Rooney, N.Y.	Utt
Nix	Rooney, Pa.	Van Deerlin
O'Hara, Mich.	Roudebush	Vander Jagt
O'Konski	Roush	Vanik
Olsen	Rumsfeld	Vigorito
O'Neal, Ga.	St Germain	Waggonner
O'Neill, Mass.	St. Onge	Waldie
Passman	Sandman	Walker
Patman	Satterfield	Wampler
Patten	Saylor	Watkins
Pelly	Schadeberg	Watson
Pepper	Scherle	Watts
Perkins	Schneebeli	Whalley
Pettis	Scott	White
Philbin	Shipley	Whitener
Pickle	Shriver	Whitten
Pike	Sikes	Widnall
Pirnie	Sisk	Wiggins
Podell	Skubitz	Williams, Pa.
Poff	Slack	Willis
Pollock	Smith, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Pool	Smith, Iowa	Wilson, Charles H.
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	
Price, Tex.	Smith, Okla.	Winn
Pryor	Snyder	Wright
Pucinski	Springer	Wyatt
Purcell	Stafford	Wydler
Quie	Staggers	Wylie
Quillen	Stanton	Wyman
Railsback	Steed	Young
Randall	Steiger, Ariz.	Zablocki
Rarick	Stephens	Zion
Reid, Ill.	Stratton	Zwach
Reifel	Stuckey	

NAYS—10

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Lukens
Bennett	Goodell	Robison
Curtis	Gross	
Davis, Wis.	Hall	

NOT VOTING—81

Adams	Hanna	Poage
Ashmore	Harvey	Rees
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Boland	Herlong	Resnick
Burton, Calif.	Holifield	Reuss
Carey	Holland	Riegle
Carter	Hull	Rosenthal
Cohelan	Irwin	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Jacobs	Roth
Daddario	Jonas	Roybal
Dellenback	Jones, Mo.	Ruppe
Dent	Karsten	Ryan
Diggs	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Dow	Kazen	Schweiker
Edwards, Calif.	Kee	Schwengel
Esch	King, Calif.	Selden
Fallon	King, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Farbstein	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Findley	Landrum	Taft
Fino	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Fraser	MacGregor	Tenzer
Gardner	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Gilbert	Moore	Thompson, N.J.
Green, Oreg.	Moorhead	Tunney
Gurney	Morse, Mass.	Whalen
Hagan	O'Hara, Ill.	Wolff
Halpern	Ottinger	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morse.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Hull with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Jonas with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Cohelan.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Fraser.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kazen.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Rees.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR AGREEING TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2516

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1100, Rept. No. 1289), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1100

Resolved, That, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

REQUEST TO PRESIDENT TO PREVENT RECURRENCE OF RECENT LAWLESSNESS AND RIOTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, as a concerned citizen and as a concerned Member of this Congress, I deplore the events that have occurred here in the Nation's Capital and in other cities in this country during the past 4 days. I have just urged and respectfully requested the President, in his statement to the Nation of the measures that he will no doubt take to prevent a recurrence of the recent lawlessness and riots to include in substance the following:

As the President of the United States, it is my duty and responsibility to enforce the laws of this land. And it is the most fundamental law of this land that the Government provide for the protection of the individual and of his property.

As of now, I am ordering the Attorney General of the United States, every Federal agency, and every Federal law enforcement officer in this Nation to enforce the laws of this land without regard to race, creed, or color.

I am urging every court and every law enforcement officer in this Nation to arrest and jail every individual regardless of race, creed, or color, who commits a crime of violence, including looting, shooting, arson and the inciting of riots.

I urge all Federal courts to act promptly upon all petitions by the Justice Department or any party of interest seeking injunctions and restraining orders prohibiting the mobilization of the large numbers of persons for street marches, which in the considered judgment of the court may reasonably be expected to result in disorders, violence, and endangering the people and their property.

I urge the Supreme Court of the United States to become cognizant of the rapid increase of crime and lawlessness in this country and to faithfully follow the true meaning of the Constitution as actually written, and to refrain from altering, amending, and remaking the United States Constitution which is not within their constitutional authority.

I am hopeful that the President will act favorably on these recommendations and that each Member of Congress will support this request.

I am also disturbed about the reports that many Members of Congress are changing their position on the proposed and so-called civil rights legislation, including the open housing amendment adopted by the Senate. I am fearful that the House is going to act on some of these measures with too much haste and without proper consideration being given to such far-reaching legislation that is obviously not to the best interests of the citizens of this country, and I am urging each Member of Congress to refrain from acting too hastily.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the wanton, brutal, and senseless assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is another dark page in the history of America. These meaningless slayings in our free society must be brought to a halt.

Every American, regardless of race, color, or creed has the right to protest, has the right to petition his Government, has the right to equal justice under the law, and the right to be heard when an injustice is being perpetrated against him.

Our Founding Fathers were aware of the need for these inalienable rights and incorporated them in our Bill of Rights in order that our Government should remain free and strong for posterity. We no longer can tolerate mob rule—we no longer can tolerate rule by the gun. We want a government based on law and the orderly process of the ballot box. Either we wholeheartedly believe in and stand behind these fundamental principles, or our Government is doomed to failure.

I represent the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which is an integrated district where people of all nationalities, all races, all colors, and all religions reside, and I have an understanding of the problems that confront all of them.

Is it asking too much to give men the right to live in decent housing? Is it asking too much to provide a decent education for his children? Is it asking too much from the greatest democracy on earth that human rights be respected before property rights?

I share the grief and shock felt in the hearts of millions of Americans across the Nation over the brutal slaying of Dr. King. This great tragedy denies the very principles which our Founding Fathers espoused in establishing our democratic form of government.

Dr. King's brilliant elocution, his international renown, his great courage on the firing line of civil rights have established him as a powerful force for sanity in race relations. He was universally hailed by almost all men and he had become for a broad mass of Americans the symbol of hope for reconciliation.

Dr. King had become the bridge of communication between whites and blacks alike in the United States, and his tragic assassination has struck grief, shock, numbness, and above all, a great sense of emptiness into the hearts of all of us. Together we mourn the passing of a great man whose life, though short, for he died at 39, has changed for the better the face of our social structure in the United States. Our country is a far different and better place today than when Martin Luther King first began his crusade for equality a little more than a decade ago in Montgomery, Ala. His death shall lead perhaps to even greater change. I am confident that we shall yet win the battle he courageously began for equal rights and equal economic opportunity.

It is expected that the civil rights bill will reach this Chamber for action on Wednesday. This bill would strike down racial barriers in housing. It would provide Federal protection for Negroes and civil rights workers, and it would make countless other improvements in our civil rights laws. By insuring the prompt passage of this landmark legislation, we keep faith with Dr. King's dream of unity, nonviolence, and social justice.

President Johnson has urged this Nation to "move with urgency, resolve, and new energy." Our opportunity to do so will come tomorrow, and I hope my colleagues will vote unanimously for the civil rights bill. Dr. King's death must be the unifying force we need as a Nation, and the best tribute that can be paid to him is for all of us to exert every possible effort toward wiping out discrimination, inequality, and the ravages of poverty.

By international consensus, Nobel Prize winner Martin Luther King was a symbol of racial peace in the world and his passing is a great loss not only to all Americans but to a world that had come to love, honor, and respect him.

On behalf of the residents of the Seventh Congressional District, I express my heartfelt condolences to his widow and to his family. I know that we shall always remember his courageous fight and the great cause for which he has given his life.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD the following editorials about Dr. King from the Washington Post and the Chicago Sun-Times:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 6, 1968]

HE SAW THE PROMISED LAND

In his last and eerily premonitory speech, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. envisioned a promised land of equality and social justice for all American Negroes. But, he said, "I may not get there with you." He talked of threats from "some of our sick white brothers." Within 24 hours the premonition came true; he was dead, the victim of a white assassin.

There is in this last sermon a message for all Americans and particularly those of both races who reject his credo that Christian brotherhood can and must be achieved in peace.

The promised land he saw cannot be reached by his people through violence. Nor can violence such as that which struck him down Thursday night prevent America's Negro citizens from inevitably reaching the promised land he now will never see.

More violence has followed the wanton act of violence that has put the entire world in mourning for this man who believed deeply that his dream of equality could never be achieved through violence. Stokely Carmichael has urged bloodshed in the streets in retaliation for the assassination of Dr. King. This is the road away from Dr. King, away from his promised land. He will have died in vain if sanity does not prevail in our cities.

A warning against violence has come from the man who has stepped into Dr. King's post as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Rev. Ralph Abernathy was with Dr. King when the assassin struck. Dr. Abernathy cradled the fallen leader's bloodied head in his lap.

"While he lived," said the new leader, "he taught us we should not let violence turn us around. . . . We (have) determined to continue down that road . . . in support of the dream he left with us."

Later he told a crowd at the Memphis airport, gathered around a plane in which Mrs. King sat, "Let us not do anything at this time to discredit Dr. King."

President Johnson spoke for all reasonable men when he called on people of all races "to stand their ground to deny violence its victory."

The killer of Dr. King must be found quickly and brought to justice. But neither the ends of justice nor the great goals of Dr. King are served if the hate and sickness the killer personifies rage across America.

Let all Americans work toward that promised land that Dr. King saw so clearly. Let his death bring that land closer—and not its destruction.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1968]

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

To each generation of mankind is given one or two rare spirits, touched by some divinity, who see visions and dream dreams. Committed to something outside themselves and beyond the orbit of ordinary lives, they serve their fellow-men as the movers and leaders of social change. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was one of these, a man whose extraordinary gifts were committed to humanity. Perhaps his tragic death was the means requisite to make real the purpose of his life.

An apostle of nonviolence, Dr. King was, nevertheless, a militant activist. He thought of nonviolence not as mere abstention from strife but as a vital mode of action. "We need an alternative to riots and to timid supplication," he once said. "Nonviolence is our most potent weapon." There was something at once mystical and pragmatic about his conception of nonviolence, In that great and moving letter he wrote from the Birmingham jail, Dr. King said: "Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and objective appraisal, we must see the need of having nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood."

He was a pacific man but an impatient one; and his impatience was the mark of his humanity. He burned with indignation at the indignities and humiliations and injustices that were the common lot of Negroes in the South and at the frustrations and inequalities and poverty that were their portion in the North. And he knew that "we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. History is the long and tragic story of the fact that privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily . . . We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed."

And he added to this a bitter, painful truth—a truth no less opposite today than when he uttered it five years ago: "For years now I have heard the word 'Wait!' It rings in the ear of every Negro with a piercing familiarity. This 'wait' has almost always meant 'never.'"

Yet, somehow, impatience and indignation were married in this man to gentleness and compassion. Hate was altogether alien to him. The dream he dreamed embraced his white as well as his black brothers. For he recognized that "the Negro needs the white man to free him from his fears. The white man needs the Negro to free him from his guilt. A doctrine of black supremacy is as evil as a doctrine of white supremacy."

His dream, so stirringly recited at the Lincoln Memorial at the time of the great March on Washington of 1963, was the oldest and noblest of man's dreams—the dream of universal brotherhood among the children of God. "I refuse," he said then, "to accept the idea that man is mere flotsam and jetsam in the river of life which surrounds him. I refuse to accept the view that mankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daybreak of peace and brotherhood can never become a reality."

So he has been struck down by the very bigotry he sought to exorcise—and before the dream could become a reality. If the dream embraced both white and black, the grief and bereavement are shared by them as well. It is meet that there should be mourning in the land. The flags belong at half-staff for the loss of a great American. The schools ought to be closed on the day of his funeral in remembrance of one who so loved little children that he gave his life to set them free.

But the joining of hands in sharing sorrow must be more than ceremonial, more than momentary. The only true tribute to Martin Luther King, lover of life and lover of mankind, is a renewed dedication to his dream. He belongs now to all of us. The rich legacy he leaves can be enjoyed only as it is shared by all men alike. The legacy lies in his faith that "unconditional love will have the final word in reality."

The only way we can really achieve freedom is to somehow conquer the fear of death. For if a man has not discovered something that he will die for, he isn't fit to live.

Deep down in our non-violent creed is the conviction that there are some things so dear, some things so precious, some things so eternally true, that they are worth dying for.

And if a man happens to be 36 years old, as I happen to be, and some great truth stands before the door of his life, some great opportunity to stand up for that which is right and that which is just, and he refuses to stand up because he wants to live a little longer and he is afraid his home will get bombed, or he is afraid that he will lose his job, or he is afraid that he will get shot . . . he may go on and live until he's 80, and the cessation of breathing in his life is merely the belated announcement of an earlier death of the spirit.

Man dies when he refuses to stand up for that which is right. A man dies when he refuses to take a stand for that which is true. So we are going to stand up right here . . . letting the world know we are determined to be free." (Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., in a 1965 speech.)

INFLAMATORY SPEECHES, THE SUPREME COURT, AND RIOTS

Mr. WHITTEN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the shooting of a human being with malice aforethought is murder in the first degree. The killing of Dr. King in Memphis by a sniper is murder of the worst kind and is deeply regretted by all right-thinking people of all races. I know it is a source of sorrow to the people of that city.

Certainly I hope, as all Members do, that the person guilty of such act is captured, convicted, and properly sentenced.

However, Mr. Speaker, the taking of a human life can never be a just cause for the destructive forces we have seen sweep the country. It is simply the excuse. Who would have believed that this Nation would come to such a place that large sections of our cities would be destroyed by thieves and looters, business houses burned, homes destroyed, lives taken all across the land. Who would have thought that American soldiers of all races would be sent into an area where there were hoodlums and outlaws and snipers, almost without number, to attempt to prevent not only theft and arson but murder without ammunition in their guns and, to cap the climax, have a special representative of the executive department go on television to advise these snipers that they were dealing with troops with no loads in their rifles and with leather covers on their bayonets?

Mr. Speaker, this type of thing has gone on far too long for us not to try to seek out the causes and attempt to correct them.

Having been a district attorney in an area where the races were perhaps evenly balanced, I can say to the Members that I discharged my responsibility without fear or favor, and I believe

earned the respect and friendship of all our people.

Mr. Speaker, as we try to determine how this terrible situation came about we cannot overlook the leaders in the executive department, and elsewhere who have made speeches agreeing that they did not blame people for taking the law into their hands when they believed they were not being treated right and where they felt they did not enjoy what to them seemed to be a fair share of the Nation's wealth.

We cannot avoid looking at the Supreme Court of the United States and its decisions. Those national figures whose intemperate and inflammatory speeches have done more than anything else to create the atmosphere which has led to murder and death many times over led by or at least supported by the Supreme Court, which by coddling law violators, have led them on.

I have read many articles and many explanations, have read many reports and heard many speeches in all of which it seemed to me the authors and the spokesmen were trying their best to point the finger of blame some place other than where the cause lies; and that cause lies with these public officials and others and the Supreme Court which, in turn, has subordinated the rights of the public, of the community to privileges which it granted to the individual.

The Supreme Court, which is mentioned last in the Constitution, without a dollar to pay itself or an individual to enforce its decrees, in recent years has put court-created privileges of the law violator ahead of rights of the community in at least 35 different instances.

It is sad, Mr. Speaker, to think of those who have suffered most from this crowd which has been burning and destroying property, looting and doing injury to law-abiding citizens of all races. Homes have been destroyed, business houses burned. Many people could not buy milk and food and are now left homeless and jobless.

Most Americans are good citizens, but this Supreme Court has repeatedly acted to release—on technicalities—agitators, rapists, murderers, and revolutionists upon innocent members of the general public. Society itself cannot long last unless the Supreme Court changes its views.

How can the members of the Court and those in the executive department who have condoned if not encouraged these actions, who have created an atmosphere of hate where none existed before which has led to this tragic era, avoid their responsibility for it and for the near anarchy which seems to face us?

We must stop the Supreme Court from its actions of setting itself up as a "supreme department," and hold those making inflamatory speeches accountable for their actions. A country may be saved and once again the indivdual who destroys, who robs, who kills, will be held accountable for violating the rules of society—the laws so necessary for the general welfare. Once again the rights of society will prevail and the Supreme Court will again be forced back to its constitutional power, that of a court as the Founding Fathers intended it, and not a five-man dictatorship as the Congress and the President have let it become.

To this end I have introduced House Resolution 904, providing for a standing Committee on the Constitution. If we can get hearings on that resolution, all we need do to indict the actions of the Court before the people of this Nation is to read the dissenting opinions of individual judges of the Supreme Court as to their colleagues.

I hope that you and other Members of the Congress, and other interested citizens will do what you can to urge the support of a Standing Committee in the House of Representatives on the Constitution. As I have said many times such a committee may help us to again become a nation where the rights of the general public are paramount; a nation where the person who works and saves to accumulate property will be protected in the enjoyment of the fruits of his labor; a nation whose Constitution once again guarantees to our people freedom of religion—not freedom from religion—as it was intended by our forefathers.

DESTRUCTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY MUST STOP

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I personally deplore the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, for it was a tragic, useless act and most regrettable. But equally deplorable, and as far as the future of this Nation is concerned, even more serious, is the action of those who choose to flaunt the laws on the statute books of this Nation and the individual States. By no stretch of the imagination can the rioting and the destruction of American citizen's personal property be construed as a civil rights act. A more adequate description would be a criminal rights act. Over a year ago, in an address before the State convention of a fine organization known as the North Carolina Negro Police Association, I made the statement that "there is no greater civil right than that of the protection of one's property and life." I have just returned from the First District of North Carolina, which I have the honor of representing in the Congress at this time, and I am convinced that there are no finer people, of both races, and they are bewildered, confused, and angry. The news media, mainly television, has constantly shown acts of violence, the destroying of one's business, and has tragically shown the officers of the law standing helplessly by with orders not to interfere. They are rightfully asking, why, what has happened? What can we do to protect our property, and yes, our life savings?

Lest this be construed as a race issue, let me point out that in many instances in the larger cities, it is the law-abiding Negro citizen who becomes a victim of these hoodlums who practice robbery and arson for the mere thrill of the matter. It is wishful thinking to believe that mass appropriations will remedy this situation, this complete disintegration of law and order. It is folly to think that it will get better, for the events of the past 24 months prove that we are finding an alarming increase in these so-called incidents. Where nonviolence is practiced, I think it is incumbent on those charged with enforcement of our criminal laws to also practice nonviolence. But on the other hand, if our law-abiding citizens are to have any degree of protection and security then it is equally important that where violence is practiced then our law-enforcement agencies should be granted the same opportunity. In times of floods, hurricanes, and other local and national disasters, we declare martial law, and those who do not respect the rights and property of others are notified and can expect to be dealt with severely, even to the point of death.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge from the Chief Executive to all levels of government, both State and local, that we untie the hands of those we have employed to do a job, and permit them to function effectively for the sake of protecting the life and property of the law-abiding citizen. To those of you who continue to insist on a "Great Society," it is an inescapable truth that at the same time we must work toward the perfection of a "decent society," and an utter disregard for the criminal laws and the rights of others certainly is detrimental to both objectives. To this date we have lost some 23,000 men in Vietnam. Hopefully, before not too long, we will be able to remove most of our fighting men from those foreign shores. It is deeply disturbing to think that they might well return to this Nation after fighting for the security and orderly processes of a foreign nation and find here in the United States a criminally sick dominated society. It is my hope that the American people and this Congress itself will realize that the hour is late and that we must take corrective measures, however strong and harsh they might be.

CRIMINAL RIOTERS SHOULD BE PROSECUTED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, until now, I have refrained from making any statement concerning the assassination of Martin Luther King and the events which followed. Too often, statements made during the height of emotion are later regretted. However, I feel that some of my thoughts should be made public.

Surely none of us would condone the action of the cowardly killer who took the life of Martin Luther King. This senseless and tragic act has only compounded the already tense situation which exists in our country. Hopefully, this assassin

will soon be apprehended and brought to the bar of justice.

Martin Luther King was the leader of many of our Nation's people. As such, he commanded the admiration of those who followed him. He was also respected by many who took no active part in his campaign, but who believed in his methods and his goals.

With Martin Luther King gone, a new leader will eventually come to the forefront. It is quite possible, even probable, that this leader will be an advocate of violence. Already in the wings are such men as Stokely Carmichael who make no secret of their violent attitudes.

Mr. Speaker, I would address myself also to the riots which followed the death of Martin Luther King. Not in my wildest imagination can I relate the looting, burning, and rioting with the death of this man, for surely the people who took part in these acts of violence were not following their professed leader, who preached nonviolent policies.

My heart was indeed saddened last Friday as I looked across the Capitol complex and saw the smoke and fires set by those who have no love for their country, and as I watched the Federal troops setting up machineguns here on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, I was troubled and disturbed and asked myself repeatedly, what are we coming to in this great land of ours?

Only in the South, where Martin Luther King was the most active, did the demonstrations which followed his death remain peaceful and this is certainly commendable on the part of his followers in Birmingham and Montgomery and Atlanta and other southern cities.

Mr. Speaker, no one gains from riots—the losers include everyone—those who loot and burn and riot; the law: enforcement officers and firemen, who risk their lives; the victims, both black and white, whose businesses and homes have been burned out and looted; the community loses; the State and the Nation loses.

Stern decisive action in dealing with those who have been caught and charged with arson and looting is in order. Justice is not served nor future riots deterred if the judges, who preside over the courts in these cases, fail to assess those who perpetrate these acts to the full extent of the law. In my judgment, maximum fines and maximum jail sentences must be handed down if we are to, in any way, slow down the terror of civil disobedience, and those who would release these thugs, militant agitators, hate mongers, and rabble rousers without punishment, must share a large portion of the blame for turmoil in our city streets.

It is time for our Nation to stand up to those who would destroy and burn and to deal severely with those who participate in these crimes. I call on the courts of this Capital City for the prompt prosecution of these criminals in meting out proper, full, and substantial punishment in an effort to halt these civil insurrections and to deter those who would contemplate further disgraceful riots in the weeks and months ahead. This, Mr. Speaker, should now be the first order of business.

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleague on the Committee on Education and Labor, Congressman MEEDS, and I introduced identical legislation to revamp our vocational education system. My bill is known as H.R. 16460, and Congressman MEED'S bill is known as H.R. 16461.

This legislation would call for a huge overhaul of our educational system, and provide career training for the young people of our country. It would assure that every young American graduate from high school with a marketable skill.

In the wake of what has happened all over this country in the past few days, I might say the introduction of this legislation was somewhat prophetic for, indeed, I believe when we look at the ruins in America and learn what the causes were that let it happen over the past weekend, I believe that we can attribute a great deal of this to the complete breakdown of the American educational system.

An editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune points that out very appropriately when it says that in the Tribune's judgment, improvements of the elementary and high schools in the cities should have top priority.

The Chicago Tribune also makes reference to a report filed by the Republican committee on the plight of the American schools.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to put this editorial in the RECORD today because I will welcome all the help that I can get from both sides of the aisle to get at this problem and get at it effectively.

The Chicago Tribune points out that the report of the Republican committee states that in the 15 largest cities of our country 60 percent of the 10th grade pupils from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school. Unemployment and delinquency rates among these dropouts are high. Many of them were participants in the recent rioting.

I have been pointing this tragic fact out to my colleagues for some time and I welcome support from the Republicans to help resolve what I have said is the Nation's foremost problem.

So I say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that I hope we can all get behind this legislation and make a constructive contribution toward helping solve these problems.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial I have been referring to is as follows:

HOPE OF THE FUTURE

The latest wave of rioting in American cities will renew the pressures for big federal and state spending programs to help the Negroes. Some of the proposals will be worthy, some will have dubious value, and some will be pipe dreams. At any rate, some will be more deserving than others, and therefore should have first call on the available funds.

In our judgment, improvement of the elementary and high schools in the cities should have top priority. We agree in general with a report just made public by the Republican party's coordinating committee which outlined the problem and proposed remedies.

In the nation's 15 largest cities, the committee said, 60 per cent of the 10th grade pupils from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school. Unemployment and delinquency rates among these dropouts are high. Many of them were participants in the recent riots.

In addition to the dropouts, however, there are many possessors of high school diplomas who are so badly educated that they are unqualified for most jobs in today's labor market. The "hard core" unemployed, whom business men are now trying to train, are the products of a deficient educational system.

The Republican coordinating committee recommended that a "vast commitment of educational resources—funds, facilities, personnel, and leadership—must be summoned at all levels of government" to overcome the educational "deficit" in the cities.

Here in Illinois the legislature in recent years has gone hog wild in its appropriations for higher educational institutions. Politicians from each section of the state vied with each other to get bigger and better universities and junior colleges. There was no corresponding pressure to provide adequate funds for the city schools, which have been engulfed by the children of impoverished migrants from the southern states and Puerto Rico.

A recent series of articles by Casey Banas, the Tribune's education editor, showed vividly that Chicago needs many new schools to relieve crowding and to replace buildings 50 or more years old. Better teachers are needed in the schools serving low income families. More special classes are needed for disturbed children and trouble makers.

The Republican coordinating committee was right in saying that personnel and leadership are required, as well as additional funds. For example, the teachers union should be forced to end its knuckleheaded opposition to any changes in the teacher transfer system that would permit assignment of more skilled teachers to schools in the slums. Teachers assigned there have difficult jobs and should receive higher pay. Until they do, the pupils in slum schools probably will continue to be taught by inexperienced substitutes, and sometimes by 8th graders.

Greater efforts also ought to be made to employ team teaching in such schools. A team teaching plan has been developed for Chicago district 8 [the west side riot area], but funds have been lacking to put it into effect.

Large sums are being spent on welfare programs, prison systems, and insurance on buildings burned and looted by rioters. Some of this money could be saved if more money were spent on education.

It is worth noting that schools on the west side, close to the recent scenes of violence, were almost untouched by the rioters. Perhaps they had sense enough to realize that the schools are the hope of their children's future.

PROPOSED NATIONAL MUSEUM AND REPOSITORY OF NEGRO HISTORY AND CULTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to establish a National Museum and Repository of Negro History and Culture at Wilberforce, Ohio. I was joined by a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who shared my belief that there is a particular need at this point in our Nation's history for such a museum expressing a positive purpose.

In view of the unfortunate events of the past week, our Nation needs the reconciliation between the races which can be fostered by the museum I have proposed. Certainly, our unique American culture is a living, vital thing which changes with every passing year. Many racial and ethnic backgrounds have contributed to that culture. Among these contributions, the Negro ranks high in what he has given to our society in arts and entertainment, science and letters, religion, politics, and many other areas.

There should be a place where all Americans can go and see graphically demonstrated the nature of these contributions. There should be a place where Negro Americans can share the pride of their participation in American life and our mutual, if sometimes difficult, struggle to accomplish the goals of the American dream.

My bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish the museum and to acquire the required land and buildings through funds to be made available by the Federal Government, as well as from gifts and donations. The Secretary is authorized to consult and cooperate with the officials of Wilberforce and Central State Universities located at Wilberforce and with appropriate historical societies and other interested persons concerning the development and operation of this museum.

The Wilberforce area is designated as the location of the museum because it is the location of the first institution of higher learning for Negroes in the United States, because it is on the mainline of the underground railroad which operated to assist slaves seeking freedom in the North, and because it was a center of the abolition movement.

I commend the legislation to the attention of my colleagues and urge their sponsorship and support of this bill, H.R. 16507.

PROSECUTING CARMICHAEL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the vital necessity for prompt application of firm force to meet lawlessness has been demonstrated over the past few days in our own Washington metropolitan area.

Fortunately, there is ample law to prosecute those looters and arsonists and other lawbreakers among the more than 5,000 who have been arrested in the disorders that have occurred in our city.

I am advised that judges are meting out proper and appropriate punishment to the wrongdoers—and I heartily concur.

In the same area of judicial activity, those who use any vehicle to foment discord and violence must be dealt with by the Federal authorities with promptness and firmness.

To this end, I would like to bring the attention of the House to an editorial from yesterday's Evening Star.

PROSECUTING CARMICHAEL

Now that the looting and the burning have subsided, the question of whether to prosecute Stokely Carmichael under the anti-riot provisions of the District's new crime law is believed to be receiving high-level attention.

Carmichael is reported to have told a street crowd on Thursday night: "Go home and get you a gun and then come back because I got me a gun." There apparently is only one witness who might be relied upon to testify to this remark. On Friday morning, however, Carmichael said much the same thing at a press conference. Among his several inflammatory statements during the conference was this: The killing of Dr. King "made it a lot easier for a lot of Negroes—they know it's time to get guns now."

Carmichael, we suppose, would contend that his remarks stop short of a specific incitement to riot. But it seems to us that there is enough evidence to justify a prosecution. If he should be brought to trial and acquitted, then the need for a broader anti-riot law will at least have been established.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. RAILSBACK. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, while a member of the Illinois General Assembly I always supported civil rights legislation.

I am very much concerned however, about one particular provision under title 803, the open occupancy section of the bill. It seems to me section 803(b)(1) has the effect of unwisely discriminating against real estate brokers, agents, salesmen, or their representatives. It encourages people to avoid using the services of these persons in the event they are apprehensive about being brought under the provisions of this title. If this is not corrected it could have, and probably would have, the effect of causing people to quit using the services of the professional realtor.

I am attaching a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News under date of Wednesday, March 13, 1968, which is directed to this very point. I might add that the Chicago Daily News has always, in my memory, favored civil rights legislation as well as open occupancy legislation.

I realize that if the bill is sent to conference this provision could be corrected. In the event that it is not sent to conference it should still be corrected by the introduction of legislation designed to do away with this discriminatory feature. I intend to introduce such legislation if the bill is not sent to conference. The editorial follows:

FLAW IN THE HOUSING BILL

The civil rights bill passed by the Senate after agonizing weeks of debate is one of those compromises that is wholly satisfactory to very few people. But if it falls short of triumph for liberals and conservatives alike, it nevertheless marks another faltering step toward the equality of opportunity that remains this nation's goal.

The feature of the bill that stalled the Senate for weeks was its fair-housing provision. *For the first time, this bill would involve the federal government in the sale or rental of individual homes,* and lower racial barriers in 80 per cent of the nation's dwellings.

The compromise hammered out on the floor of the Senate contains an escape clause that may prove bigger than the lawmakers intended. *And it deals unfairly, in our opinion, with the real estate agents by putting them in a position of policing fair housing.*

The bill provides that an individual who owns up to three homes is exempt from restrictions—in other words he may discriminate—in renting or selling his property *provided he does not use the services of a real estate agent.* Predictably, this would have a double effect. *It forces the real estate agent to evaluate the intentions of the owner who seeks help in finding a renter or a buyer. And it shuts him out of transactions that are legitimate for an owner acting alone, with a consequent loss of business and fees.*

Given the politics of the situation, it is perhaps understandable that the Senate had to leave a loophole or see the whole effort to move toward fair housing go down the drain. But if the homeowner is given a license to discriminate, and made to bear the onus for that action, *the law should require no more of the agent than that he make a conscientious effort to bring buyer and seller together, regardless of race, creed or color.*

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADE

Mr. BUSH. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the violence, the emotion, and the lack of regard for property displayed by a very small minority of our people in the last few days has left us all in a somewhat shocked condition. We all talk a great deal about law and order, but there can be no law and order unless we, as responsible citizens and property owners, want it and are willing to enforce it. There are not enough police in this country to stand guard over every grocery store, liquor store, or clothing store in the country and they are not meant to do so.

There are those of us who would say that the police, in Washington for example, did not do enough to protect the property owner from looting and from the burning of homes—we all watched the television stories showing young men, women, and children looting and a lone police officer watching it happen.

I believe I speak for the people of my congressional district when I favor strong, prompt, and forceful law en-

forcement. Riots can not be permitted to blossom. But in addition to strong, immediate law enforcement, I also advocate involvement. It is important that those citizens who have a stake in the community, especially those in the so-called ghetto areas who could be burned out by riot situations be active and constructively channeled toward community action.

This is why I am so enthusiastic about concepts like the Neighborhood Action Crusade. The Neighborhood Action Crusade is a program designed to enlist voluntary help in the poverty areas where riots are liable to break out. These volunteers could become a stabilizing influence to defuse the tensions that can lead to rioting.

Local neighborhood leaders, working within their own areas, can provide continuing communication and positive direction in this crusade to assure peace in America's cities. In many instances, this should be done on a block-by-block basis. Volunteers would serve in their neighborhoods. This idea recalls the air raid warden program in England during World War II. Here volunteers asked what they could do for their country and took admittedly hazardous duty without pay to help weather a crisis.

Let us get the people of the block involved in what is going on in the block—let us develop constructive leadership in the block. This is the only long-range answer—but it will only work if it is voluntary—it cannot be legislated.

What, then, can we as Members of Congress do? Are we helpless in riot situations. No, we are not. We can use the leadership of our office to encourage the development of ideas like the Neighborhood Action Crusade in our home districts and we can encourage the President to endorse this concept—to use the persuasive powers of his office to encourage the cities of this country to put programs like this into effect.

We can rebuild stores, homes, and anything else that gets burned, but we cannot guarantee they will not be burned and looted 2 years from now. The only way to get this kind of guarantee is for each of us personally to do our best to see that his kind of leadership and interest is developed at the block level.

INEFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP INVESTIGATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are rightfully concerned about the failure to provide effective law and order for our people, and to prevent looting and destruction of our cities.

The many citizens of the United States are fully aware that our peace officers and the Federal troops have all but been rendered ineffective because of orders from someone which, in effect, utilized the forces of law and order to protect the looters and rioters from an angry citizenry. In many cases, police and soldiers have even been photographed standing idly by while private property is being carried out of stores and shops. Why? Have our lawmen and Federal troops been curtailed in effectiveness to where they constitute but a mental deterrent against violence and looting?

Hundreds of thousands of Americans want to know why some 20 hours elapsed in our Nation's Capital before the Federal troops were called to offer at most an image of concern over the wholesale burning and looting.

The Alice-in-Wonderland myth that violence might have occurred had action been taken to interfere with the looters just cannot be accepted as an excuse or justification for delay and inaction.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that this House owes a duty to every American citizen to ascertain why, in the Federal District of Columbia, the headquarters of the Government of all our people, the President did not act immediately and effectively to protect life and property. For this reason, I am introducing today a resolution calling for a special investigation of this matter by a select committee to be composed of members of both parties appointed by the Speaker.

Commonsense dictates that such committee summon and interview Cyrus Vance, personal representative to the President; Walter Washington, District Commissioner; and Patrick Murphy, Commissioner of District Police, all appointees of the President.

This is our Nation's Capital, the nerve center of the American people—the symbol of free men throughout a troubled world. To have Washington, D.C., trampled and destroyed is a disgusting insult to every loyal American who demands to know "why" and for what reason.

DESTRUCTION AS A RESULT OF THE RECENT RIOTS AND TRIBUTE TO THE FORCES MAINTAINING ORDER

Mr. RIVERS. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thought the House would be interested in knowing that during the last 2 mornings I have been visiting the devastation here in the Capital accompanied by the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army. I saw the most terrible sights I have seen since I visited the burned out cities of World War II.

For those who have not seen the destruction, it reminds me of incendiary bomb damage. Here there is desolation and destruction brought about by a group of men—and I asked this question specifically—averaging between the ages of 25 and 35, who are the leaders. These are hardened criminal types who, in the opinion of those who know, are closely associated with one Stokely Carmichael, and his inflammatory remarks at Howard University and elsewhere in the District of Columbia.

I also visited elements of the 82d Airborne Division, as well as the District of Columbia National Guard and Air National Guard units this morning. I started my tour by car and finished the tour in a helicopter. We can be proud of our servicemen—white and colored. We can also be proud of the policemen assigned to this arduous task, who endured insufferable insults, as well as our firemen.

At the same time, we should all be mortified by the looters and the rioters who, in many areas before the troops arrived, flaunted their crimes in the faces of our policemen.

Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is a hideous reminder of the most monumental ingratitude that ever befell a minority group of people. It sickens the sensibilities of the leaders—and they are colored—of this community. Those with whom I talked are ashamed of that small minority of a minority group who put into effect their contingency plans of destruction. These plans were already made, and they picked these contingency plans off the shelf to wreak havoc in Washington and other cities.

This was no accident, Mr. Speaker. This is a disgrace. This is a tragedy. They should not be rewarded. There can be no justification for what these people have done to the capital of the world, the model city for Negro opportunity.

A BIT MORE JUSTICE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Secretray of Housing and Urban Development Robert C. Weaver has issued a directive to local urban renewal agencies that is a major accomplishment in protecting the rights of property owners in urban renewal areas. Under this new order, local agencies must make a first offer of a fair market price for property to be taken in the urban renewal project. In the past, these agencies frequently have offered a lower price, assuming the owner would negotiate, and leaving the agency some bargaining room. The trouble is that many poorer people, unaware of legal remedies available to them, accepted the first low bid.

The Providence Journal, in an editorial praising HUD's action, said:

> It could be argued that the federal government is obligated to buy at the lowest possible price when spending taxpayer's money, and this goal undoubtedly has been a factor. It is argued far more reasonably, however, that when an owner is forced by law to sell his property, he is entitled to receive a fair price without filing suit in court.

Mr. Speaker, the entire editorial is worth reading and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

> A BIT MORE JUSTICE
>
> A new directive issued by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development may strike many people as a technical re-

adjustment of little note. Certainly, it ranks as only a footnote to the nation's mammoth problems of urban renewal. Call it, if you will, a bit more justice for the disadvantaged.

It has been standard procedure in many urban renewal agencies around the country when taking land by eminent domain to offer owners less than fair market price. This policy, said a HUD official, gave an agency "a little bargaining position" should the need for negotiations arise.

It could be argued that the federal government is obligated to buy at the lowest possible price when spending taxpayers' money, and this goal undoubtedly has been a factor. It is argued far more reasonably, however, that when an owner is forced by law to sell his property, he is entitled to receive a fair price without filing suit in court.

Secretary Robert C. Weaver of HUD has ordered local agencies to revise their practices in accord with this policy. He has said the initial offer must be at fair market value, and since HUD holds powerful purse strings, the order is likely to be obeyed.

Those wronged by previous practices have not been persons familiar with the law and their rights, aware that an unsatisfactory offer could be taken to court for possible upward adjustment. HUD concedes that many poor people, lacking in sophistication, simply accepted the initial offer and received less than their property was worth on the market.

HUD has introduced a commendable change. Unfortunately it has taken a year to alter machinery putting it into effect. It will not affect much urban renewal already in hand in this country. But it will correct a wrong, undergird the standards of fairness in acquiring property, and tend to strengthen a program that frequently has been the target of critics who all too often had sound reason to complain.

AMERICA, THE VIOLENT

Mr. BURKE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial which appeared in the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger on Saturday, April 6, 1968. I feel that it is a very timely statement and that it brings out some points which deserve to be raised. It follows:

AMERICA, THE VIOLENT

The murder of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. has shocked and saddened Americans, and aroused fears of further violence.

Decent Americans by now should have had enough of the sickness in our society upon which violence feeds. It is outrageous that the United States should be torn by lawlessness, racial strife and senseless violence. Dr. King's assassination should touch off a wave of mass indignation against the violent behavior which threatens to destroy our nation.

H. Rap Brown was not far wrong when he said not too long ago, "Violence is as American as cherry pie." All nations have had their fanatics and homicidal psycopaths. But violence in the United States is not confined to an aberrant few. It is very much a part of our culture.

More than any other nation, we have made national heros out of our brawling forebears, the two-fisted, gun-totin' frontiersman and even the most notorious criminals. From the gunslinging tales of the Old West to the present cult of "Bonnie and Clyde" we have idolized the aggressive, anti-social individualist taking the law into his own hands.

Violence permeates our television programming, our popular music, the stage and our literature. To bring our sons up the right way we buy them toy weapons. In our mass culture, we seem to have a morbid fascination with violence, and those who produce it are only meeting the popular demand.

The argument that violence on the stage or on television provides a healthy outlet for aggressive emotions fed by an intensely competitive society hardly meets the test of reality.

Crimes of violence are at an all-time high; our cities have been wracked with rioting and nearly daily protests of one kind or another; we dare not send too many military forces abroad because they may be needed to keep order in urban areas this summer; the President has labeled his anti-crime legislation the "Safe Streets Act;" hoodlums in the Boston area have murdered each other with impunity.

No, the violence we have glorified in our mass culture is far from a cardboard bogeyman that serves as a peaceful substitute for the real thing. And nothing demonstrates the degree to which hatred can erupt into appalling acts of violence better than the series of political assassinations that have shocked America in the past five years.

Assassins have murdered some of our greatest and some of our most disreputable leaders: President Kennedy, Dr. King, Medgar Evers, Malcolm X, George Lincoln Rockwell. Those who may feel the apostles of hate merely got what they deserved should realize that the act is the same whether a Rockwell or a King is the victim.

We do not know the answer to this problem. Legislation can help maintain order, but laws cannot wipe out hatred or animal impulse, nor can they create brotherhood where there is no real commitment to it. But we do know this: a civilization that exalts violence as a kind of perverse virtue and regularly practices it on the streets badly needs a remedy—and fast, before our society degenerates into total anarchy.

ROGERS AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN AID BILL SAVES $452 MILLION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago I offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which was adopted and has been in effect since. The amendment directs the State Department to reduce and eventually terminate bilateral grants and gifts to foreign countries receiving U.S. aid.

I am pleased to report that the intent of that amendment is being carried out and has resulted in a savings of $452 million.

Mr. Alex Dickie, of the Agency for International Development, has informed me that since the amendment was adopted, 34 countries have been completely phased out of the program, a reduction from the original list of 41, leaving seven on the list. Originally there were also 77 countries participating in technical assistance programs. This number has been reduced to 53, a reduction of 24 countries.

It is my hope that the State Department will continue to carry out the intent of my amendment and to strictly administer it until the program eventually is completely phased out.

At this time I insert in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Dickie:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1968.

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: Thank you for your inquiry regarding compliance with the Rogers Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Section 634(e)).

With reference to supporting-type assistance, the total request made by the Executive Branch has declined from $1,047 million in FY 1959 to $595 million in Fiscal Year 1969—a reduction of $452 million. As the figures on an attached chart show, this reduction would have been considerably larger were it not for the necessity of funding increased activities in Vietnam. Use of Supporting Assistance for countries other than Vietnam has declined significantly. For example, in FY 1961 these programs totalled $653 million, and in FY 1969 the amount proposed is $115 million. The number of countries receiving such assistance has been reduced from 41 in FY 1959 to only 7 proposed for FY 1969—an overall reduction of 34 countries.

With reference to technical cooperation-type assistance, the total reduction in the appropriation request from FY 1962 to FY 1969 is $35 million. The reduction in the number of countries has been 24—from 77 in FY 1962 to 53 proposed for FY 1969 (excluding 13 countries eligible only for small self-help funds ranging from $50,000 to $200,000).

I hope this information will be helpful to you, and if we can be of further assistance, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX DICKIE,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

SUPPORTING-TYPE ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION REQUESTS SINCE APPLICATION OF THE ROGERS AMENDMENT (SEC. 634(e))

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Appropriation request	Of which Vietnam program	Number of countries for which assistance programed
1959	$1,047	----------	41
1960	1,106	----------	42
1961	992	$117	34
1962	610	86	42
1963	481	116	22
1964	435	119	19
1965	405	201	14
1966	684	475	13
1967	747	550	14
1968 (estimated)	720	550	9
1969 (proposed)	595	480	7
Total reduction in request, 1959–69	[1] 452	----------	----------
Reduction in number of countries, 1959–69	----------	----------	34

[1] The figures show that the recent increase in supporting assistance funds results from the expansion of activities in Vietnam. Use of supporting assistance for countries other than Vietnam fell from $653,000,000 in fiscal year 1961 to $115,000,000 proposed for fiscal year 1969.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION-TYPE ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION REQUESTS SINCE APPLICATION OF THE ROGERS AMENDMENT (SEC. 634(E))

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Appropriation request	Of which Alliance for Progress	Number of countries for which assistance programed
1962	$380	----------	77
1963	435	$100	80
1964	357	100	79
1965	310	85	69
1966	295	85	67
1967	319	88	[1] 66
1968 (estimated)	353	110	[1] 62
1969 (proposed)	345	110	[1] 53
Total reduction in request; 1962–69	35	----------	----------
Reduction in number of countries, 1962–69	----------	----------	24

[1] Excludes countries eligible only for self-help funds ranging from $50,000 to $200,000.

TEACHERS-IN-POLITICS WEEKEND

Mrs. May. 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 gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes that teachers play an important and legitimate part in introducing youngsters to the fundamentals of our system for governing ourselves. It came as particularly welcome news to me, therefore, that the National Education Association and its constituent state associations set aside this April 5–7 weekend as Teachers-in-Politics Weekend to encourage full teacher participation in politics to achieve in an orderly fashion the educational benefits teachers desire for children and to improve the political climate of community, State, and Nation.

As a former high school teacher, I have long encouraged teachers to make the very maximum contribution in fostering citizenship among youth. The observance of Teachers-in-Politics Weekend is a healthy indication that teachers are occupied with what that role should be.

It would seem to me that the educator's responsibility extends beyond the recitation of historical and political fact. As a person of great importance in his community, it is imperative that he be actively engaged in the political process. It would be incongruous and self-defeating to promote citizenship and political involvement among one's students and then to remain aloof from such activity.

The teacher exercises significant influence upon those he instructs. The child looks up to him. In view of such influence, what effect does a teacher's noninvolvement with, or indifference or hostility toward, the political have upon his students? If the teacher says, "I cannot be bothered," then why should the student believe that he must be? I can think of no more compelling reason for political involvement by the teacher.

For the teacher of history and government, the matter of fostering citizenship is of particular concern. In the course of doing so it would be highly remiss of him to engage in party propagandizing in the classroom. He would be derelict in his duty as a teacher to promote one party while demeaning others. That does not mean that he must avoid all references to his party affiliation, nor that he must restrain from the expression of political opinion. To do either would only bewilder the child and frustrate the teacher.

It does mean, I think, that he must not force his particular opinions and preferences upon his students. It does mean that he should promote the widest range of political expression in his class while demonstrating great tolerance for that expression. It does mean that he should emphasize the value of political activity and the need for it if democracy is going to work.

Bernard Shaw once said that democracy is a device that insures we shall be governed no better than we deserve. In his incisive fashion Mr. Shaw well stated the end result of democratic government. The quality of that result rests with the nature and extent of public involvement in politics.

By inculcating in his students a keen appreciation for our form of government, by instilling in them a desire to engage in political activity, and by setting examples of positive citizenship themselves, teachers can and will make a significant contribution toward the goal of good government.

VILLAINOUS MURDER AND THE NEED FOR ACTION WITH REASON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the villainous murder of Dr. Martin Luther King calls for prompt action in the capture and punishment of the felon. It also calls for action with reason. As Dr. King said in Washington in August of 1963:

> Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

He also said:

> Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.

His life is accepted by millions here and abroad as a symbol of nonviolent effort for reform, certainly a noble symbol. In that speech Dr. King also expressed the hope that all Americans "will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." All Americans, white and black, can well endorse this principle as in the true aspirations of our country.

The Supreme Court many years ago said there are reasonable legal limits even to the exercise of free speech and cited as an example the evil deed of shouting "fire" when there was none, in a crowded theater.

Two things need to be done if we are to find an answer in reason for the problems of racial unrest in our country. One is to enforce the law. I refer not only to the looting, murder and arson in our big cities under the guise of racial strife, but also to the provocation of such by those who assert that if they seek reforms it is proper to bend or break the law to call attention to needed reform or to frighten the Government into complying with what they feel is a proper objective. Such anarchy can lead to the death of democracy in our beloved Nation. It has done so before in history. J. Edgar Hoover in an article in the March 24 edition of the Sunday New York News, said:

> Several factors can be identified in this increasing disrespect for the law. First is the concept of civil disobedience, a diabolical doctrine with tragic consequences for our society. Proponents of this theory assert that civil disobedience is justifiable if the acts are open, not violent, respectful of the rights of others, and have the purpose of focusing attention on significant moral issues of the day.
>
> To some individuals imbued with zeal to correct abuses in society, the appeal of civil disobedience is great. They feel they are only "bending" the law, not breaking it—that their transgressions are only "minor" and "unimportant."
>
> Suppose every individual or group which believed it had a righteous cause did the same! What would happen? Society would break down completely.

Besides returning to law and order and its rigid enforcement, we need to go forward with legislation and programs which will realistically and with reason meet the challenge and opportunity to create equal opportunities for all Americans. Instead Congress has legislated racially and areawise, and has created false and unattainable hopes. Congress has by this course increased tensions and frustrations rather than eliminating them.

In a democracy based on reason there should be equality of opportunity for all to enjoy freedom in employment, freedom of association, freedom to own and control property and a host of other freedoms. I see no reason to destroy these freedoms in order to find the answers to problems which beset us today. An example in my mail today is a letter from a constituent who tells me that since she does not live in a specially designated poverty area, her retarded child cannot get the benefits of the schooling he needs and which is furnished to others who live in the designated geographical boundaries. There would be nothing wrong in Federal assistance being limited to certain income brackets but there is certainly something wrong in depriving one citizen of benefits simply because of an arbitrary geographical boundary.

I employ Negroes in my office staff, appoint Negro pages, and nominate Negroes to the academies. As far as I know I make no discrimination for or against Negroes. This is as it should be. They are considered on their individual merits and we should stop enacting laws which are designed for one race, as this tends to divide us rather than to unify our country. The dangers inherent in our present course were pointed out by the recent report on civil disorders, although I must add that I disagree with some of the conclusions of that report, particularly their point of view that white people are so culpable as they outline. Ac-

tually legislation from Congress, representing many more whites than blacks, has spent billions of dollars and forced many social changes designed primarily to help the Negro. The result has been more strife on a racial basis, not less. One aspect of the report I think was highly praiseworthy. This is the part dealing with a new concept of free enterprise-Government cooperation for the production of jobs for the hard-core unemployed, regardless of race. My bill, H.R. 15870, was the first bill introduced in Congress to carry out this recommendation; and I believe that it offers more chance for good action with reason than any other measure before us today.

Finally, we must be practical in any laws we enact. What is most needed today is understanding and affection for our fellow man. Anarchy among us cannot aid that objective. Laws of nature cannot be changed by human laws. Laws not first written in the souls of men, like tracings by fingertips in wet beach sands, dissolve by the force of the superior laws of nature.

U.S. PAVILION AT SAN ANTONIO'S HEMISFAIR '68

Mr. ROONEY of New York. 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. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled last night when reading the Washington Evening Star of Monday, April 8, to find the following article entitled "Shocks Many—Displeases Lady Bird" written by Isabelle Shelton, Star staffwriter. From this article it would appear that our First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, visited the U.S. pavilion at San Antonio's HemisFair '68 and found there was being shown a 23-minute film about which, she is alleged to have said, "showed all of the minuses, but none of the plusses of American life today." It is alleged that this film features choked highways, nauseatingly polluted rivers, frightful slums, both black and white, and equally depressing rural poverty scenes. One last riot scene looked all too much like those that flared in several cities across America the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States under the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1967, known as Public Law 89–697, appropriated $6,750,000 for a proper and substantial U.S. exhibit. This is not the first time that the area in the Department of Commerce, which handles this sort of thing, has gone off base, but I am confident that the new Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable C. R. Smith, will soon shake up the area.

The article that I referred to follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 8, 1968]

SHOCKS MANY—DISPLEASES LADY BIRD

(By Isabelle Shelton)

SAN ANTONIO.—Mrs. Lyndon Johnson ruffled some feathers in the U.S. Commerce department over the weekend by taking exception to the film "U.S." which is the pride of the official United States pavilion at San Antonio's Hemisfair '68.

The First Lady, who viewed the film after officially opening both the fair and the U.S. pavilion Saturday, told reporters she found the presentation "Very strong and artistic," but lacking in balance, because it left out "The element of hope."

The 23-minute film—A somewhat stark presentation of the nation's unsolved problems, including racial prejudice—"Showed all of the minuses, but none of the plusses" of American life today, said Mrs. Johnson.

"We haven't solved all our problems, but we are awake and busy," she commented.

SPOKESMEN REPLY

Spokesmen for the pavilion—a project of the Commerce department's exposition staff—replied tactfully yesterday that they thought the First Lady had missed the point the film seeks to convey.

The rest of exhibits in the U.S. Pavilion tell the "affirmative" story of U.S. progress, the spokesmen said.

The film, employing magnificent camera technique, and projected almost overpowering 37 x 14 foot curved screen, concentrates on the seamier side of the life in the U.S.A.

Startling and arresting film footage of unspoiled forests and mountains—what the narrator calls the "Virgin wilderness . . . waiting, be wakened by western man"—the film then switches to the worst aspects of America today.

AMERICA TODAY

There are choked highways, nauseatingly polluted rivers, frightful slums, both black and white, and equally depressing rural poverty scenes. One race riot scene looked all too much like those that flared in several cities across America the last few days.

One particularly memorable sequence shows a well-dressed, attractive Negro family of four moving into a house in a pleasant-looking obviously white neighborhood.

The film does not show any violence being committed by the white families toward their new neighbors, but it portrays their hostility with chilling effect by simply recording the expression on their faces as the realization dawns on them that they now for the first time will have Negro neighbors.

Commerce department officials at the U.S. Pavilion say the film was deliberately designed to have just the kind of "sock in the eye effect" it apparently had on Mrs. Johnson.

"She doesn't need to be hit over the head with our unsolved problems; we know she and her husband are working every day to solve them," said the spokesman.

"But millions of Americans do need such a jab," he said.

The time is past when this nation should just brag over and over about what it has achieved. We do have great problems left—and they can only be solved when Americans face up to them, and insist that the government do something about them.

MOVE TO ACTION

"We want the four million or so Americans who will see this film to go away saying and feeling, "Let's quit passing the buck to Washington to solve these problems. It's our country and we've got to solve them."

Most of the 38 European journalists for whom Mrs. Johnson is conducting a five-day tour of Texas said they found the film very impressive, but a few of them also thought the message was almost too strong.

ROUGH ON AMERICANS

"I admire you for it, but my God you Americans are rough on yourselves" said one British editor.

"I hope you don't plan to send that film overseas, especially to developing nations where the people are unsophisticated about the U.S.," said another. Most people in Europe would probably recognize that you are just showing one side of America, not all of it. But unsophisticated people in Asia and Africa would think this is America.

Pavilion officials say there are absolutely no plans to show the film abroad—that it is intended to "wake up" Hemisfair-goers, the great majority of whom they expect to be citizens of the U.S.

The film—which pavilion officials admit they knew "would cause controversy"—was produced by Francis Thompson, who won an academy award in 1966 for the best documentary short subject. The winning film was "To Be Alive," one of the most popular attractions at New York's World's Fair, where it was a part of the Johnson's Wax exhibit.

Pavilion officials added an ironic footnote above the film, the sequence showing the Negro family moving to a white neighborhood was genuine, they said, to the extent that it was a genuine white neighborhood (in San Francisco), and the white persons who are shown reacting actually did live there.

REAL SITUATION

Only the Negro family members were hired actors. A white friend of producer Thompson agreed to lend his house for the purpose, and his white neighbors really did think a Negro family was moving into their midst. (The film crew later obtained their agreement to have their faces shown.)

What the film does not show, "Because we thought it too strong," pavilion spokesmen added, was the aftermath the next morning, when the house was plastered with paint and rotten tomatoes."

The final irony, it was added, was the fate of cameraman Hugh O'Connor, to whom the film is dedicated at the beginning.

After O'Connor finished the San Francisco sequence he went to Appalachia to film some of the poverty shots, where he "Was murdered by a marksman who didn't think his poverty should be shown."

The trial of the man charged with the killing is still pending.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. DULSKI. 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. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a leader of his people has fallen. Words are inadequate to express the grief of each of us at the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

President Johnson has spoken on behalf of our Nation. Many others, too, have spoken out publicly on this tragedy of our times. Some have elected to express their dismay and sadness privately, often in silent prayer at home or at church.

The common council of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., is not meeting in regular session this week. But Councilman Horace C. Johnson of the Masten district has filed a formal adjournment resolution to be used at the meeting on April 16.

Following is the text of the resolution which Mr. Johnson has adapted from the prayer of St. Joseph:

The Lord made Martin an instrument of his peace.
Where there was hatred, he sowed love.
Where there was injury, pardon.
Where there was doubt, faith.

Where there was despair, hope.
Where there was darkness, light.
Where there was sadness, joy.
He did not so much seek to be consoled as to console.
To be understood as to understand.
To be loved as to love.
For it was in Martin's giving that he received.
It was in his pardoning that he was pardoned.
And, it was in his dying that he was born to eternal life.

Be it therefore resolved: That when this Council adjourn today, that it adjourn in loving memory of a great man, a loyal American and a true and faithful child of God—Martin Luther King.

SLAYING OF DR. KING

Mr. KEITH. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker the senseless slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King has deprived America of one of its great leaders. Dr. King preached a philosophy of nonviolence. While it is true that violence often followed this man of peace, he would have been horrified and dismayed by the rioting and looting that broke out upon the news of his assassination. He would have been the first to point out that such violence hurts rather than helps the cause to which he was so devote. Dr. King taught us all, white and black, the precept of nonviolence in achieving social progress.

We should not tolerate nor condone the criminal lawlessness which is scarring our Nation. It is vicious, destructive, and totally alien to the great traditions of this country and to the teaching of the man in whose name it is being done. There may be reasons for the looting and rioting—but there can be no excuse or justification for them.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there should be no further delay in the passage of legislation designed to achieve social progress through the lawful processes of government. Martin Luther King believed in America and its promise. He knew and taught the power of peaceful change. Prompt passage of this civil rights legislation is another step in realizing Dr. King's "dream" that no one be judged by the color of his skin. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for House approval of the Senate bill as it stands, despite my belief that it could be improved in a House-Senate conference.

My record of support for civil rights legislation dates back to my days in the Massachusetts State Senate. There, I chaired the committee that was largely responsible for making Massachusetts open-housing law one of the best and most comprehensive in the country. During my 10 years in this Chamber, I have voted for every civil rights bill to come before us. My vote for the civil rights bill of 1968 will be a continuation of that record.

Mr. Speaker, the four major daily newspapers serving my congressional district have all carried excellent analyses of the race crisis confronting our country. Because this press points out both the futility of violence and the need for prompt action to guarantee equal rights to all, I include these editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Mar. 13, 1968]

FAIR HOUSING

The U.S. Senate has acted responsibly in passing a civil rights bill containing important provisions to end discrimination in the sale or rental of about 80 percent of the nation's housing.

While Congress enacted a number of needed civil rights measures in the early 1960s, it has previously shied from a strong federal fair housing law. A hard battle was fought in 1966, but fair housing legislation was shredded by a number of House amendments, and the sham bill that emerged fortunately was killed by the Senate.

The present measure attracted sufficient senatorial support to shut off a filibuster on the fourth cloture attempt this year. It is probably the strongest that could be approved by the Senate at this time. The rights bill contains not only fair housing provisions, but a number of other measures.

They include penalties of up to 10 years in prison and a $10,000 fine for persons convicted of intimidating or injuring civil rights workers and Negroes in housing, schooling, jury duty, public facilities, voting or registering to vote; so-called "anti-riot" measures, making it a federal crime to travel from one state to another with the intent to incite a riot, or to make, transport or demonstrate the use of firearms or explosives meant for use in a riot, and the extension of broad rights to American Indians in their dealings with tribal governments, the courts and state, local and federal governments.

But the key provision outlaws housing discrimination. The measure would eliminate racial barriers in housing by three stages:

Housing built with federal assistance, including insured mortgage loans under VA and FHA programs, would be covered upon enactment.

Effective Dec. 31, 1968, all dwellings would be covered except owner-occupied dwellings of four or less units.

Effective Dec. 31, 1969, discrimination would be outlawed for all owner-occupied housing except those sold without the services of real estate brokers or agents, providing the owner did not use discriminatory advertising.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development would be authorized to attempt conciliation when problems of alleged discrimination arise. If that fails, civil suits could be brought by individuals or the attorney general. When fully in operation, the proposed law would cover about 52.6 million of the nation's 65 million housing units, whereas the 1966 House bill would have excluded nearly 37 million housing units, 61.5 per cent of the total then.

Fittingly, the civil rights bill was approved by a strong bipartisan majority vote of 42 Democrats and 29 Republicans for, 17 Democrats and three Republicans opposed. Now, the House should follow the example of the Senate and approve this important bill.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Apr. 5, 1968]

DEATH OF A MAN OF PEACE

The death by violence of Dr. Martin Luther King, leading exponent of nonviolence, is far more than a shocking tragedy of international proportion.

It is, first of all, a bludgeon-like warning to Americans that in less than five years assassins have slain not only a President and a Nobel Peace Prize winner, but several other civil rights leaders as well—and all this in a nation that once stood as a model of orderly, popular government by due process of law.

It may be argued that one sick man killed Dr. King, and this is undoubtedly so. Yet the assassination occurred against a background of looting, riots, seizure of college buildings by students, defiance of law-enforcement officers, and challenging of the law itself, not only in areas of civil rights, but in many others as well.

The temper of these trying times seems to point increasingly to a belief that litigation is too leisurely; that law need not be obeyed if one disagrees with it, and that violence is an acceptable way to achieve quick action.

Brutality, turmoil in the streets, ugly refusal to listen to or tolerate divergent view, impatience with reason—these are the distressing hallmarks of our chaotic era.

Yet solution to our problem does not lie in any such direction and the vast reasonable majority of Americans, black and white, North and South, rich and poor, must reverse this trend, must repudiate the thoughtless and easy resort to gun and molotov cocktail if we are to progress, rather than regress.

This certainly is what Dr. King would have advised.

The second major concern produced by his death is the vacuum of civil rights leadership.

Should advocates of violence, certainly in the minority, seize this opportunity to redirect the rights movement toward courses aimed at angry confrontation and purposeless destruction, it would heighten racism and thwart much of what has been accomplished.

Dr. King would be the first to repudiate such a shift, especially in his name.

Hosea Williams, one of Dr. King's aides, commenting on the death of this man of peace, said, "Within the framework of nonviolence, we must strive more than ever, we must work harder than ever, to achieve all of his goals."

This is the course we must seek, hoping that most of the Negroes of America will be able to accept Dr. King's death for precisely what it is—a terrible, isolated action reflecting the view of one deranged mind, and not by any means a pattern to which any number of Americans could subscribe.

If good can come out of evil, it may be that we do not have to worry about which Negro will succeed Dr. King as peaceful leader.

For if his death proves to be the fusing force in behalf of civil rights that it ought to be, he may be followed, not only by Negro leaders, but by American leaders, both black and white, who will perpetuate his precepts.

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Enterprise]

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

The news from Memphis was like the news from Dallas had been.

A leader of his people had been shot and killed.

Dr. Martin Luther King was the leader of the responsible Negroes of this country. He was the holder of the Nobel Prize for Peace.

Dr. King preached non-violence and the grim irony of his death was it triggered waves of violence throughout the country.

A hymn of hatred in the mourning for a minister of peace.

Dr. King had said, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character."

The assassin's bullet that killed Dr. King could not kill that dream.

Now we must face the challenges of the racial equality with an even greater determination to bring into reality Dr. King's

dream that no one be judged by the color of his skin.

[From the Cape Cod (Mass.) Standard-Times, Apr. 5, 1968]

WORDS ARE FUTILE

A sense of deep tragedy again stalked millions of American homes when word of the sniper murder of Dr. Martin Luther King was flashed.

Words seem so futile after a crime which every one but the perpetrator deplores. Handwringing in the wake of the event only whips the emotions to storm pitch but settles nothing and, despite the intensity of grief, never seems to prevent a duplication.

The murder of Dr. King is on a par with the happenings of Dallas, a national calamity to the highest degree. Dr. King had a fine mind, regardless of what one thought about his policies. A Nobel Prize winner and apostle of nonviolence in racial conflict, his was a mind that, at 39, the country can ill afford to lose, a parallel with the late President Kennedy of Hyannis Port.

Happening only months before the promised "long, hot summer" and with a heated presidential campaign in the making, Memphis has suddenly heightened nationwide tension.

The United States faces one of the greatest challenges in its history. The trend that spawns sniping by gunfire must be reversed.

PASS THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage—as quickly as possible—of the pending civil rights bill.

In the past, we have acted to create or to enforce prohibitions against racial discrimination in voting, in public education and other federally assisted programs, in public accommodations, and in employment. There is, however, one major area where Federal antidiscrimination legislation is lacking. I refer to the area of housing.

No one suggests that enactment of a Federal fair housing law will mean prompt elimination of urban ghettos. No single piece of legislation is the solution of such a complex problem. However, a fair housing statute will have great significance, practical as well as symbolic.

The symbolic aspect is that Congress will be demonstrating that it does not accept as tolerable any longer the patterns of racial segregation in housing. We will make clear once again our commitment to equality of opportunity.

The practical aspect is that, as a result of voluntary compliance with and, when necessary, enforcement of the statute, many Americans will for the first time be free from racial and religious discrimination when they seek a place to live. This will benefit Negroes and members of other minority groups. By helping to make real our democratic ideals, it will benefit our entire Nation.

AMERICAN VICTORY AT KHESANH

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the victory at Khesanh is one of the most significant victories in the history of the United States—indeed one of the most significant in the history of the free world. American and allied forces achieved a truly overwhelming victory. This victory was accomplished by a united effort. American forces—composed of marines, Army, and Air Force—performed magnificently. Forty thousand crack professional North Vietnamese troops—invaders and aggressors—were forced to flee the scene of battle. The B–52's played a major role in the victory at Khesanh, pulverizing enemy concentrations and strong points around the Khesanh perimeter. Army artillery outside Khesanh performed superbly. Of course, the splendid defense of the marines at Khesanh is without any superior in the annals of warfare.

Our victory at Khesanh ranks with Gettysburg, Tours, Anzio, and perhaps Waterloo and other great battles in the history of the free world. It is particularly significant victory in the history of free peoples. It is a victory over totalitarianism, aggression, and terror in its most sinister form. The victory at Khesanh is a justification of the military strategy and tactics of Gen. William Childs Westmoreland.

By holding Khesanh, masses of Communist invaders were tied down and prevented from joining in the Tet offensive. The wise decision on the part of the President and General Westmoreland to hold Khesanh denied the Communists shorter supply routes, reinforcements and equipment that they sorely needed for their February offensive thus contributing to the great allied victory over the Communists in that offensive.

May I remind you that the moaners, the groaners, pessimists, doubters, and peace demonstrators, and pacifists recently said that Khesanh would be another Dienbienphu? Where are they today? Where are those in high places here in Washington who recently toured the country predicting disaster and escalation of the war before screaming, yelling exponents of disunity and dissent?

Khesanh is a turning point in the war in South Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, Khesanh is proof that this Nation is no paper tiger and that we can win the type war chosen by the Communist close to his own base. Some in high places said we could not win. General de Gaulle said we could not win. We are winning and Khesanh is the answer to those who would undermine the cause of freedom in Southeast Asia.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL VISITORS FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 202(a), Public Law 90–264, the Chair appoints as members of the National Visitors Facilities Advisory Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. GRAY, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. FALLON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. SCHWENGEL.

CONGRESSMAN VANIK REPORTS ON THE 90TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks citizens of America and the world have witnessed a high-speed, computer age movement of significant historical events without precedence in modern times. Within the span of slightly over a single month, Americans witnessed the withdrawal of three major candidates for the Presidency—Gov. George Romney and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller withdrew their bids for the Republican nomination while President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his withdrawal as a Democratic candidate to succeed himself.

Dramatic changes are in the air. The people will no longer tolerate frustrating delays in the solution of public problems at every level of government. A society which bears witness to instant history on the television screen and the radio demands instant action on the problems of the country and the world.

The decision made by President Johnson on March 31 to lead America toward peace in Vietnam at the price of his future tenure was a call on every man's courage to put country above self. The contagion of this kind of integrity in high office could well become the tonic for the development of new goals for Americans at home and abroad. It extends the hopes of the late President John F. Kennedy.

VIETNAM

Of course the most encouraging development centers around our hopes for peace in Southeast Asia. We pray that the President's search for peace will succeed. On March 20, I took the floor in the House of Representatives to urge the cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam as a first step toward the negotiation of the war. I also urged the establishment of defensible enclaves to reduce the combat exposure of American troops and to protect the civilian innocents from the carnage of war. I stated:

I do not believe that we can immediately leave Vietnam. Our presence may save millions of human beings and leave the destiny of the country in the hands of its people. Our enclaved presence may deter military overthrows of Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. More importantly, our presence may deter a Chinese aggression into India, which has the potential of developing into a hundred Vietnams.

The full text of my statement is available on request.

WORLD DIPLOMACY

I do not believe that America can retreat from its role in world leadership to a "Fortress America." The demonstrated frailty of the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations organization must now be our major concern. The troubles and the sickness of any one partner in the community of nations will find its way to our door. The United Na-

tions must be strengthened and this should be the first order of business after Vietnam so that we are not again placed in the present dilemma.

As a matter of national policy, we must reconsider our military commitments around the world and look toward a reduction of the vast numbers of troops presently committed in Europe and elsewhere. The balance-of-payments problem can be very substantially met by more effective use of manpower with modern equipment.

MIDDLE EAST

Last June when the State of Israel made its momentous plea for national integrity, I immediately urged support for the State of Israel—not as a matter of treaty or legal commitment, but as a matter of conscience—our obligation to democracy's showcase in the Middle East. As in Vietnam, the role of the United Nations as a peacekeeping force in the Middle East has been totally inadequate. Last year's short-term military victory affords no real security to Israel. The Soviet rearmament of the Arab world with more modern weapons multiplies the threat of future trouble. On March 27, I protested in Congress against the sale of American weapons to the state of Jordan. It is folly to assume that these weapons will not be used against Israel. It is shameful for America to assume the role of gunmaker to the kings of the Middle East and the dictators of Latin America. I will continue vigorous efforts to oppose such indefensible action by our country.

FISCAL INTEGRITY AND THE SURTAX

In addition to the 20,000 lives and 100,000 casualties, the Vietnam war has served to place our Nation on a collision course with financial disaster. In fiscal 1965, our efforts cost $103 million. In 1966, the expenditure ran to $6 billion. In 1967, the cost of the war ran to $20½ billion. In fiscal 1968 the cost rose to $25 billion. The projection for fiscal 1969 which begins July 1 of 1968 is estimated at $30 billion.

The American economy is not equipped to permit this kind of nonproductive expenditure, three times the present annual expenditure for education and welfare. The total annual cost of the war on poverty is equal to the expenditure involved in 36 days of the war in Vietnam. Recent events in London and Paris reveal that the free world is more concerned with the collapse of our economy than the military outcome in Southeast Asia. While they can isolate themselves from our military involvement, they cannot remain isolated from our financial collapse, which would bring them down with us. In the world of economics, the domino theory works with shocking accuracy and certainty.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I cannot support a tax increase to expand or escalate the war in South Vietnam. Nor can I support the termination or further cutback of programs designed to meet the urban crisis and the problems of educating and training Americans to achieve self-support. Under these circumstances, the only possible course is a limitation on our Vietnam involvement directed toward settlement. Any other course leads toward the brutal commitment of additional thousands of American lives and the danger of financial collapse—not only for America—but for the free world.

THE URBAN PROBLEM

These times call for prompt action on the unmet needs of America which overwhelm our metropolitan communities. No citizen or community can be disassociated from responsibility. However, civic responsibility is two-fold. Civil disturbances cannot be condoned. However, no community, its citizens, or its legislators should be permitted to overlook the need for compassionate legislation to face up to the problem.

EDUCATION

Excellence in education is a mandatory national goal if we are to meet our basic problems. The tax base of every community, large and small, is hard pressed to meet the skyrocketing demands of modern educational needs. New burdens exist which were never contemplated before. Existing local resources will have to be supplemented for facilities, curriculum development, textbook purchases and teacher training if all children are to obtain a competitive education.

Since 1962, under the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson we have developed an educational program which begins to meet these massive problems. The school systems of Cleveland, Parma, East Cleveland, and Euclid among others have begun to take advantage of Federal programs in educational excellence. It is my intention to see that the schools of our metropolitan area utilize their fair share of these resources.

In the field of higher education, some private colleges in the Cleveland area are already receiving over 60 percent of their operating budgets from Federal programs directed toward quality education. Tuition payments provide less than 15 percent of these costs. In today's competitive market for teaching talent, this Federal support has become critical. Private endowment and tuition can no longer maintain teaching talent of quality. Modern higher education is being sustained on the low-cost interest federally supported student loan programs, scholarship grants and research fellowships which help provide the instructors. My office has available upon request a complete analysis of federally sponsored student loan, grant, and fellowship programs.

AREA DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT

The growth of our metropolitan area is not keeping pace with comparable places in America. The need for area-wide planning is a factor. A sensible, balanced transportation system is a key factor. The rapid transit extension to the Hopkins Airport—the first connection between mass and air transit—is a beginning. A countywide transit system which I urged over 3 years ago is more necessary. With the continued diffusion of our metropolitan population, we cannot rely entirely on the superhighway approach which consumes vast land area and destroys community life.

Our new port authority must now develop plans for the vast expansion of our port. If the severe competition of neighboring ports is to be met, we must complete plans without delay so that we can proceed for early commitment on Federal allocations and determine the level of State and local commitment required to complete the job.

Industrial development and the jobs which we will need depend upon the success of such planning. In addition, we must cope with competition from abroad, and deal more effectively with competition based solely upon lower labor standards. As an example, I recently pointed out that a Cleveland company lost defense work to Canada based on a lower bid which resulted solely from lower labor standards. It is ridiculous to expect the taxpayers of America to support American defense production in Canada under rules which discriminate against American labor and industry and compound the balance-of-payments problem.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The dimensions of a Congressman's task have multiplied as the needs of our community have grown. It is simply not enough to cosponsor a bill by adding a name to another colleague's effort. Nor does a speech make a law. The representative in Congress must draft legislative goals based upon needs supported by facts. He must prepare testimony on legislative needs and orient national goals to his community. My office has developed annual Federal expenditure studies which detail local involvement or noninvolvement in every existing Federal program. In this way, I am able to go before congressional committees with clearcut examples of how our metropolitan area continues to be shortchanged on distribution of Federal funds. For example, in the fiscal year of 1966, we received from Federal sources only 59.6 cents for every tax dollar paid in Cuyahoga County. This was a reduction of 4 cents over fiscal 1965. We must aggressively pursue our rightful share of Federal tax revenue in the form of job-producing contracts, educational programs and area development. My Federal expenditure studies for this fiscal year are currently being released and are available at your library.

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Public indignation over the terrible condition of Lake Erie continues to be met with official apathy. It is the most critical water pollution problem of the world. We may become the largest community of bottled water users in America.

After much struggle and over initial objections of the State government, we brought in a Federal Water Pollution Conference in 1965. This was the first step in getting Federal assistance. Last year, of $8 million in Federal money allocated for water pollution control in Ohio, not one penny was directed toward the fundamental pollution problem of Lake Erie. Ohio received a "block grant" of Federal funds which it proliferated in rural areas while our Lake Erie problem was untouched.

After a long battle, I was finally able to convince the U.S. Corps of Engineers

that the dredged material of the Cuyahoga River must not be dumped into Lake Erie to repollute our drinking water. Under the plan we developed, a diked retention area has been constructed but it can receive only 14 percent of the dredged pollutants. We have at least made a beginning. The Federal Government and its agencies must not be allowed to contribute to the pollution problem.

While Federal programs are directed toward the abatement of interstate air pollution, I have long urged that the Federal Government should meet pollution problems on an industry-by-industry basis so that no one industry can unfairly compete through reduced costs based upon the absence of pollution controls.

I am one of the principal proponents of the investment credit to industries committed to effective and approved methods of pollution control. A tax incentive to industry to eliminate pollution will produce more good than billions in direct spending to restore pollution damage.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Every American is a consumer. Under today's marketing pressures he is defenseless, unless alert or alerted. From time to time, I have considered it my duty to point out specific abuses in packaging, labeling and quality control. With your help, I can continue to respond on specific problems.

COMING TO WASHINGTON?

If you plan to visit Washington, please let my office know several weeks in advance so that we can provide special tours to the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, the State Department and Federal Bureau of Investigation. We will be delighted to see you. Write to me at 2463 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, or telephone my Cleveland office at 522–4252.

PUBLICATIONS

There is a tremendous range of Government publications available on almost any and every subject. Just write your request to my office and we will try to supply suitable publications. Publications in stock include: "Recent Improvements in Your Social Security," "Our Flag," "Our American Government," "How Our Laws Are Made," "Infant Care," "Food for the Family With Young Children," "The Adolescent in Your Family," "Handbook for Recreation," and "Roses for the Home."

CONCLUSION

My capacity to legislate wisely depends very much on the counsel of my constituents. If you have an idea which will make a better law or make the Federal Government work more responsively, please let me know. Some of our best Federal laws have been developed in this way. A major amendment to the medicare law which was before the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member resulted from a recent visit to my office by a constituent who pointed out a deficiency in the law. This is the essence of democracy.

FUTURE OF RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, legislation fixing the future of the Renegotiation Board is now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee. While some spokesmen in the committee hearings called for the death of the Board, bills similar to mine would make this watchdog of war profiteering permanent and restore it to Korean war strength.

As the latest extension of the Board expires this June 30, Members of this body will be called upon to vote whether and to what degree the Board shall be extended. Thus, for a comprehensive survey of the issues surrounding the Board, I commend to my colleagues the article by George Lardner, Jr., which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post, and for which I have received permission to include below.

I am not neutral on the Renegotiation Board, as readers of the RECORD know. I presented extensive testimony during the hearings in March in support of my bill to strengthen the Board. Again in that presentation, I referred to indications that war profiteering was rampant. Predictably, the defense industry spokesmen again perpetrated the stuff and nonsense that the Renegotiation Board weakens the industrial base of our military and that the problem with the defense industry is inadequate profits, not excessive profits.

The defense industry spokesmen quoted the "L.M.I. Review" that profits have been down from 1958. While I dispute their interpretations, and although this issue should be important to Congress, the average level of profitmaking on defense contracts is not strictly relevant to renegotiation. For the Board has no quarrel with average profits; it is concerned with excessive profits. The Board speedily gives clearance to most contractors who file with it; it is the very few unscrupulous or negligent contractors who receive determinations of excessive profits.

Therefore, it is more relevant to discuss whether excessive profits have risen in connection with the Vietnam buildup. Here, my colleague the Honorable CHARLES VANIK, of Cleveland, has performed a public service in disclosing that a giant U.S. corporation, judged delinquent by millions twice during the Korean war, has recently been charged with excessive profits again by the Board, this time for $5 million.

And as a rebuttal to those who maintain that the Board is unnecessary because of the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], said:

> It should be noted that the claim against the company, which is now before the board, is for profits gained in 1965—three years after the passage of the Truth-in-Negotiation Act.

I believe my colleagues will also be interested in the article concerning Mr. VANIK's statement which appeared in the Cleveland Plain-Dealer.

Also, in what is probably a futile attempt on my part to lay to their deserved rest the contentions of defense industry spokesmen that profits are declining, I am including several other articles by Sanford Watzman of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. One reports on recent U.S. Tax Court decisions upholding the determinations of $1.3 million in excessive profits made by the Board against three companies. Another reports that findings of the Defense Contract Audit Agency that 101 out of 615 contracts in an 18-month survey were overpriced. The third article concerns the Hardy report on truth-in-negotiations, concluding in part that "some contractors successfully avoid disclosure" under this act.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1968]

CONTRACTORS URGE UNITED STATES TO SCRAP WATCHDOG ON PROFITEERING

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Ever since General George Washington shuddered at the prices he had to pay to win the Revolution, Government contractors have been suspected of padding their profits.

The job of policing profiteering in recent years has fallen largely to the Renegotiation Board, an obscure Federal agency that has had its authority and its manpower cut back steadily since the end of the Korean conflict.

The Board is just beginning to wade into the business side of the war in Vietnam.

But the House Ways and Means Committee is being urged to kill the tiny agency. It will go out of business in July unless it wins a new lease from Congress. Spokesmen for hundreds of contractors have trooped up to Capitol Hill in the past month to insist that the Board be abolished or at least weakened.

Set up in 1951, the Renegotiation Board is an independent agency whose sole job is to recapture excessive profits—defined by the U.S. Tax Court as "more than is reasonable"—on defense, space and other Government contracts such as those awarded by the Federal Aviation Administration.

The contractors' argument against continuing the Board is in its bluntest form, that the $26-billion-a-year war in Vietnam is not producing enough profits for American business.

Continuation of the Renegotiation Board, protests the National Association of Manufacturers, "will weaken progressively the industrial base which supports our military commitments."

"The problem with the defense industry today," asserts Charles W. Stewart, president of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, "is inadequate profits, not excessive profits."

Yet in recent weeks, a House Armed Services Subcommittee has accused officials who buy equipment for the Armed Forces of lacking even "common sense judgment." Congressional investigators have found scores of contracts where officials failed to demand the required cost or pricing data.

Among cases reported in recent months:

A big Ohio corporation realized a 42 per cent profit on one Defense contract, producing military hardware with Government-owned facilities that it used rent-free.

A leading radar manufacturer pocketed nearly half a million dollars when the Navy allowed itself to be billed for an item that it had already decided it didn't need.

A missile supplier, as Sen. Stephen Young (D–Ohio) put it, "got away with $134,000" by "estimating" a cost of $219,000 for materials it had already bought.

Says Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.), chief Congressional defender of the Renegotiation Board: "There is abundant evidence

of current profiteering on defense contracts." Gonzalez suspects it is rampant.

Corporate profits overall since the 1965 escalation in Vietnam, according to Sen. George S. McGovern (D-S.D.), have "skyrocketed"—from an annual average of $31.7 billion after taxes to $47.3 billion. Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) said on one recent contract for M-16 rifles Colt Industries made a profit of 1400 per cent.

Not all corporate profits come from Government contracts by any means, but a sampling of 16 companies whose Government business was routinely reviewed by the Renegotiation Board in a 10-day period this year indicates that these profits, too, are rising handsomely with the spending in Vietnam.

Most of the companies, the Board reported, showed sales-related profits on their renegotiable Government business of more than 13 per cent in fiscal 1967. Six companies were listed with profits over 20 per cent and one firm, the Board reported, realized a profit of more than 32 per cent, compared to slightly under 18 per cent the year before.

The Board's findings are seldom taken to court—the only place where they are made public—and it has uncovered $950 million in excess profits since it was established. Refunds are made voluntarily in 9 out of 10 cases.

The Board doesn't always win every penny it goes after. The Douglas Aircraft Co. appealed a $19.5 million finding against it and eventually won a court-ordered reduction to $18.5 million. But the Boeing Co. took a $9.8 million assessment into the courts—and wound up owing $13 million.

The Renegotiation Board's authority, however, is shot full of loopholes. It was initially given jurisdiction over companies doing more than $250,000 worth of renegotiable business with the Government each year.

This has been raised to $1 million and Congress is being urged to increase the exemption again—to $5 million.

The Board's hands have also been tied on contracts involving a long list of products that are also sold commercially—from trucks to defoliants.

With Defense spending on military procurement now exceeding $125 million a day, the Board is a shadow of what it was in the Korean war. Operating on a slim $2.6 million budget, it has 178 employes, compared to 742 during the Korean crisis.

In its annual report last December, covering fiscal 1967, the Board said it found only $15.9 million in excess profits compared to $24.5 million the year before.

Yet its work is picking up. As the Board has pointed out, there is usually a lag of about two years between the award of a contract and any formal determination of excess profits in a contractor's overall business for a given year.

The Vietnam buildup, which Board officials say began in earnest in fiscal 1966, is reflected in other, more tentative statistics. While most contractors win easy clearance, those singled out by the Board for questioning jumped 43 per cent last year.

Voluntary refunds and price reductions by contractors also went up—from $23.2 million in fiscal 1966 to $30.3 million last year.

Board Chairman Lawrence E. Hartwig counts the Board's deterrent influence against overpricing as even more valuable to the taxpayer than the Board's direct recapture of funds.

Congress is unlikely to scuttle the Board completely. But the Board will be lucky if it can get anything more than the temporary, two-year lease on life that Congress has customarily given it. Gonzalez is pushing for permanent status along with authority to delve into some $7½ billion worth of Government contracts that the Board cannot now touch.

The Board's opponents—ranging from the aircraft and missile industry to contractors who sell canned food to the military—are working hard to keep it from regaining its Korean War vigor.

Its most vocal critics contended that the Board is unnecessary and expensive. They rely heavily on a recent report commissioned by the Defense Department, which suggests that profits from defense contracts have fallen below those from commercial undertakings.

The critics also maintain that the Defense Department can be relied on to police its own contracts under the Truth in Negotiations Act.

Gonzalez and others who have joined him—largely from the Ohio Congressional delegation whose members were alerted by articles in the Cleveland Plain Dealer—reply that the Defense Department study flies in the face of other indicators, including a General Accounting Office report that defense industry profits, especially on negotiated contracts, have been going up.

They also point to Congressional hearings last year which, they claim, showed the Defense Department had failed for years to live up to the requirements of the Truth in Negotiations Act, particularly in ordering audits.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1968]

VANIK SAYS "GIANT" FIRM HIT IN $500 MILLION PROFITEERING

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-21, charged yesterday that a "corporate giant" with a record for profiteering in the Korean War has been slapped again with a $5-million claim for the Vietnam War.

The Clevelander disclosed information which had come to him privately on the eve of closed-door hearings by the Ways and Means committee, at which the future of the Renegotiation Board will be considered.

Vanik did not immediately identify the company in his speech on the House floor.

Questioned afterward, he explained, "The law forbids the board from bandying about names or discussing the cases before it. While this law does not muzzle members of Congress, in all fairness I want to give the company an opportunity to give its side.

"I have written to the president of the corporation. After I receive a reply, I will make it public."

Vanik, member of the Ways and Means Committee, has introduced legislation to restore the board to the powers it wielded during the Korean War.

He told the House that "it has come to my attention that a company, which last fiscal year did nearly half-a-billion in dollar business with the government, is being closely examined by the Renegotiation Board and that there is a claim against this company for excess profits of $5 million.

"Some might argue that such incidents happen only once in a great while, but this same company was declared to be making excess profits of $2.25 to $3 million in fiscal year 1951 and $5.5 million in fiscal year 1953.

"The claims of the Renegotiation Board were appealed to the Tax Court by this company, but no action was taken and the appeals were withdrawn in 1959.

"Others have argued that the board is unnecessary because of the Truth-in-Negotiation Act, passed in 1962, which applies to defense contracts.

"But it should be noted that the claim against the company, which is now before the board, is for profits gained in 1965—three years after the passage of the Truth-in-negotiation Act."

Vanik's speech gives the public its first glimpse of a Vietnam war case pending before the board.

The confidentiality of the agency's operation had heretofore handicapped congressmen who put up a fight for the board without being able to cite current examples of why the antiprofiteering watchdog is needed.

Appeals filed in tax court remove the cloak of anonymity from companies taking such action.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 3, 1968]

THREE ORDERED TO REPAY $1.3 MILLION PROFITS

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—The Renegotiation Board has been upheld on three cases of excess profits and a fourth appeal filed at U.S. Tax Court in the last few weeks.

Ordered to repay $1 million to the federal treasury was the Hess Oil & Chemical Corp., formerly the Oliver Corp., a subcontractor on an Air Force procurement.

Tide-Bay, Inc., a piping contractor in Alaska, and Associated Testing Laboratories, Inc., which did missile work, were directed to rebate $150,000 each to the government.

The new appeal, was filed by Transducer Patents Co. of Los Angeles, which the board has dunned for $770,000 for fiscal years 1957 through 1964.

In the first case the Oliver Corp. and a subsidiary received a subcontract to build fuselages for the Boeing Airplane Co., which itself has a record at the board for profiteering.

The board asserted that Oliver overstated its costs by $1 million in 1954, one reason being that it improperly charged off some advertising as an expense. Company profits reviewed by the board that year totaled $50.3 million.

The case of Associated Testing, which did work on the Pershing missile, dated from 1961. It realized a profit that year of $406,795, or 24.3%, the board charged.

Tide-Bay was said to have made a profit of $323,455 in 1954. Its major contracts were for piping and storage of oil at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska.

Transducer was organized in 1952 to purchase five patents from the Curtiss-Wright Corp. for $135,000. It then licensed these patents to Statham Instruments Inc. and proceeded to collect royalties

It was these payments, amounting to $2.1 million, that were challenged by the board, which asserted that Transducer reported total costs of $231 for the years at issue.

The board said:

"The contractor (Transducer) had no employes, and the relatively small amount of administrative services required for the conduct of his business was performed by (Transducer's) general partner, Louis D. Statham, who was also president, chief executive officer and major stockholder of the related corp (Statham Instruments)."

In its petition, Transducer denied that it made any excess profits, and it disputed some statements made by the board.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 5, 1968]

ONE OF SIX DEFENSE CASES ARE CALLED OVERPRICED

(By Sanford Watzman)

PHILADELPHIA.—A survey by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) has turned up overpricing in one out of six cases examined.

This was revealed here yesterday by DCAA Director William B. Petty. He spoke at a conference on government contracts, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association.

Petty said he did not have figures with him on the amounts of money involved but he added they ranged from small to substantial.

The sampling study covered 615 Defense Department purchase agreements over an 18-month period, ending last Dec. 31. Of the 615 contracts, 101 were overpriced, he said.

The survey was in line with a systematic program of past award contract audits adopted by DCAA under prodding from the General Accounting Office (GAO).

This program did not at first include, as a

rule, the so-called firm fixed price (FFP) contracts, which are the instruments used for most major purchases of weapons and other war material.

But DCAA did amend its program late last year to bring more FFP agreements under its scrutiny.

This followed a series of articles in The Plain Dealer and hearings by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. The hearings called attention to the loophole in the audit program.

Petty told the conference that the expanded audit program is just now getting underway. Evidently, results from it will not be known for some time.

The Truth in Negotiating Act, on which the audits are based, was criticized by another participant at the conference—John Kooken, counsel for TRW, Inc.

Kooken questioned whether strict purchasing laws like the Truth Act are transforming the defense industry into a "seminationalized" branch of the economy subject to government regulation in the manner of public utilities.

He called attention to a study by the Logistics Management Institute, which held that the defense business of multimillion dollar contractors was not as profitable as the commercial business of the same corporations.

Two other speakers were Navy General Counsel Meritt H. Steger and Deputy Asst. Defense Secretary John M. Malloy.

They told the audience of contractors that the Truth Act is necessary, however burdensome it might seem to businessmen, who complain often about the paperwork involved.

They said any amendments were likely to be in the direction of tightening the law rather than liberalizing it.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 8, 1968]

SECOND REPORT WARNS OF LOADED PRICES: PENTAGON SCORED FOR OVERSPENDING

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—A second congressional group yesterday criticized the Pentagon for weak enforcement of the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act.

The latest censure came from the special investigations unit of the House Armed Services Committee, of which Rep. Porter Hardy, Jr., D-Va., is chairman.

At the same time it was announced that hearings will open Wednesday on identical bills by Rep. William E. Minshall, R-23, and Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., to strengthen the "Truth" Act.

The criticism was basically the same as that leveled at the Defense Department last summer by Sen. Proxmire's Joint Economic Committee.

Both groups claimed that overcharges on defense contracts often went undetected because the Pentagon did not have a comprehensive audit program and did not insist on documentation of contractors' cost estimates.

Hardy's subcommittee based its findings on hearings conducted late last year.

It recommended the Defense Department to strictly enforce a regulation making corporations ineligible for subsequent contracts if they were found guilty of flagrant overpricing.

"The Defense Department's procurement transactions are at a record high—approximately $45 billion a year, which is about 80% of all money spent on government purchases," the report said.

"Many of these transactions involve the procurement of weapons and equipment never manufactured before—exotic, sophisticated and undreamed of a few years ago.

"A central problem confronting government buyers is that they seldom have a very accurate picture of the cost at the outset of such ventures.

"If the price is to be fair and reasonable, all pertinent facts and data must be considered and weighed. In such negotiations, truth is the most important ingredient."

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, JUSTICE DEMAND TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of late of the need for fiscal responsibility, to reduce the Federal budget deficit, to resolve our domestic economic problems, to strengthen our international financial position. These discussions have centered around the need for reduced Federal expenditures and increased income taxes.

At a time when Americans are being asked to accept the need for fiscal responsibility, which might involve higher taxes as well as reduced Government spending, it is essential to see that any added tax burdens, as well as the existing ones, are distributed fairly. I cannot accept the suggestion that we in any way approximate a truly responsible approach to fiscal affairs so long as our tax system distributes its burdens as inequitably as it currently does.

I am thus introducing my Tax Equity Act of 1968, which contains 10 proposals for tax reform. The measures in this bill would not only bring the Government more than $5 billion of added revenue—revenue which would ease our deficit problem; equally important, these proposals would go far toward more fairly allocating the burden of tax payments among our citizens. We cannot achieve fiscal responsibility by means of any number of spending cuts or tax increases if our basic tax system operates in an irrational and unjust fashion.

One must question the fairness of a tax system which permits some taxpayers in the million-dollar-and-up bracket to pay no income taxes whatever; in which the largest oil companies with total incomes in the billions of dollars pay an average tax of 8 percent, while at the same time individuals earning $5,000 a year may be contributing over 15 percent of their salaries to the Government.

What kind of tax justice do we have when 17 Americans with incomes of $1 million or more can pay not 1 cent in taxes; when a lawyer filing one client's tax return discovered that client had six times as much income as he and paid only one-fifth as much tax; when a real estate corporation with a net cash return of over $5 million not only paid no taxes but legally reported a tax loss of almost $2 million? Such examples reflect the serious inequities in our tax system which must be eliminated.

Existing tax preferences are vigorously defended on a variety of grounds. Presumably, they are needed as an "incentive" to some generally desirable activity, to relieve a "hardship" suffered by some industry or group of individuals, or to relieve an "inequity" arising from some other facet of our legal or economic structure. And, indeed, one cannot say that most preferences or exemptions are totally devoid of justification.

What must not be forgotten, however, is that what constitutes tax relief for some creates additional burdens for the remainder of the taxpaying public. Through our system of tax preferences, we have relieved some citizens from shouldering their proportionate share of our fiscal burdens, at the expense of the majority of the taxpayers. At a time of high Government expenditure, when tax increases are being called for, the injustice of these tax inequities is compounded.

The loss of revenue to the Government through tax loopholes in itself constitutes a type of Federal expenditure. The Government has, in effect, granted subsidies to certain groups by allowing them to refrain from paying some—often large—portion of their taxes. Many of these subsidies, if subjected to the scrutiny given appropriations for regular Government expenditures, would not begin to pass under as acceptable allocations of the taxpayer's money.

Mr. Speaker, on the grounds of equity alone I would feel justified in proposing the tax reform measures contained in the tax equity bill I am introducing today. However, in times such as these, when the American public is being asked to accept a program of fiscal austerity, which could include payment of higher taxes along with a reduction of Federal spending, I feel we have an absolute obligation to insure that in placing tax burdens on our citizens, we place them fairly. Tax reform constitutes an integral and inseparable part of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to explain briefly the provisions of my bill. Before continuing, however, I should like to acknowledge my debt to some major contributors to the study of tax reform problems, on whose work I have drawn in constructing my bill: our distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS and Mr. BYRNES], the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. METCALF, and that most eminent of economic reformers, Senator Paul Douglas.

TITLE II. CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH

The capital gains tax regulations would require a man who bought a stock for $100,000 and sold it for $200,000 to pay a tax on his $100,000 capital gain of $25,000. Should the same man die, however, and should the stock be sold for $200,000 by his heir, the heir may have to pay no capital gains tax whatever. This situation, happy for the heir, unfortunate for the U.S. Government and the remainder of its taxpayers, occurs because the heir is allowed to calculate his capital gain or loss not on the original price paid for the asset but on the value of the asset at the time of its transfer to him. Thus, the gain in value from the time of purchase by the decedent to the transfer to the heir, completely escapes capital gains taxation.

Title II of the bill would revise the law so as to subject the accrued gain on assets transferred at death to capital gains taxation. By this revision, the Government could gain about $2.5 billion in added tax revenues.

TITLE III. UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTIONS

Charity can, for some people, be a highly profitable enterprise, as in the

case of the 13 philanthropists who, because of their charitable donations, enjoyed incomes of $20 million or more over a 3-year period without paying a penny of taxes. The generous treatment of these gentlemen by the Internal Revenue Service resulted from the section of our tax laws which allows a taxpayer an unlimited charitable deduction under certain circumstances, rather than the usual 20- or 30-percent ceiling on these deductions.

This unlimited deduction is offered if a taxpayer's charitable contributions plus his income tax for the taxable year plus 8 of the 10 preceding years exceeded 90 percent of this taxable income. For an individual in the higher income brackets, particularly if he chooses his contributions shrewdly—donating highly appreciated capital assets rather than cash—meeting this requirement is not at all difficult. It is, further, most improbable that such a taxpayer will actually be giving up 90 percent of his total income for charity and taxes, since he is likely to have a large portion of nontaxable income which is not included in the 90 percent calculation. Moreover, many of these "charitable" contributions are to private foundations, the major beneficiaries of which are the donors themselves.

Title III of the bill would eliminate this unlimited charitable deduction, and would thereby bring the Government an additional $50 million in tax revenues.

TITLE IV. STOCK OPTIONS

When the average taxpayer receives a salary increase or a bonus, he pays taxes on this part of his income at the same rate as on his regular income; he may even find himself pushed into a higher tax bracket. Some taxpayers, however, are privileged to pay only the capital gains tax rate on income increases, regardless of their tax bracket, if they are fortunate enough to receive these increases in the form of stock options.

A corporation executive who is rewarded with a stock option is allowed, for a certain period, to purchase the stock of his company at a given price, regardless of how high the market price of the stock may rise during that period. If he exercises the option, buys the stock at the low option price and sells at a much higher current market price, he pays only a capital gains tax, despite the fact that this option is merely another form of bonus or salary increase.

Title IV will require stock option gains to be taxed at regular income tax rates, and should net the Government about $100 million in added tax revenues.

TITLE V. MULTIPLE CORPORATION SURTAX EXEMPTION

Corporations presently pay a 22-percent tax on all taxable income, plus a surtax of 26 percent on all taxable income above $25,000; thus, each company is entitled to a $25,000 surtax exemption. Related corporations subject to less than 80-percent common ownership or control can elect to be taxed as separate corporations, and can thus each separately take advantage of the $25,000 surtax exemption.

Therefore, a corporation can, by electing to operate through a series of subsidiaries rather than through a parent company and branches, obtain any number of surtax exemptions, depending on how many subsidiaries they can, to some degree, justify forming. However, if a corporation is, in fact, a single enterprise, there is no justification for discriminating in favor of the subsidiary structure by offering the separate parts of such an operation multiple surtax exemption advantages.

Title V of the bill would eliminate this tax advantage, and gain for the Government an added $150 million in tax revenues.

TITLE VI. MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

The head of a corporation who would like to obtain funds for construction of a plant or other industrial facilities as cheaply as possible would be well advised to locate his new plant in one of the many municipalities which are currently issuing annually some $1 billion of industrial revenue bonds.

The ultimate purpose behind the issuance of these bonds is to attract industry to some given area. Because these municipal bonds are tax-free, they will be accepted by the public at relatively low interest rates. With the inexpensive funds a city raises, it can construct industrial plants and offer to lease them cheaply to industry. Thus, the locality has managed to attract industry and the corporation has received a subsidy, in the form of reduced cost on its plant.

The only problem is that, rather than being used to attract new industries to areas of widespread unemployment, these bonds are largely used to attract firms with plentiful resources of their own into areas which would not generally merit Federal subsidies.

Title VI would eliminate the tax exemption provided for these bonds, and would bring the Government an estimated $50 million in additional revenue.

TITLE VIII. PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Tax reform discussions are replete with startling examples of the benefits of having an interest in the minerals sector of our economy, particularly the oil industry. There is the individual who, in 1960, enjoyed an income of over $26 million and paid not a penny of Federal income tax that year; and the gentleman who, over 4 years, enjoyed a net income of over $9 million, but paid no taxes in any of those years; and the company which made profits of almost $66 million in a 6-year period, and not only paid no income taxes over that period, but actually received a refund on previously paid taxes; and so on, and on.

The percentage depletion method of calculating investment depreciation in the minerals industry allows investors to continue to claim depreciation allowances long after all initial investment costs have been recovered.

The discriminatory tax treatment in favor of these industries has long since lost any justification it may originally have had, and the optimum solution would be to eliminate completely these percentage depletion allowances in favor of depletion allowances based on actual investment costs in line with the practice in all other industries; however, with a view toward the political feasibility of the reform, and with consideration for the transitional difficulties caused by such a move, I would recommend reduction of all percentage depletion allowances to a maximum of 10 percent, from current rates as high as 27½ percent for oil and gas.

Title VII of the bill contains this proposal, and would increase Government tax revenues by an estimated $1.5 billion.

TITLE VII. GIFT TAXES

The simplest way for a wealthy individual to avoid having a large portion of his wealth absorbed by estate taxes after his death is to give away most of his wealth during his lifetime. With gift tax rates one-fourth lower than estate tax rates, and further, wtih these gift taxes calculated in a manner so as to further reduce their impact, transferring wealth in the form of a gift can leave the recipient or heir with nearly three times as much after taxes as the identical outlay as part of an estate.

Title VIII would eliminate this loophole for estate tax avoidance by establishing the same rate for gift and estate taxes; the savings in Government tax revenue would amount to about $100 million.

TITLE IX. USE OF U.S. GOVERNMENT BONDS TO PAY ESTATE TAXES

Under present law, certain Government bonds can be redeemed at par value to pay an estate tax. Thus, if bonds that have a par value of $100,000 were bought for $80,000, these bonds could be used to pay an estate tax of $100,000 even though their market value might still be $80,000.

Title IX would eliminate this tax windfall enjoyed by certain taxpayers by requiring bonds used for payment of estate taxes to be evaluated at the fair market value; the gain in tax revenues for the Government would be some $50 million.

TITLE X. TAX-LOSS FARMING

Many "gentleman farmers" invest in agricultural enterprises not because of the gains they expect to accumulate but because of the losses they hope to show. A 1965 study shows that 119 individuals with annual incomes over $1 million had farm operations and 87 percent of them reported losses on farm operations.

Such individuals make large farming investments, hoping to show annual losses, against which they can write off nonfarm income, thus obtaining sizable income tax savings. They hope ultimately, by virtue of the improvements they put into their farms, to realize sizable gains upon sale of these properties, with these gains taxed at the capital gains rather than regular income tax rates. Thus, their farm losses enable them to enjoy savings on their considerably higher income tax payments, and on their final profit from sale of the farm, they pay only the lower capital gains taxes.

Title X will prevent this type of farming for tax writeoffs only, by limiting deductions for farming losses to an amount not exceeding the gross income derived from the actual business of farming. This provision can be conservatively esti-

mated to bring the Government an additional $450 million of tax revenues annually.

TITLE XI. ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON SPECULATIVE REAL ESTATE

The ability of real estate speculators to take accelerated depreciation deductions on property they have purchased can net them, in the long run, millions of dollars of tax savings. Immediately after purchase, the real estate owner can begin taking very large initial depreciation deductions on his property, which he can use to offset income from other sources, and thus reduce his income tax payments. When, after a few years, he has already written off the largest part of the depreciation under the accelerated schedule, he can then sell the property, for a much higher price than that indicated by the book value after depreciation, and pay taxes on the difference between book value and sale price at capital gains rates.

Title XI would deprive real estate speculators of unwarranted tax deductions and excessive capital gains by eliminating the tax provisions allowing accelerated depreciation deductions on real estate speculation. The gain in Government revenue would be $100 million.

DAYS OF TERROR, NIGHTS OF FIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, a shadow of shame darker than the smoke clouds of the past weekend hangs over the Nation's Capitol today. Shame at the wanton burning and violence that erupted last Thursday in the name of civil rights and as a eulogy to Dr. Martin Luther King. What vaunted excuses to use for acts of immoral irresponsibility? The only excuse for the appalling action is that the baser natures of mankind were unleashed and allowed to run wild.

Thursday night, a few hours after the announcement that Dr. King had been murdered by a sniper in Memphis, Tenn., sporadic instances of firebombings and small gangs of roaming terrorists were reported in the upper northwest section of the city. These were scattered and minor incidents, but they caused a sense of urgency in the responsible people of Washington who watched the explosion of Detroit and Newark last year in a detached manner. Washington residents did not expect this senseless violence and the people of the United States did not deserve such action.

Shortly after noon on Friday, the occurrence that all Americans feared came about. Large sections of the city went up in flames. Smoke fell over the city like a shroud, obscuring the Washington Monument. The White House had to be surrounded by Federal troops. Machine-gun positions were taken on the grounds of the Capitol Building and the White House. The center of America's democracy was under attack. Was this any kind of memorial to a man who professed nonviolence?

Dr. Martin Luther King's death was as senseless as the burning and destruction in downtown Washington. He was a nonviolent man, but violence followed in his footsteps.

I do not believe that the rioting and burning, looting and murder that followed Dr. King's death can be blamed on this one act. The insurrection that occurred over the past weekend had been brewing for a long time. Any incident—either the unlawful shooting of Dr. King or a policeman's shooting of a fleeing felon—would have set off the fires. The militants of Washington, Detroit, Newark, Los Angeles, and Harlem had already geared their organizations to violence and the destruction was bound to happen sometime this year. The murder of Martin Luther King only gave a unified reason to touch off riots throughout the Nation. Long before Dr. King went to Memphis, a young man named Stokely Carmichael had promised in several Communist countries that he would return to America and unite Negroes to overthrow our Government. Last Thursday Carmichael led the first gangs that went into the city to begin burning.

The Washington Post reported that Thursday night's trouble began when a group at SNCC—Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—headquarters decided to close down stores on upper 14th Street in memory of Dr. King. Carmichael led this group down the street in what soon became a riotous trip. True, Carmichael told his followers to exercise restraint. He was quoted as saying "Now is not the time." The next morning, Friday, Carmichael declared at a news conference that white America declared war on black people when Dr. King was killed. Later that day at Howard University, he advised students to arm themselves—"Tonight is our night." Not long after that statement, downtown Washington exploded in flames.

Carmichael flaunted authority during the Washington riot and he defied our laws last year when he traveled to Havana, Hanoi, and other Communist cities, cursing the United States. Before that he had worked behind the scenes appealing to irresponsible Negroes to join his movement which can best be described by his call to arms, "kill whitey." Not "civil rights" or "equality," but "kill whitey."

The press here in Washington has attributed the destruction to a desire to force passage of a new civil rights bill that is now being considered by the House of Representatives. The local papers, radio, and television stations have called this a bitter uprising of a downtrodden people.

Since when do Americans—any Americans—have to burn and rob business places to pass necessary legislation? Was the monumental civil rights bill of 1964 passed because Negroes were burning the heart of the Nation's Capital? I refuse to be intimidated by mobs of people who have no purpose other than complete disruption of our way of life.

The proposed act is not good legislation—the section dealing with open housing raises many constitutional questions that should be reviewed by the House Judiciary Committee. Another section of the bill may conflict with rights that have been granted through treaties. These sections should be reviewed by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

That is the way America legislates and the process has worked effectively for almost 200 years. Not always efficiently, but at least effectively. The committee system has proven itself in the severe test of time and should not be upset by the blackmail of deliberate turmoil.

The latest in a series of civil rights legislation will be brought up in the House this week and Representatives are being urged to accept the bill as it is, without amendments and without further debate and consideration. We are warned that more and intensified violence is apt to occur if this bill is not sent on for President Johnson's signature immediately. The President has also promised Negro civil rights leaders that he will send new legislative proposals to Congress as soon as possible with recommendations for immediate passage.

Gentlemen, if we bow to these threats and accept this bill over our reservations, the rioters have been successful; and then if the President proposes, for instance, a guaranteed annual income, we can expect the same violence to force this foolhardy idea across.

Congress has a duty to act responsibly in this matter. We cannot allow this pressure to force our hand because in doing so we would violate the sacred trust that is placed in this honorable body, the duty to protect the civil rights of every American, regardless of his color, race, or creed. The main objection that I have to this legislation is that the provisions presume and concede that these rights are not now inherent in our laws.

Civil rights of all Americans are already guaranteed and further legislation in this direction only holds out a false promise of something that Congress cannot provide. We can reiterate the right of every citizen to own property, but by that reiteration we do not eliminate the most effective segregation and that is economic selection. For all the legislation we might pass, we cannot give every family in these United States enough money to buy any house they want.

When a person moves into a new neighborhood, nothing can force his neighbors to accept him. And that is a more effective form of segregation. Congress cannot strike down economic segregation and riots and looting will never end personal preference segregation.

Whose civil rights were actually involved in the tragic events this weekend? These riots were ignited in the powerful name of civil rights and yet the rioters violated yours and my civil rights and those of our constituents. Congress could not have safely met during the violence-packed weekend and that deprived our people of the rights which our representative government promises. In fact, a curfew was imposed, preventing us from traveling to the Capitol from 4 p.m. to 6:30 a.m.

Our National Capitol was under siege for 3 days and this city, which every American can rightfully claim as his own, was blockaded. My staff, which works entirely for the people of Montana, was ordered to leave the office for self-protection. Tourists from every State in the Union were ordered off the streets early in the afternoon and the streets were not safe during the day. The Cherry Blossom Ball and Parade were canceled

in deference to screaming fire engines and jubilant looters and arsonists. Stokely Carmichael was no doubt the happiest person in the city, but thousands of proud Americans were prevented from seeing their city.

The rioters were assured of their civil rights. For most purposes, their civil rights were extended to include the right to steal and destroy property. In the instances when looters were arrested, they were provided free legal counsel. This entire tragedy was allowed to run unchecked. District policemen performed their duties as best they could, but they needed help and it was 5 hours before the President decided the situation was urgent enough to require the presence of Federal troops. By then, the rabble was in control and anarchy reigned in the seat of democracy.

For half a day Friday, all day and night Saturday, and for part of the day Sunday, law and order was circumvented. In this great city which the countries of the world look to for leadership and assistance, good people were not safe to walk the streets. None of the Federal buildings were burned, but I am sure that is only because they were heavily protected by troops. Thank God for that protection, because these buildings hold the treasures of our heritage.

The National Archives holds the original copy of our Constitution, a document that Americans have fought and died to uphold. That priceless symbol of the greatness of our country could have been destroyed—as it was, the meaning and history of those words were suspended for 48 hours.

The Nation's Capital was smothered in turmoil and I am afraid that we will see further rioting here now that the militant leaders have proven their ideas can be successful. I must grant that the law was enforced to a certain degree. After all, 6,124 persons were arrested, but for everyone of these many were not stopped from looting. From photographs on television and in the newspapers, it was obvious that looting took place in plain view of police officers and soldiers, who because of orders from much higher up were unable to act.

According to statistics gathered by the press, these rioters were not oppressed, downtrodden people or individuals who are "beyond hope." A good many of them were Federal employees, some in clerical positions. According to the Washington Post, the typical person arrested in the riot was "about 29, who attended 11 grades of school, has a job paying $85 to $95 a week and has not been in trouble with the law before." Only 10 percent were unemployed and a few had college degrees. The arrest docket included several college students. These were not people who had never found an opportunity to better themselves.

The involvement of these apparently respectable people goes back to another tenet of Martin Luther King's creed: "If you feel a law is unjust, you don't have to obey it." The Nation is now being paid for apathetic acceptance of this theory. In this anarchic position is found the breakdown of law and order, for in our society we must have almost voluntary compliance to the law or at least grudging acceptance of the law until it can be changed through the orderly process of representative legislative action. Until the theory of ignoring legal standards is rejected, we will have violence in our streets.

It has been said many times in the past few days that Martin Luther King "had a dream." Well, I have a dream also and this dream is the dream of many Americans. I have hopes of a new day in the United States that does not require a double standard for the various races of mankind, that does not need special laws for every shade of skin.

That dream will come true when the black, white, yellow, and red people of this country reach a point in their understanding of one another where each is an American. Not an Afro-American, not an Indian American, or an oriental American—just an American dedicated to the freedom of all men and to an orderly society. The society of this dream will not apply or require different standards. It will simply recognize the worth of a man by his accomplishments and ideals.

That dream is not near to being because we must first deal with elements in our society who violate the rights of others while demanding special concessions for themselves. Those elements incited the riots in Washington and 41 other American cities during the past few days. The U.S. Government must deal with these riots to preserve any hope for this dream.

We are a nation of laws and these laws, not men, govern our people. But the leaders of this country must see that our laws are enforced and upheld when they are just laws—amended or repealed, if they prove to be unjust. And the Government has a responsibility to meet unlawful force with whatever force is required to preserve order. The Government cannot look aside on one occasion when the law is being violated and then expect easy enforcement on the next occasion. As a good example, I recall law enforcement during times of natural disaster, such as earthquake or flood. Looters—who are really just human scavengers taking advantage of a tragedy—are shot when they strike out during the panic following acts of God.

Do you know what would happen in Montana if a riot broke out and the good people could see that authorities were unable or unwilling to protect their lives and property? Although the people of Montana are for the most part law-abiding and tolerant, they would use whatever they could put their hands on to restore order.

I know this to be a fact and not just supposition, because several years ago the townspeople of West Yellowstone, Mont., did act on their own to calm a disturbance. Large groups of young people had taken over this resort town and proceeded to build a large fire in the middle of Main Street. Residents of the town waited long enough to see that the problem was becoming worse, and in fact already out of control of the limited police force, and then they took action. These self-sufficient citizens went into Main Street with ax handles and solved the problem. There were no serious injuries when things calmed down, but there were some young people with bruised hind parts and new respect for the town of West Yellowstone.

Now realize, please, that this is not a chapter out of the history of the Old West—this happened 5 short years ago and West Yellowstone has not had a problem with rioters since then.

By giving you this example I am not advocating a return to the vigilante days, but I am trying to show the only alternative to firm action by the government, local or Federal. People will protect their homes and families, if the government fails to do so.

The alternative to controlling these riots through swift and strong government action is to allow the rioters, looters and aronists to have their way. If we have this brutal a riot in April, what will the heat of August bring? If Government continues to fail in safeguarding the rights of all people, we can expect far worse as the summer wears on. These beautiful monuments will be the next target and the Capitol Building and White House will be under attack. The large cities in America will one by one be given over to the rioters and this anarchy which we now permit will spread throughout the country.

Our President and the Congress must take a firm footing and not be pushed into hasty and panicked actions that encourage more violence.

If we yield to a violent, but small segment of society, we have failed the majority of Americans who are now depending on us. Our obligation is clear: Restore order and discourage malcontents.

Fail in that duty and the leaders of our country will allow this violence, which we have now had a small taste of, to become a way of life.

Days of terror and nights of fire will continue to assault America unless our Federal, State, and local governments act now, and act as forcefully as required, to restore the order and dream of a free and stable society.

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN ISSUES 1968 FIRST QUARTER REPORT ON FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I share the hope of all Americans that recent deplomatic efforts will ultimately succeed in bringing about a just and lasting peace in Vietnam. It is still too early, however, for much optimism. Meanwhile the war goes on and so we must continue to be concerned about the enemy's sources of supply which contribute to its operation. With the curtailing of bombing attacks on North Vietnam I believe this means the problem of the enemy's seaborne sources of supply can only take on added importance. At such a time as this I believe, therefore, we should be increasing our efforts to stop free world

shipping to North Vietnam. Regrettably this does not appear to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, during March, 12 more free world-flag ships arrived in North Vietnam—10 British, one Italian, and one Singapore flag. This brings the total for the first 3 months of 1968 to 30 free world arrivals, a more than 100-percent increase over the 14 arrivals during the first quarter of 1967. Despite these startling facts, I can find no one in the administration who is actively concerned about this seaborne supply to the enemy. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table showing the number of arrivals of free world-flag ships to North Vietnam during the first quarter of 1968:

FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1968

Flag of registry	January	February	March	Total
British	9	7	10	26
Cypriot	1	1		2
Italian			1	1
Singapore			1	1
Total	10	8	12	30

This traffic has continued quite undisturbed since the administration belatedly decided to blacklist these vessels. Careful examination of the most recent list, issued March 20, 1968, by the Maritime Administration, reveals that it is neither complete nor effective in doing anything to stop current traffic.

First of all, the Maritime report, as published in the Federal Register, lists only the names of individual ships and says nothing about the number of times they have been to North Vietnam. It is, therefore, not a reliable indicator of the extent or volume of this trade, Furthermore, it does not even make public the names of all the ships involved.

In the March 20 report the names of only 16 British-flag ships appear, however, the information provided me by the Defense Department shows twice that number. During the period covered by the Maritime report, in fact, I am advised that some 32 different British-flag ships have been to North Vietnamese ports a total of 126 times.

Secondly, the purpose of this list is to deny to the specific ships listed the privilege of carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes from American ports. There is, however, no prohibition about these same ships coming to U.S. ports to carry on regular non-Government-financed trade nor to prevent their owners from making profits by using other vessels under their control to transport U.S. Government-financed or private cargoes.

To illustrate, it is my understanding, from information supplied me by the Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration, that the owner of a Lebanese-flag vessel, the *Nagos*, which arrived in North Vietnam in December 1967, also owns or controls a Cypriot-flag vessel, the *Pat*, which entered the port of Albany, N.Y., on January 2, 1968.

Similarly, the owner of a Cypriot-flag vessel, which already has been to North Vietnam twice this year, also owns a Liberian-flag ship, the *Mistral 1*, which entered the port of Pensacola, Fla., on July 6, 1967, and loaded cargo destined for England. This same vessel was also reported in San Francisco on October 2, 1967, and in Tampa, Fla., November 4, 1967.

As one who has sponsored legislation—reintroduced January 10, 1967, as H.R. 365—since 1965 to close our ports to all vessels owned or controlled by a shipping interest which engages in trade with North Vietnam, I can only reiterate my great disappointment that the administration has sought to oppose taking more effective action.

During the first quarter of 1968, British-flag vessels continued to top the list, accounting for 26 of the 30 free world-flag arrivals. This fact, however, does not appear to be of any great concern to the State Department. In the course of a standard response to inquiries about this trade, the Department recently stated:

> More than 85% of the calls made (at North Vietnamese ports) in 1967 were by Hong Kong-registered ships flying the British flag but under the effective control of Chinese Communists.

Having said that, the reader is presumably left to conclude that somehow these are not really British ships and therefore nothing can or should be done to remove them from this traffic.

At the outset, I would first point out that this is the very same attitude expressed by the State Department during the past few years. It was only after Congress began to show its concern and voted, over the opposition of the administration, to tighten aid restrictions on countries involved in this trade with the Hanoi regime, that the level of free world traffic began to drop from 401 arrivals in 1964 to 257 in 1965 and to 74 in 1966. The 78 arrivals during 1967 indicates, however, that this downward trend has been reversed, and that additional steps are now required in order to make further reduction in this traffic to the enemy.

Now let us examine the activities of these Hong Kong-based British-flag ships more closely. It is true that in recent months there have been no British-flag vessels registered in England in this trade, and I would commend the British Government for its assistance in this regard. It is also true that the Hong Kong vessels currently trading with North Vietnam are under charter to Communist governments and are presumably carrying, for the most part, Communist goods.

Nonetheless, the Department of Defense has stated in testimony submitted to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee August 16, 1967, that 10 percent of North Vietnam's total imports continue to come from free world sources while 20 percent of all of North Vietnam's seaborne imports arrive in free world-flag ships. I have also been advised that some, but not all, of the companies owning these vessels are in reality controlled by designated nationals of Red China, and that this is apparently completely in accordance with current British maritime law.

The Department of the Treasury has informed me, however, that several other of these Hong Kong shipping interests appear to be under the ultimate control of a citizen of the Union of South Africa. In any event, the stubborn fact remains that these vessels do fly the British flag and no other.

I am told that up until the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854 British ships could be registered only in England. Under that act, as a student of British maritime law has remarked, the "high privilege" of extending the power to register "British ships" was accorded the colonies. Consequently—

> By the Imperial Act a "British Ship" had the right to fly the British flag indicating its national character. To do so without proper authority incurred the severest penalties, because wherever the ship should be found the union jack was notice to all the world that behind it and supporting it for all lawful purposes was the Power of the British Empire and the might of the British Navy.[1]

To date, I am not aware that anyone challenges the legality of the registration of these Hong Kong ships. If, however, the issue were raised, there is apparently an adequate legal remedy. Under section 69 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894, a vessel which improperly takes on the British character is liable to be confiscated by the Crown—

> If a person uses the British flag and assumes the British national character on board a ship owned in whole or in part by any persons not qualified to own a British ship, for the purposes of making the ship appear to be a British ship, the ship shall be subject to forfeiture under this Act. . . .

So I believe it is clear that these Hong Kong vessels are British ships. If the British Government cannot exercise effective control over vessels under its flag then, I respectfully suggest again, as I did last November in an address to our NATO allies at the North Atlantic Assembly meeting in Brussels, that a revision of the British maritime law might well be considered. I would point out that the British Government is a signatory to the Geneva Convention on the High Seas of 1958, wherein article 5, section 1, reads as follows:

> Each State shall fix the conditions for the grant of its nationality to ships, for the registration of ships in its territory, and for the right to fly its flag. Ships have the nationality of the State whose flag they are entitled to fly. There must exist a genuine link between the State and the ship; in particular, the State must effectively exercise its jurisdiction and control in administrative technical and social matters over ships flying its flag.

The British Government maintains that under existing maritime law, and without a declaration of war on North Vietnam, it cannot control the movements of these Hong Kong vessels. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the war goes on and that the Hanoi regime regularly and increasingly depends upon these Hong Kong vessels for at least 20 percent of its total seaborne imports. In addition, while it has been frequently claimed by the State Department that these Hong Kong ships do not carry so-called strategic goods, the Defense De-

[1] Quoted by Robert Reinow, *The Test of the Nationality of a Merchant Vessel*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1937, 141.

partment reports I receive indicate that such items have been repeatedly delivered during the past 12 months and including this past March. As I stated time and time again, it is evident that the war economy of North Vietnam dictates that only high priority supplies be permitted cargo space; and with the hiring of free world vessels the strains and pressures on their transportation facilities available to the North Vietnamese are necessarily eased.

Another intriguing fact is that these same Hong Kong vessels are barred by the British from trade with Southern Rhodesia. This was clearly brought out during Secretary of State Rusk's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11 when he supplied Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, the following information:

British flag-Hong Kong registered ships were, as were all British ships, barred from trade with Southern Rhodesia in implementation of Security Council Resolution No. 232 adopted December 16, 1966 (which imposed selective mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia) and of the Southern Rhodesia Act of 1965, since the British flag-Hong Kong registered ships engaged in trade with North Vietnam are not engaged in trade with Rhodesia, the question of enforcement of the Rhodesia ban against these particular ships has not arisen.

As we all know, the British Government has urged the United Nations to adopt a trade embargo on Southern Rhodesia on the grounds that the present situation there constitutes a threat to international peace and security. To cite a concrete example, among other prohibited Rhodesian trade is that involving automobiles and parts. Yet the British Government has permitted the sale of British cars to North Vietnam. If such trade is reprehensible in the case of Southern Rhodesia how does it suddenly become a matter of no concern in the case of North Vietnam?

Does the British Government seriously suggest that the policies of North Vietname are less a threat to international peace and security? Such a double standard is incredible and intolerable. The administration must do more to impress upon the British Government the deep concern of the American people so that action will be taken to stop this aid and comfort to the enemy.

At this point I insert report No. 19 issued by the Maritime Administration on March 20, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, REPORT NO. 19

LIST OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

Section 1. The President has approved a policy of denying the carriage of United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States on foreign flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966.

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate United States Government Departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through March 18, 1968. This list does not include vessels under the registration of countries, including the Soviet Union and Communist China, which normally do not have vessels calling at United States ports.

Flag of registry, name of ship, and gross tonnage	
Total, all flags, 51 ships	349, 399
Polish (27 ships):	209, 301
Andrzej Strug	6, 919
Beniowski	10, 443
Djakarta	6, 915
Energetyk	10, 876
Florian Ceynowa	6, 784
General Sikorski	6, 785
Hanka Sawicka	6, 944
Hanoi	6, 914
Hugo Kollataj	3, 755
Jan Matejko	6, 748
Janek Krasicki	6, 904
Jozef Conrad	8, 730
Kapitan Kosko	6, 629
Kochanowski	8, 231
Konopnicka	9, 690
Karaszewski	10, 363
Lelewel	7, 817
Marceli Nowotko	6, 660
Marian Buczek	7, 053
Moniuszko	9, 247
Norwid	5, 512
Phenian	6, 923
Przyjazn Narodow	8, 876
Stefan Okrzeja	6, 620
Transportowiec	10, 854
Wieniawski	9, 190
Wladyslaw Broniewski	6, 919
British (15 ships)	84, 452
Ardrossmore	5, 820
Ardrowan	7, 300
Dartford	2, 739
Greenford	2, 964
Isabel Erica	7, 105
Kingford	2, 911
Rochford	3, 324
Rosetta Maud (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name, Ardtara—British)[1]	5, 795
Santa Granda	7, 229
Shienfoon	7, 127
Shirley Christine	6, 724
Shun Tai[2]	7, 085
Taipieng	5, 676
Vercharmian[2]	7, 265
Yungfutary	5, 388
Cypriot (5 ships)	30, 981
Acme	7, 173
Agenor (trips to North Vietnam—Greek)[1]	7, 139
Amon	7, 229
Antonia II	7, 303
Marianthi	2, 137
Italian (1 ship) Agostino Bertani	8, 380
Lebanese (1 ship) Nagos	7, 092
Maltese (1 ship) Amalia	7, 304
Panamanian (1 ship) Salamanca (Trips to North Vietnam under ex-name, Milford—British)[1]	1, 889

[1] Ships appearing on the List which have made no trips to North Vietnam under the present registry.

[2] Added to Report No. 18 appearing in the Federal Register issue of February 21, 1968.

Section 2. In accordance with approved procedures, the vessels listed below which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, have reacquired eligibility to carry United States Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) that such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the United States Government to discourage such trade and;

(b) that no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c) and;

(c) that vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

Flag of registry:	*Number of ships*
Since last report	None
Previous reports—flag of registry:	
British	1

Section 3. The following number of vessels have been removed from this list since they have been broken up:

Flag of registry:	*Broken up*
British	1
Cypriot	2
Greek	1

By Order of the Acting Maritime Administrator.

Date: March 20, 1968.

JAMES S. DAWSON, JR.,
Secretary.

NATION MOURNS MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening when the tragic news of Dr. Martin Luther King's murder was announced I stated the following:

It is a shameful and shocking tragedy—the irony is that this man of peace who preached non-violence should have been snuffed out by the hand of violence. All Americans who decry and reject racism and violence must do more than deplore this cancer which is infecting the bloodstream of America today. We must act to eradicate it!

Americans must show that they care for their brother Americans by working more zealously toward the fulfillment of the dream which Martin Luther King dreamed—an America where all black and white can live together, free of bigotry and inequality in a spirit of brotherhood, where there is true, equal justice amid equality of opportunity. Only by demonstrating this concern and working toward the fulfillment of this dream can we say that he did not die in vain.

Mr. Speaker, my own city of Newark, N.J., where racial tensions erupted last summer in a holocaust of hate, arson, looting, and murder, has awakened to the awful truth that no society can stand the breakdown of law and order and the divisiveness of racial hatred. The rights and the wrongs of any situation pale in the face of assassinations, beatings, and all the ugly forms of violent outbursts. That is why I was proud of Newark this last week when black and white sat down together to a plan a fitting citywide response to Dr. King's death.

On Sunday over 25,000 citizens, black and white, urban and suburban, marched together in a spirit of brotherhood to mourn the murder of a great leader. There is now some hope in Newark because of this unity.

The following article and editorials from the Newark Star-Ledger and Evening News fittingly describe Newark's reaction to the tragic death of Martin Luther King, Jr.:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Apr. 8, 1968]

NEWARK WALK: NEGROES, WHITES IN TRIBUTE

(By Douglas Eldridge)

Thousands of Negroes and whites walked side by side through Newark's Central Ward yesterday in an historic demonstration of concern for the ghetto and commitment to the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King.

The huge, peaceful "Walk for Understanding" was the biggest demonstration in recent memory in Newark—and a stirring tribute to the slain champion of nonviolence and brotherhood.

Crowd estimates varied from less than 15,000 to more than 35,000. The most common figure was 25,000.

In a column more than 1½ miles long, the marchers—more than half whites from many suburban communities—walked 10 abreast through slums still scarred from last July's rioting.

DR. KING EULOGIZED

Then they swarmed in front of the Essex County Courthouse to cheer challenges for continued black-white teamwork from two top Negro leaders, and a Catholic priest's eulogy of Dr. King as "a saint in the fullest sense of the term . . . who has shown us the face of God in our time."

The walk, conceived six weeks ago as a demonstration by suburban whites of concern and goodwill for the city, was turned into a memorial to Dr. King after his assassination in Memphis last Thursday.

The orderly outpouring of leaders and ordinary citizens was a sharp contrast to the chaos here last summer, and the violence in many other cities in the wake of Dr. King's assassination.

Favored by crisp spring weather and untroubled by any incidents, the throng set out from High and Mercer streets in a mood both solemn and buoyant. Sorrow for Dr. King and anxiety about racial unrest were offset somewhat by joy at the large turnout, and its spirit of reconciliation.

Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio and Willie Wright, militant president of the United Afro-American Association, walked together behind the 10-foot-wide banner at the head of the procession. The yellow banner, with black and white figures, said "Walk for Understanding—People Care."

A little farther back, two men—one black, one white—held aloft a 2-foot-high photograph of Dr. King, draped in purple. There were no other signs or displays.

Most marchers wore large "I Care" buttons and black armbands, and some carried palms from church services. Most were quiet, but some sang "We Shall Overcome" and freedom songs. A few called to knots of pedestrians and loungers outside taverns to join the procession—and some did. Most spectators watched silenly.

The marchers—young and old, black and white, city and suburban, prominent and obscure—passed two giant public housing projects and the Abyssinian Baptist Church, which was Dr. King's last stop in his March 27 tour of Northern New Jersey.

The procession also passed shattered stores and rotting tenements, as well as the Fourth Precinct, scene of last July's first violence. Capt. Edward Williams, highest ranking Negro in the department, waited outside in uniform—and was applauded and pulled into the head of the procession by the marchers.

The crowd included Essex County's two congressmen and many public officials, clergymen of many faiths, and suburban families who came on more than 40 chartered buses. They marched beside many of Newark's top Negro leaders and hundreds of Negro families in all kinds of attire.

Wright, who originally proposed meeting at Queen of Angels Church, told the crowd outside the courthouse: "You have set a precedent for all other people around this nation to follow."

CAN GET TOGETHER

The outspoken black leader added: "It has been proven in the last few days that black people and white people can get together."

He also asked the crowd whether it agreed with the findings of the President's and Governors' commissions on civil disorders. Many shouted "yes," but a large number yelled "no."

The bearded leader also emphasized, however, that the out-of-towners had caught just a glimpse of conditions in the city, and added: "This is a beginning . . . if you're really concerned, if you really care, this is not a one-day affair." He urged them to return again soon, perhaps for a memorial for the 26 persons who died during last July's riot.

Timothy Still, president of the United Community Corp., told the visitors: "What you have seen today as you walked through the yard cries out for partnership of those of us who believe in the dignity of man."

APPEAL TO WHITES

Still, a veteran Central Ward leader, also urged the whites to support black political leadership, voter registration drives, antipoverty programs and "the development of black community corporations in which the black community can serve the economic needs of its people."

A eulogy of Dr. King by Msgr. Thomas J. Carey of Queen of Angels ended the hour-long program—and drew thunderous applause and shouts of "hallelujah" and "tell it, father"!

Many cried openly as the white priest recalled Dr. King's "I Have a Dream" speech at the 1963 March on Washington, and then declared:

"Maybe God will perform a miracle to help all of us become other Martin Luther Kings . . . only then will all of us be able to say with Martin Luther King:

"FREE AT LAST"

"Free at last . . . free at last . . . thank God almighty, we're all free at last."

The priest also recalled the parable of the rich man who was doomed for ignoring Lazarus, and declared: "If this country does not see its poor, if it lets them remain in poverty and misery, then it will surely go to hell."

The march co-chairman, David Foley of Woodcliff Lake, told the whites in the crowd: "You and I have been silent too long . . . We have let others push other people around too long."

He urged the visitors to promote open housing and aid voter registration drives. At Foley's suggestion whites and Negroes throughout the crowd exchanged handshakes.

"NEW HOPE" SEEN

Afterward, Joe Chaneyfield, a housing project maintenance man who was grand marshal of the march, beamed and said: "I'm overwhelmed!" And Timothy Still said simply: "There's new hope."

Some Negro participants were more cautious, however. "Let's see what meaningful comes out of it," observed Mrs. Johnnie Johnson. And Albert Black, chairman of the Newark Human Rights Commission, commented: "It's magnificent—if something develops from it."

A few Negro leaders refused to join the march. Robert Curvin, director of the Rutgers Community Action Intern program, stood on the sidelines and said he could not walk with politicians "who have been responsible for arresting, harassing, intimidating and providing all kinds of obstruction to people who were trying to do what Martin Luther King did." Curvin, a former chairman of Newark-Essex CORE, added: "It's hypocrisy. I could never march with them."

PICKS UP PARTICIPANTS

The march began at 2:18 p.m. and the first marchers reached the courthouse at 3:05—just 20 minutes after the last marchers had left the starting line. The march picked up participants as it moved along its 2½-mile route, and it was 4:05 before the end of the line finally reached the courthouse.

Marchers coming down Springfield Avenue were able to look across Prince Street and see others still going up W. Kinney Street—nearly 1½ miles farther back along the parade route.

Before stepping off, the marchers were addressed briefly by David Ludlow, an architect from Summit, and Rev. Dennis Westbrooks, director of the church volunteer service in the Scudder Homes. Mr. Westbrooks welcomed the white marchers, but added: "Do not walk for us, or we will lose the use of our own feet."

Then the bell of nearby St. Mary's Catholic Church tolled 39 times—once for each year of Dr. King's life. A banner on St. Mary's tower said: "Not fear but love."

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, Apr. 7, 1968]

DAY OF MOURNING

Only eight days before he was assassinated, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was in Newark urging that the Negro people's slogan be "build, baby, build" rather than "burn, baby, burn." This was a succinct expression of his nonviolent philosophy and reflected his unswerving faith, as repeated in Newark, that "we do belong and we do count."

Dr. King devoted most of his life to leadership in this effort. He looked to Negroes to win their goals through political power, through influence on their elected representatives in accordance with the democratic system. Though many of his goals remain unfulfilled, he was on the path that offered the soundest prospect of reaching them.

Dr. King's death removed a distinguished leader and an outstanding personality, a man talented in reaching Americans at all levels. Other leaders of ability remain who share much the same view, and a heavy responsibility has now fallen on them.

But the best "succession" is in the men and women who work quietly in the ghettos and elsewhere to bridge the gap between black and white, in the spirit which Dr. King symbolized. It is they who can be especially useful in carrying on Dr. King's counsel:

"Get the weapon of nonviolence, the breastplate of righteousness, the armor of truth, and just keep marching."

Thus, the outbreaks of disorder and looting which have followed his tragic death are an evil memorial to this great man, whose life was dedicated to the obliteration of violence and mob rule. In their way, the burning, pillaging and killing are as senseless as the act of the cowardly assassin who triggered the fatal shot.

Country and Congress cannot leave a solution of racial problems, emergent as it is, to extremists on either side. What progress toward a unified country is made by the rioting in the nation's capital? What is gained when the President is obliged to call out federal troops to restore order? This is not the America of Dr. King's dream, it is the road to hatred and catastrophe. Today is a period of national mourning for Dr. King, so proclaimed by the President of the United States. It would be a day to remember in the years ahead if this Sunday should also mark the end of the racial violence which Dr. King so deeply abhorred.

[From the Sunday Star Ledger, Apr. 6. 1968]

A NATION SHAMED

The killing of Dr. Martin Luther King is the shame of the nation, the shocking sym-

bol of the irrationality and violence that has plunged this country into the abyss of distored human values.

The fact that a man with a sick mind fired the fatal shot does not absolve the rest of the nation from blame, black or white. The slayer is a product of the envenomed atmosphere that spews hatred, distrust, suspicion and hostility.

In the numbing aftermath of this terrible occurrence, the futility of the harsh word, the inflammatory phrase, and the bitter denunciation surfaces with awesome inadequacy.

This is a moment of monumental grief and sorrow, the terrible reprise of the historical injustices, social and economic, that has afflicted the Negroes for more than a century in this country.

The supreme irony of the killing of Dr. King will never be lost, not for a moment. This man was an apostle of peace, the advocate of nonviolence in a movement that has been lately characterized by a militancy that contemptuously brushes aside his philosophy of man's love for man.

This was a man with a lifetime of profound religious commitment who sought to find a solution for his fellow Negro's historical plight in a white-oriented society in an ecclesiastical context. This man should have been the least likely target for an assassin's bullet . . . he was a man of peace, not violence.

In a deep, personal sense the grief of the bereft family of Dr. King becomes the grief of the nation, of all Americans. Condolence and sympathy serve no purpose, however, if the tragic killing of this courageous man is not memorialized in a constructive manner, a universal willingness and dedication to translate the good intentions into deed.

There can be no more fitting legacy than the approval by Congress of the 1968 civil rights bill . . . and legislative controls on the sale of guns. In this context, the nation could help to partially expiate this wanton criminal act that has shamed and degraded a country.

The words that perhaps best exemplify the humane commitment of Dr. King were spoken by him before that great outpouring of humanity, black and white, in the 1963 civil rights march on Washington:

"I have a dream," Dr. King said on that historic day, "that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed, 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.' "

The fulfillment of this dream is the only epitaph that could bring meaning to the life of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man with a vision that all men, black and white, could live in a fraternity of human understanding and compassion.

NOW IS THE TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the strength of a building is tested, not during periods of calm, but in time of storm. The same, I suggest, is true for nations.

We are undergoing a time of severe crises. Are we to survive or are our democratic ideals to perish? The answer is clear.

Tragedy has befallen our Nation, but we can and we must renew our strength. This can be done, not by reliance upon repression, but by application of our principles of justice and equality. Those who violate the law must be punished. At the same time, we must lend a helping hand to those persons, black and white, whose lives have been disrupted by the riots. Furthermore, we must continue and intensify the struggle against injustice and poverty. Only in this way can we make clear that our legal system is responsive to the pressing needs of the country.

One specific measure recommended by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders is passage of a Federal fair housing law. Such a measure and other important provisions are contained in the civil rights bill now being considered by the Rules Committee.

I urge the Rules Committee to bring the civil rights bill to the floor prior to the Easter recess. We must act upon and pass that legislation before our recess begins.

OUR GLORY AND OUR SHAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 7, 1968, I attended memorial services for the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King in Rochdale Village, a community within my congressional district. The services were sponsored by the Rochdale Negro Cultural Society under the chairmanship of its president, William Booker. Almost 3,000 men, women, and children of every race, color, and creed attended. There were many eloquent words, prayers, and songs heard in memory of Dr. King, a world figure and spiritual leader. I believe, however, that the greatest testimonial to his teachings is this community of Rochdale itself which, if imitated throughout this country would immediately bring understanding and true fulfillment of the principles of our Constitution, for here at Rochdale within the last several years have come together over 25,000 people from all walks of life, of every race, color, and creed, living together and working together in harmony. This community of Rochdale Village, I believe, would fit into the dream of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that no law or laws can ever create or fulfill such a dream: a dream can only be accomplished into reality if put into every day's living of life and the laws are obeyed by all. Money cannot buy this, violence cannot buy this—only true meaningful determined understanding can bring this about. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Long Island Sunday Press on April 7, 1968:

OUR GLORY AND OUR SHAME

Twice, in less than five years of our turbulent time, America has lost eloquent leaders of inspired vision to the depravity that threatens to engulf us all.

The murders of President John F. Kennedy and the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. are wounds that scar the souls of all of us. These murders not only shame us before the world and before ourselves but they obscure the glory that is also America.

Our glory is that we produce men like John Kennedy and Martin King who touched the hearts of men throughout the world as few others have in our time. These were the men who, in a time of cynical hatred, gave young and old the hope that the highest human ideals are ultimately the practical salvation of our diseased civilization. To them, the impossible dream was the only possibility worth surviving for.

Our shame is that we produced not just the madmen who pulled the triggers that killed these great young leaders. Our shame—and our mortal danger—is that there were other Americans, some in silence and others openly, gave their assent to such unspeakable crimes.

The mortal danger is that these apostles of shame and violence will draw America into separate camps pitched at the outer extremes of the human condition. They are poles apart, yet like the frigid poles at the ends of the earth, their terrain is the same. The Kennedy haters came from the far left and the far right, just as the King haters came from the black and the far white.

They deliberately use terror and violence because this breeds fear and kills reason, because this demoralizes the vast middle, the great American melting pot of diverse people. Listen now to Stokely Carmichael. Alive Martin Luther King was to him just an Uncle Tom who preached the square notion that black and white can find salvation only through learning to live together in peaceful respect for each other's humanity. But martyred Martin Luther King is Carmichael's rallying cry to draw Negroes around his pole and force white America to another. And this is the motive of the white extremists who engineered or welcomed the death of Martin Luther King.

This is the way extremists hope to achieve power.

This is what President Johnson meant Friday when he called on the nation—all men and all races—to "stand their ground to deny violence its victory." The violence of the vendetta solves nothing. It simply breeds on itself until it tears apart the fabric of civilized life.

Stokely Carmichael's strident screams for revenge have an understandable appeal to soul wounded Negroes. It sounds so simple—as simple as the bullet in the head of Martin Luther King must have seemed to his white killer. But Martin Luther King's greatness was that with magnificent patience and eloquence he made multitudes understand that black and white can survive only in coming together. If, in losing Dr. King we also lose his message, then our melting-pot America will move inexorably toward some new kind of racist hell.

LAKE KOOCANUSA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today naming the reservoir created by Libby Dam now under construction in northwestern Montana on the Kootenai River.

The name I have proposed is Lake Koocanusa. This name, although it sounds like an Indian name, is in fact a combination of the names: Kootenai, Canada, and USA. Kootenai, of course, is the name of the river; Canada is included because the reservoir extends into the territory of our northern neighbor; and USA indicates that this is a body of water that connects our two great countries.

This name has the support of the residents in the area of the reservoir and I am hopeful that the Canadian Board of

Geographic Names will give its necessary concurrence. I have asked the Department of the Interior to ask for concurrence from the Canadian Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is the hope of all Montanans and especially those in the western district that Americans from all 50 States will in the years to come visit Lake Koocanusa to view the outstanding beauty of the area and to enjoy the many recreational features of the man-made lake.

Libby Dam is a monument to international cooperation, to national progress and to legislative faith in the future of America. Lake Koocanusa will be a proud addition to the lexicon of the great American outdoors.

MOTHER VOICES CONCERN FOR FIGHTING MEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from a mother of a soldier serving in Vietnam. Mrs. Thompson's views on this conflict reflect a great deal of thought and consideration. Her views also reflect some of the deep concern that only a mother can experience.

Under unanimous consent I submit Mrs. Thompson's letter and quotes from letters and recordings from her son, Sfc. Myrle M. Thompson. I commend to the attention of every Member of this body these most patriotic, most moving words. The letter follows:

APRIL 1, 1968.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEVILL: First of all, may I say that I do not pretend to know how the war should be run in Vietnam. I'm just an American and a mother with a son in Vietnam, my only son. I would be very happy to see my son brought home to his family, and out of danger, from war, but not at the risk of sacrificing everything that I believe in, the principles of our great country, with freedom and justice for all peoples in all countries. As an American I cannot understand how any one can say they are an American, and still do things or even say them that may jeopardize the lives of our courageous men, regardless if they are relatives of some of them or not. How our great men, learned men and our representatives, can say, "Bring our men home and leave the South Vietnamese to fight for their own country," is beyond my comprehension.

I have no idea if this can accomplish anything or you as our spokesman can help in anyway, but I feel that if the American mothers, fathers and friends of our men in Vietnam would speak out on or ask for publication of some of the mail we receive from Vietnam on how the men there feel about what they are doing and how they believe in it, so that we could be heard, that it would help a great deal. Otherwise, if we just keep quiet and say nothing, we may be helping to jeopardize our sons or help to prolong the time for victory for a worthy people that have had to bear so much without accomplishment of anything except the prolonging of our mens' stay in Vietnam, and many lives lost for no purpose.

My concern for our men there and such things as the television broadcast of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the attitude of Chairman Fulbright, and some of the others, prompted me to write this; also the fact that our President has halted the bombings, as I fear what could or may happen during this pause. I realize the President has so much pressure placed upon him, and we the meek have not protested, so this is a, or rather the only form of protest, that I would recognize, as being in accord with the American principles.

Sincerely,

MRS. L. J. THOMPSON.

QUOTES FROM LETTERS AND RECORDINGS FROM SFC. MYRL M. THOMPSON, 68TH MEDICAL GROUP, VIETNAM

"An American goes wherever his Government tells him to go, at any time or any place, without regard for personal risk or danger. He does the job he is sent to do to the best of his ability."

"Mother, in reference to the Hill, where some of our bombs were dropped from planes by our own men, on our troops, this happens in every way. This is tragic and regrettable, but also unavoidable. The man in the plane has precision instruments, unfortunately the man on the ground does not. It is impossible for him to pinpoint his position or the location of the enemy. Therefore, he cannot be precise in giving his exact position when asking for help from the air. The man in the plane follows the instructions he is given, as to where to drop the bombs. If this happens to me, or I'm wounded, regardless of the severity of that injury, or if I am killed by my own buddies, I will have no regrets, nor would I have it any different if I knew this would happen. It can happen on the ground, at sea or in the air.

"Never in any war have the news reporters been allowed to report a war like they have in this one. They are paid to get the sensational, the headline makers. The war movies of the John Wayne kind makes for interesting viewing, but seldom does this happen in a real war, where all the facts are put together. The everyday happenings of an American sharing any food or razor blades with all his buddies when he receives a package from home, or the cooperation and the helping of the South Vietnamese—this is what makes up the war for us. We, too, would like to be at home with our dear ones, and we would like to hate the people of South Vietnam, but this we can't do. These people are greatly appreciative of every little thing we do for them. They wish to learn that they may become useful and independent citizens. All the men here that I know feel the same—We know why we are here, for we are Americans and it follows that we believe in freedom and justice for all men, of all countries on this earth. We ignore the draft card burners and the marches back home as much as possible and do everything we can to help each other and our allies. It does bother us that so much of the tax paid dollar is having to be used to sponsor some of this and to feed and rebuild cities that have been damaged, that should never have happened in the first place."

"We were aware of the attacks that were to be made during the Tet holidays, and prepared for it in every possible way we could. Unfortunately, neither we or the people of South Vietnam can be sure who is enemy or friend, and some of the Vietnamese that may have known were frightened into not talking or telling, because of the brutal threats to their families."

"I'm sending clippings from the Pacific Stars and Stripes, on some of the better things that occur everyday, that may never make the headlines at home. One is how we worked around the clock to save the life of Sp/4 Michael Donaldson, who was bitten by a banded krait, a deadly snake."

IS INSURRECTION BREWING IN THE UNITED STATES?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, after touring the areas of devastation here in the Nation's Capital, I believe that serious attention must be devoted to the whys and wherefores of mass disturbances and insurrections in our city streets. This month's issue of Reader's Digest presents an excellent condensation of an article which appeared in U.S. News & World Report of December 1967 by Richard H. Sanger which analyzes many aspects of this timely and important subject.

Richard H. Sanger is a recognized authority on the causes and patterns of political violence. He spent more than a year in Russia, in 1933, and 1934, and attended a series of lectures on how to foment revolution. Returning to the United States, he lectured on the dangers of communism; then, during 25 years in the U.S. Foreign Service, he observed at firsthand insurgencies and revolts in a number of countries. The author of "Insurgent Era," he is a lecturer at various universities, the State Department's Foreign Service Institute and senior defense colleges.

While it is not suggested that the rash of outbreaks during the last few days in various cities was instigated by any one source, the qualified observations of Mr. Sanger emphasize the dangerous use to which mob action can be put by clever and designing forces.

I place the interview, "Is Insurrection Brewing in the United States," in the RECORD at this point:

IS INSURRECTION BREWING IN THE UNITED STATES?—AN EXPERT'S APPRAISAL

(NOTE.—Richard H. Sanger is a recognized authority on the causes and patterns of political violence. He spent more than a year in Russia, in 1933 and 1934, and attended a series of lectures on how to foment revolution. Returnking to the United States, he lectured on the dangers of communism; then, during 25 years in the U.S. Foreign Service, he observed at firsthand insurgencies and revolts in a number of countries. The author of "Insurgent Era," he is a lecturer at various universities, the State Department's Foreign Service Institute and senior defense colleges.)

Q. Mr. Sanger, the way things have been going in this country, could it be that an open insurrection against the government is developing?

A. Yes, it is quite possible. I observed the course of a half dozen insurgencies and revolts overseas—in Algeria, Jordan, Kenya, Cuba, Angola and the Congo—and I'm disturbed to note the similarities to the situation now in this country The evidence is that we are now in a transition: passing from mere nuisance demonstrations over civil rights and Vietnam to something much more violent and dangerous. Perhaps many of us have been living in a fool's paradise, thinking that "it can't happen here." There is growing evidence to the contrary.

Q. You see a clearly discernible pattern?

A. Definitely. Political violence starts with

a grievance, a frustration to which one or more new factors may be added. Without question, some of the patterns which have led to insurrections elsewhere are being repeated here. Some of the grievances played up in the United States are phony, but there are genuine grievances: for instance, an apparent gap in communications between the ruling group and the discontented.

I notice other ingredients. Leaders, for example, are now rising to mobilize the discontented. Also in the classic pattern are the efforts by the aggrieved to get action first through peaceful delegations, then through quiet demonstrations, and then through nuisance demonstrations—the sit-ins, pray-ins, lie-downs, stall-downs, and so on. These movements escalate rapidly. Extremists in this country will encourage such escalation.

Q. What should we expect, if the pattern runs true to form?

A. I wouldn't be surprised next summer to see a dramatic and perhaps widespread extension of the burning and looting we saw in Detroit and Watts. I think we've about seen the end of what I call "Gandhi's notebook," the kind of non-violent movement which go no further than the nuisance demonstration. Then you start getting a taste of "Stalin's notebook"—something much more explosive and violent.

Dr. Martin Luther King, for example, has announced he will lead a massive demonstration of the nation's "poor and disinherited" in Washington this April.* That demonstration could be dynamite. Most of the demonstrators, I expect, would be conscientious and lawabiding. But a small percentage of extremists might try to cut off the lights and water, cripple movement by turning over vehicles on the main arteries and temporarily take over parts of the city. Things like these have been done in parts of Detroit, Watts, Newark and elsewhere.

Consider what happened in Washington last October at the mass anti-war demonstration. Just as the peaceful and legitimate demonstrators reached the Pentagon, stopped and were ready to go home, the extremists took over and forced the issue, purposely producing damage, injuries and arrests.

Q. Where could the escalation go from there?

A. The sequence is this: Peaceful demonstrations lead to nuisance demonstrations, which lead to scattered violence. If that doesn't bring results, the next step usually takes the form of underground activities—material terror, the smashing of windows, the burning of cars. After that comes explosive terror, where picked and trained elements in the mobs begin to use guns and bombs. Personal terror and assassination fit into this stage. Finally, this all builds up of general terror—the sort of violence that was so messy and effective in Algeria—rebels putting bombs in suitcases and leaving them in streetcars and movie theaters, or on airplanes.

Q. Who is exploiting the unrest in this country? Communists?

A. Some are communists, but they are in the minority. We've got several grievances cooking all at once here—the Vietnam war, discrimination and living conditions in the big cities, young people irritated by the normal gap between the generations. Vietnam is being exploited by pacifist elements that don't believe in war at all; by isolationist elements that don't think we should be involved in a war so far from the United States; and then certainly by some radicals and real communists who want to make us drop out of the war.

The overwhelming majority in both the anti-war and the racial movements are sincere Americans. But in both groups there are the two or three percent who are out to weaken America, to tear it apart.

Q. Who controlled that Pentagon demonstration?

A. Of about 50,000 marchers, I would say 40,000 were pacifists and other anti-war people. Then there were about 9500 "hippies," "flower children," "beatniks," etc. And then a small corps—probably 200 in all—were the activists, whom you could spot when they moved in. At times they surrounded their speakers to protect them. At other times they formed cordons or linked arms to clear the way. They were mostly 20 to 35 years old. It was they who were giving the directions, and it was no accident that some $10,000 worth of loudspeaker equipment was there for them to use.

Q. Who were these activists?

A. In general, they were leftists, extremists or actual communists. Legitimate pacifist organizations paid for much of the October show. But a lot of cash for such a peace demonstration reportedly comes from Russia, from China or from North Vietnam, which is most directly concerned. I believe this disturbance was opportunistic, aimed at showing the rest of the world we were falling apart, more than at seizing the Pentagon. The march on the Pentagon, incidentally, revealed how the activists have mastered another of the techniques of insurrection—breaking images.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. Picturing the police as brutal, soldiers as bloodthirsty louts with bayonets, and the government as heartless seekers after power. This technique of making police look like Cossacks is an old Bolshevik gambit. For instance, the activists are told to go and sit, perhaps to pray, outside a cathedral or on the pavement in front of the Lincoln Memorial or some other shrine, wherever they know the police will have to shove them aside. When the police move in, they go limp and have to be dragged along. And when they are put in the paddy wagon, they struggle and fight for the benefit of the press and the cameramen.

What emerges is a story of an 18-year-old boy or girl struggling and being beaten over the head. If he is injured, that's fine; he must make certain that the press sees how badly he's hurt. The riot leaders often distribute little plastic bags of red liquid which you can burst on your head so "blood" comes dripping down. And they're now beginning to give the girls easily torn paper dresses.

This sort of character assassination—showing that right in the capital of the United States we have military brutality—is a standard technique. It's been used all around the world. It's very effective, particularly with those who do not know the United States. This sort of thing, incidentally, was taught in the school in Russia when I was there in 1934.

Q. Are many college students involved in this sort of violence?

A. Many may turn out for the excitement, but only a very small proportion are involved in the planning and staging of such riots. Yet all you need is the hard core, the commandos at the center, to do the job.

To the communists, a mob is three pieces: First come the minutemen—people you can get into the streets fast. The second element is the street fillers—the large numbers. In themselves, these groups do no more than just mill around. Then come the action groups, who give direction to the mob. They are easy to spot, and once you do, you know you're dealing with professionals.

Q. What can be done to break the pattern of growing insurgency in the United States?

A. Two things. One is to get at the roots of the problem. Where there are genuine racial grievances, go out and correct them. If there is a need for jobs, for better housing and better schools, raise the money and pay the price of removing the grievance. The other half—equally important—is to make certain that law and order are maintained, even if it means taking drastic measures. The faster you stop organized violence in the streets, the better for all concerned. There will be shouts of police brutality—one must expect that. But if you move in fast and do the job properly, the reckless elements will see that their strategy doesn't pay. It's better to shoot one lawbreaker than to have the situation get out of hand, reaching a point where eventually hundreds may be killed. Successful insurgency or revolt is habit-forming. If rioters can get away with it in one place, they will reason that they can get away with it in ten more.

Q. Why hasn't there been a harder crackdown on lawbreakers?

A. Perhaps some of our authorities are losing the courage to stick their necks out. This is in the classic pattern, a sign of social disintegration. The enforcement of discipline by the government requires responsibility—willingness to take the rap. You see the law-enforcers paralyzed through fear of being associated with "police brutality." What we are witnessing in some parts of the United States is the effectiveness of image-breaking, of character assassination by the radical left.

If policemen won't act, if judges won't meet their responsibilities, if politicians are not willing to enact the required laws, you end up with an abdication of the will to govern—and that is one of the most serious aspects of this entire matter.

Q. If chaos comes, is the average American going to stand for what would amount to open insurrection?

A. No, I don't think he will. I think this would generate a violent reaction that might result in extensive use of troops. Of course, the communists would love that. It would be terrific propaganda for them.

Q. Do the extremists believe they can bring off a revolution here, as the Bolsheviks did in Russia?

A. No, the real communists know they cannot take over the United States. Their intention would be to create violence, shut down power plants, tamper with city water supplies, set gasoline stations on fire, block traffic, turn in false fire alarms, bring on general chaos. As they see it: revolution no, insurrection yes.

The communists think insurrection is possible because a number of Negroes in this country are convinced that they cannot change government policy except by violence. They have gone through "Gandhi's notebook" without, they feel, getting notable results. Unless we act and convince them that we mean business, I think the extremists among them are ready to open the pages of "Stalin's notebook."

* See "Martin Luther King's March on Washington," page 65.

RULE OF MEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the tragedies of violence in America's cities in recent days show how far we have gone in breaking down respect for the law.

Whether an unthinking man guns down another human being, or whether groups of looters ransack stores and set fires—these are all signs that some Americans feel they need to take the law into their own hands.

Of course, they are badly mistaken, because if any country goes far enough in replacing the rule of law with the rule of men, then comes anarchy, where every-

body suffers, or a dictatorship where the freedom we all take for granted is lost.

But one important part of today's problem is that individuals among us should at least be able to know that the Government itself follows the law.

But they cannot. In recent years the Federal Government has shown a disregard for the law, time and time again. Decisions of top officials have too often ignored and replaced the actual law.

And even if many Americans cannot give you specific examples of how this has happened, they feel it. And with it comes a sense of frustration, helplessness and anger that results in senseless acts.

One of the burning issues which led the American colonies to break with Britain in 1776 was that the king taxed the Americans on decision from London, without the colonies having anything to say about it: taxation without representation.

But is the same thing happening here now?

Existing U.S. law provides that on April 1 this year the Federal excise tax on automobile sales was to be reduced from 7 percent to 2 percent. And the Federal excise tax on telephone service was to be cut from 10 percent to 1 percent.

Congress had legislation pending to extend these rates at the higher levels. But April 1 came and went and the legislation was not presented for enactment. So, by law, the rates should have gone down.

However, the Internal Revenue Service announced that the taxes should continue at the higher rates even without the legislation, in the expectation that Congress would pass the needed legislation and would make it retroactive to April 1.

It may well be that Congress will do just that. But meanwhile American citizens are being taxed not on the basis of law, but rather because of the decision of some unknown Government official within the giant bureaucracy; someone who has taken the law into his own hands.

And the question that must be asked is: Where does this stop? If an official can tax the people in one way, under one pretext, then what is to prevent him from imposing some other tax, on some other pretext?

If this goes far enough, the bureaucrats finally will have full authority to decide what is best for the people. And then it is too late to salvage the idea that people can govern themselves.

In a time of national disunity such as this, all Americans need to stop and think, and to readjust some of the mistaken notions which seem to have filled peoples heads recently.

The laws must be obeyed, and where problems exist we should change the laws, not disregard them. But just as individuals must understand this, so must the Government.

With Washington showing a genuine respect for law, and thus providing the kind of proper leadership the people have a right to expect, then we will see a greater measure of national unity.

Guns and fire do not settle problems. Good will, reliance on law, and constant improvement of democratic processes—these must provide the answers to the legitimate problems of all Americans as we make our country a better place in which to live.

CONEY ISLAND

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the possible exception of apple pie and the American flag, there is nothing more American than Coney Island. Is there anyone who has not seen a picture of this famous beach on a hot summer day when there are more people than there is sand? Coney Island has become a symbol of the American way of life. After all, it was in Coney Island just over 100 years ago that the hotdog was invented, and I have never met a man, woman, or child since who has not tasted this culinary delight at least once in their life. Coney Island is more than a beach and a hotdog stand, however, for it offers a wide variety of fun-filled entertainment, ranging from the exciting roller coaster to the 300-foot astro tower, with 485 other rides in between. A recent article in the Long Island Press pays tribute to this great American institution, and I include the text of the article for the benefit of my colleagues:

CONEY ISLAND BRACES FOR 139TH SEASON

Jacqueline Kennedy thinks it's "camp." Governors, mayors and congressmen like it because they have to. Some people say it's tawdry and wouldn't touch it with a 10-foot mustard spreader.

But to 60 million visitors a year, Coney Island is the poor man's Palm Beach, the Brooklyn Riviera, Acapulco at the end of the subway line and the Honolulu of the hot dog lover's world.

The resort, which opens its 139th season on Saturday, had its first tourists in 1606 when Henry Hudson's "Half Moon" landed on its shores. According to tradition, the settlers named the area "Conyne" after the Dutch word for the thousands of rabbits that populated the island. Hudson's landing will be re-enacted this July.

Bounded by the Atlantic Ocean, Coney Island Creek and Sheepshead and Gravesend Bays, where pirate ships once sailed, the resort boasts six miles of beach and a resident population of about 100,000—including gypsies who tell fortunes during the summer season, American Indians and a die-hard colony of midwinter surf bathers.

As it grew from a small settlement to a summer resort for the wealthy to a boardwalk amusement park, Coney Island—just 10 miles from the theaters of Times Square—developed an impressive list of alumni.

Cary Grant once paraded the boardwalk in stilts to advertise thrill rides, Jimmy Durante, Irving Berlin and Sophie Tucker got their starts singing in local bars. Clara Bow once worked at Nathan's famous hot dog stand before going on to fame as the "It Girl" in Hollywood.

It was in Coney Island that the hot dog was invented in 1867. Nathan's, at Surf and Stillwell Avenues, the honky-tonk hub of the island, once catered frankfurters for a party given by Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt at their Hyde Park home for the king and queen of England. Also it once mailed a salami to former President Eisenhower at his Gettysburg, Pa., farm.

But after visitors get their fill of Coney's lobster rolls, knishes, corn on the cob, jellied apples, clams, cotton candy, root beer and salt water taffy, there's plenty left to do.

The boardwalk boast 485 rides, including the mighty cyclone roller coaster, the 300-foot astro tower and the wonder wheel. The nearby New York Aquarium offers thousands of marine specimens from white whales to snails.

A kaleidoscope of contests is scheduled for 1968—for kiteflyers, fishermen, marble throwers, twin boys with freckles, girls with pigtails, handsome lifeguards, glamorous grandmothers, the "girl most easily watched" by girlwatchers and just plain old beautiful girls.

Fireworks, ice skating at the new city rink, an Easter parade, a patriotic marching band pageant, a mardi gras and a blanket tossing olympics are also planned.

Politicians from Theodore Roosevelt to Sen. Robert Kennedy have historically included a frankfurter-munching jaunt to Coney Island in their campaign itinerary. According to Gov. Rockefeller, "No candidate can ever expect to be elected without a visit to Nathan's when he is campaigning for office in the New York area."

Since 1968 is an election year, office-seekers are expected to turn out by the block, and the cries of hawks and doves may be heard along the boardwalk this summer with the caws of the local sea gulls.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Tuesday, April 9, on account of official business.

Mr. BURTON of California (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California), for Tuesday, April 9, 1968, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. JOELSON), for Tuesday, April 9, 1968, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BATTIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 20 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GILBERT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PIRNIE to revise and extend his remarks at the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. CONTE.

Mrs. REID of Illinois to follow the remarks of Mr. CONTE.

Mr. STEED to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. RAILSBACK.
Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.
Mr. CURTIS in five instances.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. WATSON.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. COWGER.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. SCHWEIKER.
Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.
Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.
Mr. SNYDER.
Mr. GOODELL in five instances.
Mr. REIFEL.
Mr. PELLY in five instances.
Mr. BATTIN.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. GUDE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. HANNA.
Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. PODELL in three instances.
Mr. BROWN of California in three instances.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. FALLON.
Mr. WILLIS.
Mr. DENT in five instances.
Mr. LONG of Louisiana.
Mr. MCCARTHY.
Mrs. KELLY in two instances.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN in three instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. NICHOLS in two instances.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mr. COHELAN.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. GONZALEZ in four instances.
Mr. CAREY.
Mr. HATHAWAY.
Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.
Mr. HOLLAND.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. BRADEMAS in six instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1418. An act to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force: to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2015. An act to amend section 11–1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the Coroner of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2496. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Colubia.

S. 2884. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5799. An act to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16324. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 10, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1723. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1724. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1725. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for Fiscal Year 1967, and a copy of the Report of Annual General Inspection of the Home, 1967, by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 59, 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1726. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1727. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the prosecution of the offenses of disorderly conduct and lewd, indecent, or obscene acts shall be conducted in the name of and for the benefit of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1728. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year 1967, pursuant to sections 106(a) and 212(c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1729. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the American National Red Cross for the year ending June 30, 1967, together with the combined statement of income and expenditures and the audit report, pursuant to the provisions of the act of January 5, 1905, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1730. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on savings available by using certified rather than registered mail to transmit confidential material, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1731. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the more precise planning initiated in the employee housing construction program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1732. A letter from the Assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the Academy for the year 1967, pursuant to section 4 of their charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

1733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the Institute for the year 1967, pursuant to section 4 of their charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

1734. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 29, 1968, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1735. A letter from the chairman of the board, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting the corporation's report for the calendar year 1967, pursuant to the provision of section 404(b) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1736. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 313 of the act approved October 27, 1965 (79 Stat. 1073); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15271. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Spokane Tribe of Indians (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3299. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1119. An act to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands

in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1100. Resolution providing for agreeing to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 16534. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16535. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 16536. A bill to provide that an individual who participates in a riot or civil disorder, or in any demonstration against activities of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, may not accept or hold a position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16537. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 16538. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to remove persons from Federal employment who engage in unlawful acts connected with civil disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16539. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by expanding the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, by providing for temporary restraining orders for certain violations of that act, and by making any violation of that act with intent to defraud or mislead a misdemeanor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 16541. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Delaware Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 337, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 16542. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to remove persons from Federal employment who engage in unlawful acts connected with civil disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 16543. A bill to amend section 7311 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that a person who is convicted of committing a felony which is directly or indirectly related to any riot or civil disorder shall not accept or hold a position in the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 16544. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 16545. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide for a national program to improve the availability of necessary insurance protection for residential and business properties against fire, crime, and other perils, through the cooperative efforts of the Federal and State Governments and the private property insurance industry, to authorize Federal reinsurance with appropriate loss sharing by the States against insurance losses resulting from riots and other civil commotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16546. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry into the United States of children adopted by U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 16547. A bill to designate the Spanish Peaks Wilderness, Gallatin National Forest, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16548. A bill to designate the lake formed by the waters impounded by the Libby Dam, Mont., as Lake Koocanusa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 16549. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16550. A bill to establish a Department of Education and Manpower; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 16552. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of invert or high-test molasses and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 16553. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries, to confirm to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States, to specify the exceptions thereof, and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 16554. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to promote civil responsibilities, insure domestic tranquility and foster the general welfare by making unlawful certain acts which foment domestic disorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 16555. A bill to amend the Federal employees and retired Federal employees health benefits programs to insure that retired Federal employees do not have to pay twice for benefits which are provided both under such programs and under the health insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16556. A bill to amend the Federal employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 16557. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit retired officers of the uniformed services employed in civilian positions under the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia to receive the full amounts of their retired or retirement pay in addition to the pay of their civilian positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 16558. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to promote the efficient and effective use of the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission in connection with functions and services of the Commission, to facilitate improvements in program administration and financial management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. KEITH (for himself Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BATES, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. MCCLORY, and Mr. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 16559. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 16560. A bill to develop business and employment opportunities in smaller cities by providing certain preferences for prospective Government contractors in such cities and areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16561. A bill to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. ULLMAN, Mrs. MAY, Mr. SCHADEBERG, and Mr. LUKENS):

H.R. 16562. A bill to transfer from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the National Academy of Sciences the function of approving new drug applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.J. Res. 1223. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the 7-percent excise tax rate on automobiles and the 10-percent excise tax rate on communication services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.J. Res. 1224. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1968; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Con. Res. 758. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Central City Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 759. Concurrent resolution relative to the independence of free peoples of the captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK:

H. Con. Res. 760. Concurrent resolution relative to a flag tribute to American men and women martyred in battle against communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 1129. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the failure to take certain steps with respect to rioting in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16563. A bill for the relief of Josefa Kucek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 16564. A bill for the relief of Emmanouel Tsiknopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 16565. A bill for the relief of Efstratios A. Marinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 16566. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sadananda Goud and his wife, Shobha Kesaree Goud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16567. A bill for the relief of Patrick Hugh McDonnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 16568. A bill for the relief of Filippa Bellone Termini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16569. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Laezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 16570. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Andolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16571. A bill for the relief of Gabriele D'Antona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16572. A bill for the relief of Ronald Gordon Bullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 16573. A bill for the relief of Francesco P. Massafra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 16574. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Maria (Deanna Tirelli) and Sister Mary Daniela (Giuseppa Fantucci); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 16575. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Warren Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 16576. A bill for the relief of Mina Ullman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 16577. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior of certain lands and interests in lands in Grand and Clear Creek Counties, Colo., in exchange for certain lands within the national forests of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16578. A bill for the relief of Alkiviadis Peter Bouras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 16579. A bill for the relief of Harold P. Conroy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

280. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Elizabeth, N.J., relative to pending legislation on allowable truck size and weights on interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

281. Also, petition of Robert D. Hodgdon, Springfield, Mo., relative to the rules of criminal procedure for the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Victory at Khesanh

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, all of the domestic turmoil and difficulties that our Nation has experienced in the past few days have tended to obscure almost all other events.

One of these, the end of the siege of Khesanh, in ordinary times would have been given banner notice. The fact that it did not does not lessen the great relief that all Americans must experience at the successful end to this small but significant chapter in our history. We also feel a great sense of pride in the performance of those beleaguered young marines who never faltered in their successful defense of this allegedly "indefensible" position.

An editorial in yesterday's Washington Evening Star expresses some worthwhile observations regarding this historic occasion. The text follows:

VICTORY AT KHESANH

The siege of Khe Sanh, begun nearly three months ago, is now at an end. The North Vietnamese encirclers, who once numbered around 20,000, have for some weeks past been carrying out a disengaging maneuver. Only about 7,000 of them are in the area at the moment, and they too appear to be withdrawing as Operation Pegasus—involving large American and allied forces—applies heavy new pressure.

In deciding not to hold their ground and launch an all-out attack on Khe Sanh's 6,000 U.S. Marine and South Vietnamese defenders, Ho Chi Minh and the Communist high command in Hanoi may be offering a token of deescalation in response to the bombing cut ordered by President Johnson. Or maybe they are just redeploying the troops for a large-scale attack at some other point, possibly against the important provincial capital of Quang Tri or maybe even Hue.

Whatever the motivation, one thing is clear enough: The North Vietnamese have abandoned what once seemed their firm intention to overwhelm Khe Sanh and force it into an ignominious surrender, just as with the French at Dienbienphu over a decade ago. Evidently they have decided that the job would have cost them much too much in terms of prestige and lives. And in the end, as our top military commanders have affirmed all along, they probably still could not have taken the place against our tremendous firepower—artillery and air bombardment—and the valor of the defending Marines and South Vietnamese.

All this should give pause to loud and emotional American critics—some of them quite prominent—who have damned the President, General Westmoreland and the Joint Chiefs of Staff for having let our troops be "trapped" in Khe Sanh and dooming them, without hope of escape, to a Dienbienphu fate. Today these Cassandras—who have scoffed at Khe Sanh's continuing importance in terms of blocking significant enemy infiltration routes—should be having second thoughts. Hanoi, it would seem, has let them down.

And this, as far as we are concerned, is all to the good.

Needed Congressional Action on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important tasks facing the Congress is to meet its responsibilities with respect to the problems in the central city areas of our Nation. We must discharge our responsibility to the public by gathering what information and knowledge exists relating to the problems and to the civil disorders in our central cities and take whatever action if any is necessary after due deliberation and debate.

On March 4, 1968, I took the floor of the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, H1599–H1600—to publicly express my concern over the growing attitude that the Kerner report, an Executive Commission report, is a substitute for congressional study. The work of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders constitutes what might be an excellent beginning for a full-blown congressional examination of our central city problems. But it can only be considered as a beginning, for the Commission's study was a closed-door proceeding. In making its recommendations it seems to have ignored many essential matters and studies necessary for intelligent action, congressional or otherwise.

It is of little or no value to concentrate on areas of failure as the Commission report seems to do without placing them in the context of our successes. Rather than impugn our ideals because of our failure to fulfill them; our ideals should be reemphasized, and our areas of failure contrasted with the areas of success to gain the understanding of how best to move forward in eliminating these shortcomings.

The Commission report notably ignores the studies and efforts that have been undertaken over a period of years, many of which emanate from the Congress and which have met with some successes in meeting our economic and social problems.

I would observe that the Commission's

recommendations are on far too narrow a base as they do not show an understanding of certain basic social and economic movements. The development of the high-rise city in the latter part of the 19th and early part of the 20th century based upon the development of steampower and mass production with limited manpower mobility is historically unique. The high-rise city became passe as electrical power began to displace steampower and the automobile removed the limitation of mobility of the workers. From then on the high-rise central city was doomed. One large U.S. city, Los Angeles, developed after 1920 when these forces had begun to be effective and it never did become high rise. The report fails to relate the problem of the Negro to the age-old problem of the rural and essential agriculturist who moves to the urban area, where a different set of mores and customs exist. Nor does it reflect an understanding of the merits and demerits of the various fiscal tools and tax mechanisms available to provide funds for urban areas, nor does it reflect much study of the various private profit and nonprofit organizations and the various governmental authorities—Federal, State, local, or multistate agencies—most appropriate to deal with social and economic problems. In these areas and others the report is empty.

The Congress through its proliferation of standing committees has done some analytical study in most of these areas—albeit cursory in several—and certainly with little synthesis to correlate the analytical studies and treat the subject comprehensively. This collective resource of information and expertise derived from the analytical process is the basic strength of the Congress and it should not be overlooked in favor of a hastily prepared Executive Commission report which seeks to provide a synthesis without availing itself of the analyses.

I propose that Congress begin immediately to organize itself so that it can effectively pinpoint the problems of the central city, some of which are referred to in the report of the National Advisory Commission, and correct and supplement them so that a truly comprehensive study has been made.

I am introducing today a resolution to establish a Joint Senate-House Committee on Central City Affairs to immediately take up the report of the National Advisory Commission together with its working papers and background material, to hold public hearings on the report, calling before it the members of the Commission and others who helped in its studies as well as knowledgeable people in both government and the private sector—all under cross-examination—and then to report back to the Congress within 6 months recommendations for action. Such a joint committee should be composed of members of the House Education and Labor Committee, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Banking and Currency Committee, and the Judiciary Committee. This committee must realize that other committees unrepresented on the coordinating committee have aspects of jurisdiction that bear on the total problem: First, Post Office and Civil Service; second, Public Works; third Interior and Insular Affairs; and fourth, Armed Services.

The committee should coordinate the studies already made by the various congressional committees, including those of the Ways and Means Committee in the past few years which became the basis for the comprehensive 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, and that of the special subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee set up last year to study the problems of the central city.

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CONGRESS AS AN INSTITUTION

I am much concerned with the problems of our cities, but I am probably more concerned with the danger that this unexamined executive report exemplifies, to the Congress as a decision-making institution. I fear that the current leadership of the Congress fails to see the erosion of congressional influence and effectiveness if decisions involving problems of the magnitude of our urban areas are allowed to be made outside of the Congress through the closed-door process instead of through the open hearing process involving cross-examination and rebuttal testimony. The establishment of a joint congressional committee to take the National Advisory Commission's report as a base for public hearings as the Joint Economic Committee takes the President's annual Economic Report, will put the Congress back in the act.

Congress must act if our society is to retain the mechanism of study and deliberation in which the people can participate, and so make the crucial social and economic judgments to move the society forward.

Ideally, Congress is a mechanism for gathering together the knowledge and wisdom existing within the society to make judgments to solve the problems facing the society. Assembling the necessary data and background information occurs through three primary processes.

First, the distilled wisdom (i.e., that which has been reduced to books and other units of storage) contained in the Library of Congress is further refined for Members of Congress by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library. Second, the current wisdom of the society is collected through the standing committees of Congress with the help of professional staff employed by the committees. It is in these forums that the knowledge of experts in the executive branch and in the private sector is brought to bear on public problems and national goals. The testimony is received in public hearings with the witnesses under cross-examination and their statements subject to rebuttal. Third, from the letters and conversations of constituents and self-interest groups in the society, Members of Congress gather knowledge of the subject upon which the individual citizens are uniquely expert: how the laws as written and administered affect them.

The deliberative process in Congress also has three essential parts. The committees, each assigned jurisdiction over particular subject-matter areas, study the mass of assembled data and arguments obtained from the sources described above. These data and arguments are then boiled down into written reports, containing majority and minority views, to accompany the legislation for the next stage of deliberation, the floor debate. The floor debate is essentially among the members of the committee responsible for conducting the study and issuing the printed report. The rest of the members sit somewhat as a jury, albeit with the power of interrupting to ask questions and to contribute collateral knowledge and arguments. Finally, a deliberation occurs between "managers" of both houses to strike a common version of the usually divergent versions resulting from the decision-making processes which go on in both houses of Congress. There is a possible further deliberation in the event that the President vetoes the ultimate judgments reached and the Congress decides to override the President's veto.

There is another theory of Congress, a competing theory which is increasingly winning supporters and which has already weakened the Congress as a study and deliberative body. This theory seeks to retain the Congress as a mechanism for recording decisions which have been made previously and elsewhere in the society through different processes. Those presently advancing this radical theory of the Congress think of these decisions as being made in the executive branch of the federal government, but once the Congress is structured as a conduit these decisions could as easily be made in Wall Street, along the Charles River, or wherever the powers within the society may rest. The legislative process under the conduit theory is reduced to a system whereby the decisions, wherever they are made, would be forced through the Congress by whatever methods may be necessary. These methods in practice bypass the techniques of appealing to facts and fair argument. The great fault of the conduit theory for reaching decisions is that it does not permit Congress to avail itself of the greatest amount of knowledge and wisdom within the society. Indeed, the actual decision-making is conducted behind closed doors, frequently in guarded or unkown buildings. The gathering of the data and the deliberations are not made public. Who gives the information, what arguments are advanced, remain secret. Members of Congress as well as the general public are left in the dark and given only the data and arguments which support the judgments made.

I think it is obvious that total implementation of this theory ultimately would destroy the Congress as a study and deliberative body. The Congress under this concept would be basically a super computer machine, a public opinion computer, to record and reflect the pressures which have been built up within the society through propaganda campaigns. Propaganda results when the experts and spokesmen for various points of view do not confront each other in a common forum and are not subjected to cross-examination and rebuttal.

The preceding quotation is from my foreword to the book "We Propose: A Modern Congress," which contains selected proposals by the House Republican task force on congressional reform and minority staffing. This book was published in 1966 in response at that time to the growing concern over the weakening of the Congress. Congressional inaction on the National Advisory Commission's report in 1968 would be a further step toward the "conduit" theory of the Congress. The unfortunate parallel of the Congress in respect to studying and researching the problem in military manpower over the years culminating in the rubberstamp extension of our UMT laws last year is clearly before us. Futhermore, the people are not unobservant of the important fact that Congress has completely defaulted in its responsi-

bility to make meaningful the constitutional power it possesses to declare or not to declare war.

THE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF THE COMMISSION'S BACKGROUND AND WORKING PAPERS

I have written to the Chairman of the Commission, Gov. Otto Kerner, requesting that the Congress be provided with the working papers, data, and transcripts of testimony which the Commission's report indicates have been exhaustively collected and indexed. I have received in reply a letter from the Commission's Director of Congressional Relations indicating only that the Commission is now in the process of transmitting its materials to the National Archives and is "considering policies under which such materials will be made public." I hope the Commission and their congressional relations staff will see the futility in the contradictory reasoning which would lock background materials in the National Archives, on the other hand, in a crisis atmosphere, rushing to print a report through a commercial press paperback edition earlier than scheduled. For meaningful implementing legislation to be developed, the greatest amount of information upon which the Commission based their conclusions should be made available.

Come to Your Senses, America

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my friend and neighbor, William H. Rentschler, has composed a moving and timely essay on the subject of our Nation's tragic internal strife. I bring this powerful article to the earnest attention of my colleagues in this House and to all Americans throughout the Nation:

COME TO YOUR SENSES, AMERICA

(By William H. Rentschler)

Come to your senses, America, before all hope has fled.

There is madness in the air.

This is not the America we have known.

There is today an unprecedented degree of virulence and antagonism whenever men disagree.

A young President is cut down.

His successor, a prisoner of the nation's ugly mood, withdraws.

Cities burn. Hatred flares.

And now a civil rights Titan is slain.

This is madness.

A nation cannot long endure free and sane and productive in such a poisoned atmosphere.

There can be no progress without reason. No great challenges can be met when passion rules the mind. No nation inflamed and divided and turbulent can justify its claim to greatness.

We have known America as a land of warmth and compassion, with gentle, helping hands extended across the street and across the sea. We accept love and charity as commonplace. We know within ourselves, most of us, that this land is not ruled by hate.

Yet suddenly violence and hatred blot out like an evil black cloud all that is good. We are fearful and disbelieving. Can this truly be our beloved land, unscarred, a haven of hope in a torn world, where peace so long had reigned?

Few of us have known fear at home. Now fear, a sense of foreboding, a strange and awful unease, are being woven into the fabric of our lives.

No man of good will can be less than heartsick and troubled, deeply so, as he wonders if evil and hatred and violence are to be his constant companions, if ours is to be a harvest only of bitter fruit.

This cannot be. We must never accept violence of mind and body and spirit as a condition of life in America, for that would unmistakably signal the desolate state of the American ideal.

Each of us in this hour of national trial—and sorrow, too—must bend a little further than ever before, reach out, give and forgive, and discover deep inside an untapped vein of tolerance.

It is very late.

Come to your senses, America!

Are the Strains of the Presidency Too Much?

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of our national pastimes has become the comparison of how the President looked when he came into office and how he looked when he left it. In view of President Johnson's recent decision not to seek the nomination of his party, I believe the following statement of editorial opinion by Max H. Jacobs, of radio stations KNUZ and KQUE–FM in Houston, Tex., is most timely and worthy of the attention of us all:

A STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL OPINION BROADCAST OVER RADIO STATIONS KNUZ AND KQUE–FM, BY MAX H. JACOBS, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, APRIL 3, 1968

The sudden withdrawal of Lyndon Johnson from the race for president poses a frightening question: Does our democratic system impose burdens upon the president which human flesh and blood simply can not bear?

For many years we have made a national pastime out of what, for lack of a better term, can only be called president-baiting. Not even our greatest presidents have been spared. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt—all of them were rewarded during heart-rending years with vilification and character assassination.

In recent years, Presidents Truman, Kennedy and Eisenhower were subjected to an intensifying chorus of shrill abuse.

During the past two years of President Johnson's administration, it seems to us, the volume and intensity of criticism have risen beyond all reason.

In our land, the right of dissent is, of course, a basic and precious ingredient of freedom, but dissent is one thing, and senseless, violent abuse is quite another.

At best, the presidency is the most terrible job in the world, demanding and exacting in many cases the very life of the person who assumes its responsibilities. Under present conditions, when a president's critics may literally abuse him in the white house—to his face—the strains of the office are multiplied a thousand-fold, and may well become more than the strongest man can bear.

Let us hope President Johnson's sacrificial decision to take himself out of the presidential campaign as a step toward national unity will have a sobering effect on the American people.

If we ignore the plain implications of this startling development, we may find ourselves on the same course that led Germany to Adolf Hitler and France to Charles De Gaulle. The presidency may become a job that only a ruthless dictator, or an egomaniac, would want.

Urban Education: Problems and Priorities

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Republican coordinating committee for an excellent dissertation on the problems and priorities for urban education. I think my colleagues will find the following statement valuable in assessing the goals of our elementary and secondary education programs in the towns and cities of America I would like to congratulate Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, chairman of the coordinating committee's study group on urban education. His associates on the study group are listed below:

MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S STUDY GROUP ON URBAN EDUCATION

ALBERT H. QUIE, Chairman, Member of Congress from Minnesota.

Samuel Miller Brownell, Professor of Urban Educational Administration, Yale University and the University of Connecticut.

James T. Guines, administrative assistant to the superintendent of schools, Richmond, Virginia.

David S. Seeley, Director, Mayor's Office of Education Liaison, New York City.

Robert F. Sittig, Professor of Political Science, University of Nebraska.

Harold Spears, Visiting Professor and Educational Consultant, University of Indiana.

ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Member of Congress from Ohio.

Deborah Wolfe, Professor of Education, Queens College, Flushing, New York.

OBSERVERS

Cleo W. Blackburn, Director, Board for Fundamental Education, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Joseph M. Brooks, Executive Secretary, California School Boards Association.

John T. Cicco, Deputy Superintendent, Catholic School Board, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Lawrence L. Thompson, Secretary to the Study Group.

URBAN EDUCATION: PROBLEMS AND PRIORITIES

". . . I am convinced we are allowing social dynamite to accumulate in our large cities," wrote Dr. James B. Conant in 1961 in his assessment of the quality of education in major urban centers. Events in the past seven years have forcefully demonstrated the accuracy of his judgment, but America has not yet been moved to deal in a determined and resourceful manner with the troubled conditions of urban education.[1] These are the facts:

[1] This paper addresses primarily the problems of elementary and secondary education in urban areas, and does not include an analysis of the problems pertaining to higher education. Recommendations concerning education in rural areas are contained in "Revitalizing Rural America," issued by the Republican Coordinating Committee in July, 1967.

Children from low-income families in metropolitan areas, especially among minority groups, begin their schooling with a handicap. For example, on standardized achievement tests given to first graders in metropolitan areas, minority group children on the average scored about 15 percent below other children.

Urban school programs do not compensate for this handicap. Based on achievement tests the average minority group child in metropolitan areas is roughly the equivalent of two grades behind the others at grade six; three grades behind at grade nine; and four grades behind at grade twelve.

In our fifteen largest cities roughly 60 percent of the tenth grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school; unemployment and delinquency rates among these dropouts are many times greater than the national average.

Our big city schools generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as do the schools in adjacent suburbs.

These figures reveal an educational deficit of vast proportions in American cities today, with millions of children tragically ill-equipped to participate meaningfully in modern urban society. The picture contrasts sharply with the traditional American ideal of offering excellence and equality of educational opportunity to all children.

We believe that the challenge of eliminating the educational deficit in the cities must be elevated to a position of high national priority: first, for the welfare of educationally disadvantaged children, whose lives do not attain fulfillment and second, for the welfare of society that needs the undeveloped talent possessed by these children and needs the order and stability which have been jarred by civil disorders. The urban crisis in America will never be resolved until the quality of education for all children, regardless of social or economic background, attains a level commensurate with the demands of life in our complex urban society and offers the opportunity for the fulfillment of the potential abilities of all children.

A REAFFIRMATION OF GOALS

At the outset, we wish to reaffirm our belief in the guiding principles of excellence and equal opportunity in education. In straight-forward terms, an excellent education is one which fully serves the needs of the individual and the needs of society. For the individual this means an education which challenges the individual and fosters the development of a strong self-image, a spirit of independence and motivation, a continuing thirst for learning and re-education, and which prepares him to be an active and productive member of society. Society, in turn, derives its strength from the contributions of its individual members. Excellence in education, therefore, promotes an effective and enduring democracy, a strong and expanding economy, and a stable and progressive social order.

Equality of educational opportunity implies a condition in which: (1) the education program presents no barriers within the school to the full development of the capabilities of the individual students; and (2) education programs effectively compensate for barriers which may exist outside the school. Equal educational opportunity is a key ingredient of individual fulfillment and upward mobility, values which have always occupied a special place in the hierarchy of American beliefs.

Throughout our history, the American people have stressed the importance of education, and have devoted great resources and energy to the education enterprise. But we have never rested on past accomplishments. At a number of points in the development of the nation, our people have effected basic and necessary changes in the educational system in response to new challenges.

The challenge of today and for the 1970's is to raise the quality of education for millions of children in the cities to a new standard of excellence and equal opportunity never before envisioned. By accepting these goals, and with the determined support of the American people through their public and private institutions, we are confident that this challenge can be met.

THE UNIQUE PROBLEMS OF URBAN EDUCATION

There are a number of aspects of the present conditions in the cities which illuminate the unique nature of urban education problems, and establish a framework for making various proposals.

The first is the increasingly high concentration of families from disadvantaged social and economic backgrounds in large portions of the central cities. This increase is attributable to the migrations of these families to the cities, largely from the rural areas, due to economic dislocations in agriculture, and the expected job opportunities, and hoped for social betterment in urban centers. Typically these families lack adequate education and training. Their children grow to school age with poorly developed skills, and without benefit of the cultural and motivating experiences which middle and upper income families often impart to their children. Consequently, large numbers of these children start school with an education handicap that slows their rate of progress, and creates special problems for the school system.

The central portion of many cities is often characterized by high mobility rates, crowded and substandard housing, unemployment, socially disruptive welfare regulations, and by racial tensions. These conditions frequently result in the breakdown of the social structure and intergroup communication. Many times these factors develop homes with children who tend to be uncertain, frustrated, withdrawn, and even hostile as they attempt to deal with the program presented by existing schools. Even stable homes are handicapped in efforts to guide their children. Crowded living conditions and inadequate recreation facilities make it almost impossible for children to overcome such conditions and to develop constructive social and educational attitudes and habits.

This sense of alienation has another dimension. With the high turnover of residency in the inner-city, and with teachers and school staff frequently living elsewhere, teachers and parents find themselves strangers to one another, and school-community relations are strained. Both parents and teachers in turn feel isolated from the highly centralized city-wide education agency, which in most cases determines education policy, and makes detailed decisions on school practices and problems with minimum consultation or participation on the part of either group.

While their problems of education mount, most cities find their capacity to finance needed improvements sorely strained. The departure of industry and middle income families to the suburbs, and their replacement by low income residents, has left the cities with an array of social problems whose costs are rapidly increasing, but without the tax resources to pay for them. For instance, between 1930 and 1960 the average per pupil expenditure for education in fourteen of the nation's largest cities rose by 331 percent, while the per capita value of taxable property rose by an average of only 97 percent, indicating that the tax base of the cities has not kept pace with the demands of education. Also, non-school governmental expenditures tend to account for about 60 percent of property tax receipts in large cities, but take less than 50 percent in small towns and rural communities. The fiscal squeeze on the cities has resulted in an increased need for State and Federal aid, yet even such problems as overcrowding and deteriorating school buildings remain unsolved.

The large city school system is often the center of a hostile public attack, one that it is ill-equipped to withstand due to limited resources. For instance, the neighborhood group that demands the replacement of an antiquated building, destructive to both pupil and teacher morale, leaves little defense for the school authorities who know too well the validity of the proposal.

A final aspect of the urban education problem is that society today, and particularly urban society, places heavier demands on the school system than ever before. The complex, challenging, and turbulent nature of urban society, and indeed of the entire world, requires to an unprecedented degree a citizenry of great ability and character, and one which manifests an understanding awareness of the problems and attitudes of all mankind. Education plays a pivotal role in broadening the horizons of young people, and in preparing them to assume the responsibilities of modern living.

Also, our technological economy, centered in urban areas, has an increasing need for the highly educated and the well trained, and less and less place for the semi-literate, the unskilled, and the dropout. An unemployed person faces greater hardships in urban areas, where living costs are high, and where extended family relationships are lacking to provide temporary shelter to those out of work.

In short, the stakes of success or failure in urban schools today are higher than in times past, and higher than in many rural areas. The schools, therefore, will be required to assume an increased responsibility for matching the attitudes and aptitudes of the urban population to the needs of a dynamic and challenging modern world.

ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES

Efforts to overcome the enormous educational deficit in the cities must proceed within the framework of well-ordered priorities. Too often scarce resources have been spread thinly among a proliferation of programs, with the result that major improvements in any single program are hardly discernible. We believe that an especially high priority should be attached to five major problem areas in urban education, as follows:

1. Early childhood education.
2. Community-school relations.
3. The quality of teaching and administration.
4. Transition from school to the world of work.
5. Inter-cultural education.

1. Early childhood education

Early childhood education programs should, as a matter of priority and urgency, be expanded to include all 5- and 4-year olds, and perhaps 3-year olds, from improverished neighborhoods who could benefit from this experience. For a child who comes to school lacking the home experiences and reinforcements which make for successful schooling, we believe that it is imperative for the education system to prevent or offset these deficiencies with special programs at the earliest possible age. Compensatory efforts to prepare children to reap the full benefits of regular schooling are central to our concept of equal educational opportunity.

A disadvantaged early childhood has numerous dimensions beyond the inability to score well on standardized achievement tests. Low test scores may be a manifestation, not only of poor language training and learning experiences, but also of health and diet deficiencies, unstable home situations, and other factors. The nature and extent of these problems, which may begin at birth, vary greatly from one child to the next. We believe that the task of preparing these children to be able to utilize opportunities and to function effectively in society must be viewed in the most comprehensive terms to include not only schooling, but also atten-

tion and assistance related to these other human needs.

Early childhood education programs, therefore, must have a strong interagency orientation, and must be concerned with the whole child and his environment. This requires a flexible program of cooperation and consultation among teachers, health officers, and social welfare workers with the school providing common facilities and performing a central coordinating function.

2. Community-school relations

One of the more disturbing aspects of urban education today is the prevailing sense of mistrust and alienation among students, teachers, and parents. In part this is caused by differences of background and attitude which even under the very best conditions, would make effective communication difficult. However, we believe that the problem is aggravated by the highly centralized nature and lack of flexibility of most big city school systems, which tends to exclude parents and teachers from the decision process on many problems on which their knowledge and understanding is crucial. This overcentralization minimizes the opportunities for interaction between the school system, the parents, and the community.

The specific solution to this problem should properly vary from city to city according to the needs of the local situation. However, we feel that recent proposals for school decentralization in a number of the larger cities are worthy of serious attention and consideration by others as possible guides for action.

The decentralized, community school concept offers numerous potential benefits. By bringing citizens into the decision-making process at the community level, a cooperative partnership of professional educators and parents could be formed. Such a partnership would be in marked contrast to the lack of understanding and communication now frequently existing between these groups, as a result of the monopoly of detailed decision-making often exercised by the city board of education and by the professionals who staff the central education agency. Also, delegation of many operating responsibilities to the community level would relieve the city-wide superintendent and board members of many time-consuming tasks. This arrangement would permit these leaders to devote needed attention and energy to broad policy formulation, creative planning, and the strengthening of educational standards.

The concepts of increased local community control and responsibility, and the full participation of the individual citizen in decisions affecting his family's welfare, are basic precepts of the Republican Party. Decentralization in many aspects of school operations in urban areas would be the application of these traditional principles to a contemporary problem. By enabling parents and teachers to work together toward a common goal—the welfare and education of the child—decentralization could help build an enduring sense of community now so often missing in the cities today.

3. The quality of teaching and administration

The teacher is a fundamental and crucial link between the education system and the child. A child is under the influence of his teachers for a continuous period of five hours or more per day, 180 days or more per year. This is less than one-third of his waking hours, but it is a longer and more sustained exposure than to almost any other adult influence in his daily environment, including, in many cases, his parents. It is apparent that success or failure of an education system will depend most vitally upon the quality of teaching. Yet in urban areas today, because of numerous difficulties, the quality of teaching and the pupil-teacher relationship frequently do not meet the needs of the disadvantaged child.

One pressing need is to provide teachers and school administrators, many of whom come from middle income and small community origins, with a broader knowledge of the special problems and backgrounds of children who live in congested, lower income sections of large cities. Universities and colleges need to modify and strengthen programs of preparation and retraining for teachers and administrators, by offering a richer mixture of academic courses and field experience covering a broad range of social sciences. Opportunities for full-time graduate study, as well as part-time research and training programs, should encourage teachers and administrators to expand their knowledge and preception of the urban child and of the influences on his growth, development, and learning.

In addition to the study of formal academic subjects, the teacher's awareness of the child's background and culture should be extended through greater direct contact with the community. City school systems have their effectiveness impaired because many teachers live a long distance from their school; thus their contact with pupils outside the class and with parents is minimal. Consideration should be given to special incentives, designed in conjunction with other urban policies, to encourage more teachers to live and participate in the community where they teach. Also, opportunities for wider contact and communication between teachers and the community would be enhanced under the school decentralization concept. Changes of these types are needed to build a strong sense of identity between teacher and child.

Teachers in urban schools today often encounter numerous difficulties, such as overcrowding, heavy teaching loads, disciplinary problems, and inadequate pay which hamper their effectiveness and undermine their morale. Under these conditions, and in the face of competition from suburban schools, it is a major challenge to attract and retain a high quality and experienced teaching staff in central city schools. Far too often it is the young and inexperienced teachers who are given the most difficult assignments.

As a basic principle, we believe that teachers must be accorded the professional status, pay, and perquisites commensurate with the challenge of the assignment and with the benefits which society realizes when this assignment is successfully discharged. In order to attract and retain more intellectually gifted and highly motivated individuals to teach in city schools, benefits will have to approach those offered in other professions.

To relieve the heavy load on the professional teacher, greater use should be made of teaching assistants recruited whenever possible from the immediate community. Personnel of this type could relieve the teacher of the burden of many tasks which are important to the classroom and school operations, but do not require the preparation of a professional teacher. They could also serve as another communication link between teacher and community.

Computerized instruction programs and other electronic teaching devices have the potential to offer the child certain types of learning experiences on an individual basis, while permitting the teacher to devote additional time to those parts of the curriculum that demand the human touch. These new educational tools should be given increased attention.

4. Transition from school to the world of work

High unemployment rates among city youths, which run as high as 25–30 percent for Negro teen-agers, are a stark indication of failure of our society to provide a workable transition between the secondary schools and the job market or education beyond high school. Youth, the community, and the economy all suffer because of this situation, since the unemployed youth are neither in gainful jobs nor continuing their education. Responsibility must be shared jointly by the schools, by business and labor groups, and by the entire community, and new patterns of cooperation and interaction between public and private institutions need to be devised. The goal must be a flexible system of schooling, training, and part-time work experience which each year will enable millions of young people, with varying abilities, inclinations, and talents, to make either an effective transition from full-time schooling to full-time productive employment or help provide the incentive for further schooling.

The schools, for their part, must take immediate steps to reorient existing occupational preparation programs, which are greatly in need of modernization to match the current demands of the job market. According to the latest figures, the number of students in Federally aided vocational education programs engaged in an agricultural or home economics curriculum is more than seven times the number in technical and industrial pursuits. This imbalance must be corrected, and new types of training programs should be introduced to meet the needs of an increasingly technological and service-oriented economy.

Elementary and secondary school students need to have their sights raised in accord with their potential, and to identify themselves with the diverse occupational possibilities open to them and with the preparation programs required. Guidance and counseling programs for students require strengthening for those who are planning to enter the job market directly from school and for those who should be encouraged to continue their schooling. The schools should make greater efforts to avail themselves of the assistance of business, labor, and other occupational groups whose representatives could most accurately help students learn the nature of various jobs, the opportunities for placement, and the requirements for entry and success.

An increasing number of jobs in our economy require training and education beyond that available in most secondary schools, yet do not demand a full college or professional degree. To meet this expanded demand for skilled technicians and semi-professional personnel, and to offer the high school graduate a choice other than ending his formal education or pursuing a four year college program, we urge the expansion and strengthening of two year technical institutes and community college programs located near the students' homes.

For their part, business and labor unions need to recognize the critical need to train and employ youths, and must adjust their hiring and membership practices to accomplish this objective.[2] Company hiring regulations and aptitude tests administered to job applicants often set arbitrarily high education standards for unskilled and clerical positions, thereby automatically excluding many who could perform adequately in these jobs. Restrictions of this type should be reexamined and modified, for business and labor must accept the principle that just as all youth have a place in the school, so at a certain age, all must have a place in the world of work.

Business and industry can play a more active and innovative role in matching their employment requirements to the needs of city youth. A number of companies have set outstanding examples of cooperative action by "adopting" a particular high school in a low-income section of a city, and working

[2] This recommendation and others related to job opportunities for youth are contained in "Full and Equal Employment Opportunities" issued by the Republican Coordinating Committee in December, 1967.

closely with school personnel to prepare students for gainful jobs with the firm.

One of the deficiencies of current efforts is the fragmentation of responsibility and lack of communication among schools, business, labor, and other government agencies in the training and employment of young people. We believe as a general principle that the schools should assume much of the principal coordinating responsibility for placing students who are not college bound in gainful employment.

In order for the schools to fulfill this role, new administrative procedures and machinery and new methods of communication among those involved will be required. This might involve establishing local community employment councils composed of educators, businessmen and labor leaders; allowing the schools to exercise greater influence in the planning and administration of government programs of job training assistance to industry; and developing local data systems that will enable rapid correlation and exchange of information on job training programs, trainees, and employment opportunities.

By pin-pointing to the schools greater responsibility for a successful transition to the world of work, educators would be encouraged to review critically existing program, to attempt to identify potential employment handicaps at the earliest possible age, and to work more closely with business and labor.

5. Intercultural education

We firmly believe in the positive value of inter-cultural and inter-racial educational experiences for all children. Integrated schools expand the knowledge and understanding of the child, increase his awareness of others, and provide lessons of tolerance and fairness that are important assets to the individual and to society. Such experiences help young people understand that those who differ in racial, national, ethnic, religious, and social backgrounds have much in common in abilities, interests, and reactions. Such experiences also help young people to learn to appreciate the value of diversity among peoples. These attitudes help to strengthen the foundation of equal rights, democracy, and international understanding, and to equip young Americans to work effectively with others in a multi-cultural and multi-racial nation and world.

In working toward these goals, a requirement is to provide conditions of living, including high quality city education programs, which will stem the migration of whites to the suburbs and attract suburbanites back to the city. Education policies alone cannot achieve this objective; equally important are policies in regard to housing, urban renewal, employment, and public transportation. However, city schools of exceptionally high quality could be a key factor in stemming the flight to the suburbs and in bringing about greater integration in education.

ADEQUATE SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT

The priority needs expressed in the previous section will be impossible to meet without adequate school facilities. The typical school building in central sections of the large cities is seriously overcrowded and physically dilapidated; these conditions are the result of age, neglect, or obsolescence. High population densities often place on the school building a pupil load far beyond the original design capacity; double or even triple sessions are not uncommon in some cities.

Physical surroundings of this type are detrimental to the quality of education, and to the quality of life in the neighborhood. They erode the morale and sap the creativity of both teachers and students, and affect adversely the attitude of the community toward the school. The existence of unsound and unsightly school facilities is tangible testimony to many years of neglect, and to the educational deficit that has accumulated in the large cities.

We recommend that steps be taken to embark on a construction program to provide new and expanded school facilities in the cities, equivalent to the modern and spacious plant frequently found in suburban school districts. Such a program would begin to reverse the spiral of deterioration in city school facilities, would promote a sense of community pride, and would be of lasting benefit to urban education. In view of ever-rising construction costs, these efforts should proceed without delay.

THE ROLES OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Today all three levels of government in our Federal system share importantly in the responsibility for educating children. In the 1950's and early 1960's the issue was whether the Federal government would become involved to any significant degree in the support of elementary and secondary education. That question has been answered—in the affirmative; Federal support for 1967 was estimated at $2.4 billion. Since this is less than 10 percent of total outlays for elementary and secondary education, and inasmuch as local governments and many States simply do not have adequate revenue sources, we expect that Federal support will grow in the years ahead.

The issue of the 1970's is what the distinctive roles of each level of government should be in the total education enterprise. This question has not yet been answered.

Our views on this issue can be summarized by saying that education is a Federal concern, a State responsibility, and a local function. All three must bear a portion of the cost of developing the total education system. The Federal government with its superior revenue raising powers should provide increased financial support. The main thrust of Federal support should be aimed at raising the overall expenditure for education to adequate levels, and at equalizing the ability of the various States to support education. Federal funds should be channeled to the States in a manner that will encourage greater support efforts on their part.

State government must bear the basic legal responsibility for education, set standards for attendance, teacher certification, curriculum, and per pupil expenditures, and develop comprehensive long-range plans. Local school systems should always perform the functions of instruction, including teacher selection and school administration, and retain the principal responsibilty for program development.

Within this framework we feel that Federal aid programs for elementary and secondary education, which currently number over 30, should be combined into a smaller, more manageable number of grant categories, in order to provide larger amounts of aid to problems of the highest priority.

Federal support should, as a general rule, not only be channeled through the States, but it should be made available in a steady and predictable manner, based on objective formulas, so that States and communities can plan with confidence, and can avoid disruptive starts and stops in vital programs. As a condition of providing support, the Federal government should establish broad planning rquirements for the State departments of education and should set general ground rules for the planning process. For example, the Federal government might require that the planning process provide full opportunity for all interested parties to participate, including officials of non-public and city school systems. Also, the Federal government should encourage the States to extend their efforts to improve education, by giving the greatest flexibility in expenditure of Federal funds to those States which increase most their investment in education.

Local school systems should be responsible for developing specific projects and programs in applying for assistance. They should be permitted maximum discretion and flexibility in the selection and administration of these programs, consistent with State plans and broad Federal policies.

We envision a strengthened role for State departments of education in developing comprehensive State-wide urban education plans, and in administering Federal assistance. Some State education departments have not in the past responded adequately to the needs of urban areas, and may not be fully equipped to handle these increased responsibilities. We view this as a problem to be overcome, but not as a rationale for failing to try to strengthen them. The 50 States should perform an intermediate planning and review function between thousands of local school districts and the Federal government, and should equip themselves to provide leadership and maximum assistance for the solution of metropolitan school problems.

THE ROLE OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Non-public elementary and secondary schools constitute an important element of the total education system of the nation. Today about one out of seven children attends a non-public school nationwide; however, in many large cities as many as 25 percent or more attend parochial schools. The existence of these schools permits parents to exercise a degree of freedom of choice in the education of their children.

In recent years many non-public schools have encountered serious financial difficulties; per pupil costs have risen sharply and government assistance to non-public school children traditionally has been very limited. Overcrowding in these schools is very common, and in some instances schools have been closed.

The Republican Coordinating Committee previously pointed out in its statement entitled, "The Restoration of Federalism in America," issued in December, 1967, that if financial aid goes only to public institutions, the existing balance could be shifted strongly toward public education. The Committee indicated that this could effectively be remedied in part by the granting of Federal income tax credits for tuition and certain other expenses in education. Financial aid programs such as this must be carefully designed, along with other needed education programs, to include significant assistance to young people from families with the greatest financial need.

In response to the financial difficulties of non-public schools, Federal, and in some cases, State support has been provided for such indirect purposes as pupil transportation, books, school lunches, shared time programs, teacher training, and compensatory education. At the local level, there are many excellent examples in the country of highly successful programs of cooperation between public and non-public school systems which are worthy of attention.

The educational goals of excellence and equality of opportunity in urban schools, to which we subscribe, apply uniformly to all American children regardless of whether they attend public or non-public schools. For this reason Federal government aid to education should be distributed on the basis of fair and equitable treatment of all school children.

We urge the Senate to present plans that would include distribution of such Federal aid to non-public school children, and that provide for the participation of non-public school representatives in the planning process, but where State conditions prevent use of funds for non-public school children there shall be a public agency designated to administer Federal funds.

In making these provisions, it is important that programs devised for non-public school children meet the same minimum standards of quality and non-discrimination required of public schools. Moreover, in recognizing the need for support for non-public school children, we must never lose sight of the goal of maintaining the strongest possible public school system.

CONCLUSION

This paper outlines a set of policies and priorities which we believe must become the basis for a most determined and comprehensive attack on the grave problems of urban education. There is no escaping the fact that to overcome the enormous educational deficit confronting the cities of this nation, an equally vast commitment of educational resources—funds, facilities, personnel, and leadership—must be summoned at all levels of government and in the society as a whole.

Under present economic conditions this will call for a searching re-examination of priorities in the allocation of resources, and an unrelenting effort to increase the efficiency of school operations by means of improved management. One method of accomplishing this objective is through research efforts aimed at finding more effective methods of education, followed by the devotion of adequate resources to demonstrate and encourage the adoption of research findings that will increase educational quality and productivity.

Increased outlays for education should properly be viewed as an investment in the future. Though many of the benefits of education are qualitative and not subject even to rough measurement, the direct economic benefits alone are undoubtedly sufficient to justify the cost. A concentration of expenditures on the upgrading of urban education will result in increased lifetime earnings for individuals, and will reduce the costs of welfare, unemployment, delinquency and crime that bear so heavily on the cities today.

We believe that the pay-off in these terms alone, to say nothing of the advantages of greater individual dignity and fulfillment and social stability, makes a vast commitment to urban education an investment the nation can ill afford *not* to undertake.

Farm Parity Stays Down in March

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the barometric report on the condition of the farmers' finances as reported this week by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is still issuing disaster warnings. The parity ratio for the month of March was unable to raise above the 74-percent level. This is the same dangerously low point that rural America received as its valentine in February. This is also the very same level as of March 1967.

Again, the culprit according to the Department is the item of ever-increasing farm costs as another alltime high was established for the farm cost index. It now is 350 percent of the 1910–14 average. It is small wonder that farmers are leaving their occupation at the rate of nearly 12 per hour, or 276 per day, over the past 4 years.

The average parity ratio between groups of farm commodities reveals that grain crops which are supported by Federal programs have a parity ratio of 68 percent, livestock is 75 percent, and livestock products are 66 percent. At this point I insert a table to illustrate farm parity in February and March:

FARM PARITY

	February (74 percent)	March (74 percent)
Cotton	45	44
Wheat	55	55
Corn	66	65
Peanuts	74	75
Butterfat	77	77
Milk	85	85
Wool	42	43
Barley	74	72
Flax	73	74
Oats	78	78
Sorghum	72	72
Soybeans	77	76
Beef	78	88
Chickens	68	68
Eggs	60	62
Hogs	77	76
Lamb	82	86
Turkeys	59	57

The National Debt: Looking Ahead

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1968 issue of Tax Review, Prof. C. Lowell Harriss reviews the major issues raised by the rapid growth of Federal debt in a time of unprecedented prosperity.

Growth of Federal debt, he says, will absorb savings which would otherwise go to finance private capital formation—or tempt the Government to undertake inflationary financing. Moreover, borrowing rather than raising taxes to finance spending loosens expenditure discipline.

The size of the Federal debt does present problems when it is considered that over $9 billion a month is required for refundings and over $1 billion a month in taxes is required for interest costs. Government agencies and trust funds and the Federal Reserve have, in effect, acquired approximately 80 percent of the 7-year increase of $52 billion in Federal debt. The Treasury has not been required to market much of the increase in national debt in competition with other borrowers.

Professor Harriss supports the statutory debt ceiling. Although a ceiling will not help in setting priorities, in evaluating the wisdom of alternative expenditure proposals, or in affecting the total, it can compel Congress to look at the Federal financial situation as a whole and can, therefore, result in an improvement in the analysis of Federal finances.

Professor Harriss believes that the interest rate ceiling on long-term debt "does affect the decisions about which portion of the market the Treasury must use and thus influences the maturity structure of the debt. Today, it forces more debt into relatively short-term form. The shorter the debt, the greater its liquidity and 'moneyness.'"

He concludes that there are difficulties in financing budget deficits in non-inflationary ways. The public has to decide whether a lower deficit—more taxes or less in spending—would be better or worse than the difference in interest payments plus going without whatever private investment projects are sacrificed.

I place the March 1968 issue of Tax Review in the RECORD at this point:

THE NATIONAL DEBT: LOOKING AHEAD

(By C. Lowell Harriss, economic consultant, Tax Foundation, Inc.)

The Federal debt keeps on growing in years of unprecedented prosperity. The budget for 1969 calls for $8 billion more spending than revenue even with a 10 percent addition to our already high income taxes.

Arguments for deficit spending when the economy has much underutilized productive capacity lose force with the approach of full employment. For the near term our condition will be one more nearly of full employment than of substantial unemployment. The growth of Federal debt raises issues of markedly distinguishable types.

1. If taxes do not have to be incurred to finance expenditures, society loses one instrument of control over the "quality" of the expenditure. The public faces less pressure to be sure that benefits of expenditures are worth their cost. The standards set for deciding whether or not to incur an expenditure are likely to be looser, more relaxed, when payment is by borrowing.

2. The dollar cost goes up when interest must be paid. But the obligation to pay interest does not get included in the cost of those Federal projects which are responsible for the borrowing.

3. The borrowing can be inflationary. The Treasury may turn to the banking system. The banks may create credit that would not otherwise come into existence and thereby enlarge the total of medium of exchange ("money" as generally defined). This possibility is real—but not necessary.

How large is "the" Federal debt? The official figure, now about $342 billion, does not include all obligations. The government has committed itself to make payments under leases, as for post offices; it has promises to veterans and to its own employees for pensions; it has guaranteed and insured a vast total of private debt for housing and other purposes; and it stands behind insurance of accounts in banks and savings and loan associations. And so on.

Each of these obligations, however, differs from the public debt in the commonly accepted sense. The contingencies under which some liabilities would require payments from tax receipts are so remote as to call for no concern today; frequently, for example, assets of substantial amount would be available before any call on the Treasury. For Social Security benefits, and for insurance on veterans' lives and bank deposits, the associated inflows of earmarked taxes and insurance premiums seem likely to be adequate. Commitments for leases and veterans' pensions will be met out of tax receipts.

Is $342 billion big for this country? As a weight "bearing down" on us, the debt seems remote from our personal experience and not large. Nor does it seem big if considered as a total amount already so large that expansion would endanger the economy. Yet as an element which financial markets must "accommodate" in amounts averaging over $9 billion a month for refundings—or as a debt whose interest cost requires over $1 billion a month in taxes—the size does present problems.

The following table shows ownership of the debt:

[In billions of dollars]

	Dec. 31, 1960	October 1967
Held by—		
U.S. Government agencies and trust funds	55	76
Federal Reserve banks	27	47
Total	82	123
Held by public:		
Commercial banks	62	64
Mutual savings banks and insurance companies	18	13
Other corporations	19	12
State and local governments	19	25
Individuals	66	73
Foreign and international	13	15
Corporate pension funds, savings and loan associations, dealers and brokers, nonprofit institutions, and othe miscellaneous	11	17
Total publicly held debt	208	219
Total debt	290	342

Government agencies and trust funds and the Federal Reserve have, in effect, acquired approximately 80 percent of the seven-year increase of $52 billion. The Treasury has not been required to market much of the *increase* in national debt in competition with other borrowers.

Federal and Private Debt—In thinking about the Federal debt, one naturally turns to comparison with private debt. To some extent, however, the national debt and its problems differ from those of family or business debts.

1. All debt is two-sided. The debtor sees the obligation from one side; the owner of the bond or mortgage from another. Our personal experience finds us sometimes debtors, sometimes lender—but never on both sides of the same obligation. However, citizens of the country as a whole stand on both sides as regards the Federal debt. We are both the debtors and the owners of the bonds.

2. Private and state-local debt are usually incurred to get something productive—a home, utility equipment, or a business building—from which the borrower expects real benefits that will be greater than the cost of the debt. The things acquired will produce at least enough to cover the interest and eventual repayment of the debt. The Federal government, however, does not rely upon the creativity of capital assets to service its debt. Yet the person who lends to the Treasury must give up alternative uses of dollars; such uses reflect the productivity of capital which is the basis of private borrowing. Federal decisions can ignore productivity in deciding whether to incur a budget deficit. But standards of creativity which govern decisions about assuming private obligations will influence the competition which the Treasury must meet in selling its debt issues.

3. A national government has control of the money-creating mechanism. A rise or reduction of Federal debt can be related to changes in the supply of money. Although the same is true of private debt, private borrowers do not *control* the ability of the banking system to create new demand deposits. Neither private nor governmental borrowing, however, involves any necessary connection between growth of debt and the money supply. A national government has the power to use its control over the monetary system to ease its borrowing. But there is no inevitability of such use—or abuse.

DEBT CEILING SEEN CRUDE BUT USEFUL

Statutory Debt Ceiling—The legal ceiling on the Federal debt was last raised in June 1967 to $358 billion. Actions to lift the ceiling have been required year after year. Obviously, no ceiling has lasted for long. Does any limit, therefore, make sense?

The ceiling is a curious institution, one created by statutory enactment. No figure has had grounding in careful, explicit analysis of economic reality. There has not been any serious professional effort to measure either the total of debt which may "safely" be owed at any time or the amount of change in debt which may wisely be incurred.

Does the limit serve to influence spending decisions significantly? Does the ceiling in fact help in setting priorities, in evaluating the wisdom of alternative expenditure proposals, or in affecting the total? Not observably. Executive budget making for example, goes on without being confined by the debt ceiling. In Congress the appropriations process has no discernible contact with the debt ceiling. And the process of legislating on revenue takes a course in which influence from the debt ceiling has no evident effect.

Therefore, if the debt ceiling has no tie to basic economic limitations, if it has no observable connection with the making of decisions on appropriations and taxes, if each ceiling figure has so little durability, why keep limits at all?

Defenders of the ceiling as an institution point to one merit. Debates on raising the ceiling, or renewing a "temporary" authorization to exceed a "permanent" top, offer the only occasion on which the legislative committees of Congress *must* look at the Federal financial situation *as a whole.*

Existence of the limit can force an occasional broad examination of Federal finances. In contrast, neither the tax nor the appropriations process requires, and neither in practice offers even the occasion for, relating the two kinds of issues in the context of the whole. Hearings before the Joint Economic Committee do provide a forum for broad analysis. But these hearings are not associated with legislation. They do not put the Executive Branch in quite the same position as do the debt hearings. The latter, perhaps illogically and unfairly, but yet effectively, compel the Executive Branch to come before a bipartisan body in the posture of an applicant. One result can be an improvement in the analysis of Federal finances. As an instrument for this purpose the debt limit is a crude device. Yet the objective of looking at the whole of Federal finances appears to me important. The method seems scarcely the best man could devise. But it is better than any replacement on the horizon.

Interest Rate Ceiling—A ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest payable on debt with a maturity over five years was a legacy from World War I. Congress in 1967 met part of a Treasury request for authority to sell notes maturing up to seven years at whatever interest rate the market requires. For longer debt, however, the 4¼ percent limit continues. Imagine trying to finance an industrial enterprise or a public utility or housing with such restriction—no borrowing for more than seven years!

For long the 4¼ percent limit had no operational significance. In the 1920's when interest rates were higher, the Treasury was retiring debt. After that, either the level of interest rates or the structure enabled the Treasury to manage a large and growing debt with little or no interference from the ceiling. But this is not the case today. Nor will it always be the case in the future. Long-term loans of top quality may often command more than 4¼ percent. Why? The productivity of capital—which underlies much of the demand for private borrowing—will often be appreciably higher. And may not inflation reduce willingness to lend for long periods at interest rates acceptable in the past?

Interest rates result from operation of the forces of demand and supply. Part of the demand comes from the national government. The Treasury in managing the outstanding debt must often borrow. Its demands can have significant effects for a time in a part of the market even though its total debt is not growing.

INTEREST RATE LIMIT KEEPS DEBT LIQUID

The government can also be a supplier of funds to the loan market—when a budget surplus enables the Treasury to retire debt. More important on the supply side, however, are the operations of the Federal Reserve. It controls that portion of the increase in total credit which results from expansion of demand deposits. Even this amount, however, is ordinarily only a small part (rarely 10 percent) of the increase in supply of loanable funds.

If market forces lead to interest rates which are above 4¼ percent, what can the Treasury do as it faces the need to refund old debt? It must borrow where it can—on short term—and pay whatever rates the market demands. Today much over 4¼ percent. The legal limit does not determine the interest cost of the debt.

The ceiling does affect the decisions about which portion of the market the Treasury must use and thus influences the maturity structure of the debt. Today, it forces more debt into relatively short-term form. The shorter the debt, the greater its liquidity and "moneyness."

Our Federal debt seems likely to endure for generations. Therefore, a ceiling which prohibits borrowing for 30 or 20 or even 10 years must prevent rational and realistic adjustment to reality. The ceiling now forces issuance of relatively liquid debt forms. To call the interest rate ceiling an "engine of inflation" is to exaggerate, but some such result does occur.

Though not saving interest the ceiling complicates the work of those responsible for management of the debt. And the most skillful management cannot keep the debt from making the economy a little more "inflation prone," if the ceiling continues.

Managing the Debt—Even if the Federal debt were not growing, the borrowing of billions to repay an equal amount of debt falling due will not be a matter of indifference for the economy. Not all holders of old debt accept new Federal debt in return. The Treasury will obtain funds by new borrowing in some sectors of the market and then makes funds available elsewhere to a somewhat different group. The refunding of the debt can change the relation of interest rates and the relative ease or tightness of credit.

Some shift in relations among interest rates, and in availability of credit, may help a little in stimulating a weak sector of the economy or restraining one which is unduly active. The Treasury's refunding actions, however, can have unwelcome effects.

"Modern analysis of public debt . . . places considerable emphasis on the extent to which different debt forms have characteristics of money. Currency is a demand obligation of government in monetary form. Some other obligations of government are almost payable on demands . . . Such debt can serve some of the functions of money or demand deposits; it has a very high degree of 'moneyness' . . . The time to maturity is the main factor distinguishing the degrees of 'moneyness' of government debt. By arranging the maturity, composition of any given total amount of debt, the Treasury can increase or decrease the proportions that come very close to constituting part of the money stock of the country." [1]

Shifting debt into very short-term form is called "monetizing the debt." Each passing day reduces the remaining life of outstanding debt. An obligation due within a few weeks has very different liquidity characteristics from one due in 20 years.

To achieve the best balance of long-, intermediate-, and short-term debt, the Treasury must be able to sell the kinds of issues required. But if new long-term debt cannot in

[1] W. J. Shultz and C. Lowell Harriss, *American Public Finance,* 8th ed.. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 498.

fact be sold, the maturity structure will show the effects, and they will not be healthy.

Must We "Pay Off" the Federal Debt?—Personal debts must eventually be paid off or settled by repudiation and bankruptcy. National governments as debtors, however, have options not open to the individual. Government's immortality makes a difference. Cannot the Federal government stay in debt perpetually?

Each of us, as part of the collectivity, owes part of the national debt. Each of us can get rid of his share easily and automatically—by dying and thus passing it on to surviving citizens. "We" also pass on the bonds, and they become assets of the heirs of present owners. (Individuals, of course, do not all share equally as taxpayers obliged to pay the interest costs and as inheritors of bonds.)

Americans face no compulsion to reduce the Federal debt. To curb inflation, debt reduction might be worth the taxes needed to make it possible. The Treasury's—our—interest bill would go down. Many of us, however, pay much higher interest rates on personal debt than on Federal debt. Would it make sense to force ourselves to save collectively by imposing taxes high enough to bring budget surpluses?

Today's problem is not paying off the national debt in the sense of reducing it. But "paying off" in the sense of the faithful observance of the terms of every security as it falls due is clearly essential. This is the job of debt management.

Noninflationary Financing of a Budget Deficit—Under conditions of essentially full employment, it is possible to finance a budget deficit in ways which will have no inflationary effect. The Treasury borrowing must not lead to the creation of money by the banking system. The government must go to the capital market, getting savings that would otherwise go for such different purposes as financing business expansion or new housing. And the Federal Reserve must not enable banks to create additional credit for borrowers who do not get the savings which the Treasury absorbs.

If the Treasury is to borrow in noninflationary ways, it must pay the necessary interest rates. Those rates may seem high. Moreover, Treasury demand for borrowing will raise interest rates for private borrowers. The question for the public, then, is whether a lower deficit (more taxes or less in spending) would be better or worse than the difference in interest payments plus going without whatever private investment projects sacrificed. To avoid inflation when the budget is in deficit in an economy as fully employed as ours requires hard sacrifices.

The fact that a budget deficit can be financed in ways that are not inflationary provides no basis for concluding that it will be financed in such a way. Political pressures and conditions in the capital markets may reenforce pressures to use what in the short run is an easier method.

Looking into the months, and perhaps years, ahead we see real difficulties in financing budget deficits in noninflationary ways. The job can be done. But the larger the deficit, the greater the strains. Growth of Federal debt will absorb savings which would otherwise go to finance private capital formation—or tempt inflationary finance.

Import of Foreign Textiles

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, many of us here in the Congress continue to be concerned about the alarming rate at which foreign textiles are being permitted to come into this country and the disruptive effect these imports are having on our domestic textile industry.

In the early part of the 90th Congress, those of us from cotton-producing areas of the Far West, Southwest, the Mississippi Delta, and the Southeast formed a committee to work on this problem. This committee, chaired by the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, and the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, of Georgia, has met repeatedly with industry and producer groups and with officials of the State Department, but this discrimination against the American textile industry continues to expand.

Under the long-term arrangement on cotton textiles, it was originally contemplated that imports would increase only at a rate of about 5 percent a year. However, Mr. Speaker, these increases have far exceeded these guidelines and in actual volume have grown under the so-called long-term arrangement from 720 million square yards to 1½ billion square yards.

In the current issue of the Avondale Sun, the trade publication of Avondale Mills, whose main office is in my home town of Sylacauga, Ala., Mr. Craig Smith, president of Avondale, pointed up very effectively what this free trade policy with foreign countries is doing to the textile industry of this Nation. Under the unanimous-consent rule, I include both of these statements in the RECORD:

DOES PRESIDENT JOHNSON WANT THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN THIS COUNTRY?

Money, like water, is fluid. Water runs downhill. Money moves to those businesses and those countries where the return on it is the highest and the risk the least.

We have a minimum wage law in this country which was passed to protect the income of those individuals who are in most need of protection. We then permit the import of textiles, including garments, made by Asian laborers who are paid a very small part of our minimum wage. These imports destroy the jobs of the people the minimum wage law was passed to protect. The chance for other Americans to make a large profit on these cheap-labor imports encourages them either to move their present manufacturing facilities abroad or to make their new investments where their dollars will earn the most.

Within the lifetime of men now living, England shipped hundreds of millions of yards of fabric each year to India and Pakistan. The men and women who worked in the mills of Lancashire were then busy. Today, India and Pakistan are shipping hundreds of millions of yards of fabric to England. Many men and women who looked to the Lancashire industry for their livelihood went on relief. England is now facing a financial crisis. Anyone who says this can't happen here is silly. Many garment plants have already been built by American companies in the low-wage areas of the world. These garment companies were the customers of the American textile industry. When the customers of the textile industry leave America, our industry too must leave or fold.

There are people in high places in Washington who advocate the build-up of the textile and garment industries in the so-called developing countries and the liquidation of those industries here.

Last week, the Senate of the United States passed the Hollings bill as an amendment to the tax bill. This bill would permit the continuation of imports in their present volume but would require the Administration to limit increases in imports to a reasonable figure. We are told that the Hollings amendment may have difficulty in the House of Representatives and that should it pass the House of Representatives, there is danger of a Presidential veto. We are entitled to know whether or not we are wanted as an industry in the United States. We are entitled to a "yes" or "no" answer to this inquiry from the President of our country.

IS THIS FREE TRADE?

Pakistan has a government-subsidized textile export program which permits the exporter to collect 50 per cent above his selling price.

Israel has a textile export program under which 25 per cent of the value of the textiles exported may be collected as a subsidy.

India has a textile export subsidy based on a sliding scale. The highest rate is to the United States, where grey goods earn a premium of 8½ per cent. Those who do finishing or manufacture fabric into apparel receive an additional subsidy. India, along with many other countries, has a total embargo on imports of cotton textiles.

The Spinners and Weavers Association of Korea recently ran an ad in the New York Times saying Korea should have a larger part of the American market. They gave as one reason the fact that they bought 387,814 bales of American cotton. We shipped them all but 49,000 of these bales for nonconvertible Korean money, which can be spent only in Korea. They bought only 49,000 bales. For all practical purposes, we gave them the rest.

The four examples I have just mentioned are typical. Foreigners who are screaming for free trade are using free American cotton, subsidizing their exports, paying their people a fraction of our legal minimum wage, and in many cases, by many devious means, making it completely impossible for any American textiles to go on the backs of any of their own ragged people who are being overcharged at home.

My ivory-tower friends argue for free trade. They mean a further opening of the American market, which is already the most open market in the world. They start looking out the window when they are confronted with the facts of life, just a few of which I have enumerated here.

NEA Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the days of the one-room schoolhouse have long vanished, as have uninformed, politically apathetic teachers. Today's tutorial image is an impressive one; we see a vast number of educators interested and involved in the management of our Goverment.

This is as it should be, for in order to educate our children thoroughly, we must have teachers knowledgeable in varied aspects of American life. Our children must be made aware of their potential political importance; this can only be accomplished through example.

The teacher has, in recent years, been of unestimatable benefit in the backing of candidates; nothing is more impressive than an educated, concerned teacher thoroughly supporting his or her candidate. The candidate involved, when en-

trusted with such a dynamic force as the teachers' vote, becomes more resolved to seek measures to insure the stability and security of education in our Nation.

In this regard, I would like to commend the National Education Association for its sponsorship of the Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. Events such as these insure a continuation of the prodigious amount of involvement and support needed and sought after in contemporary America. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and as one who has been active in the advancement of education for many years, I can only commend and support this special weekend and this trend of involvement.

Sgt. Ronald LeBel of Dudley, Mass.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Marine Sgt. Ronald LeBel of Dudley, Mass., in a letter to his mother has expressed his reasons for volunteering to fight in Vietnam.

Sergeant LeBel is risking his life thousands of miles from home because he feels he must help preserve the liberties we enjoy here in the United States.

I know my colleagues join me in commending this young man for his sense of patriotism and in hoping the new bombing pause will lead to a negotiated settlement that will bring him home.

The United States, it is clear, must marshal all its diplomatic skills in an effort to achieve a negotiated settlement. We cannot continue to ask soldiers like Sergeant LeBel to carry out a military "win" policy that has proved fruitless.

The Webster, Mass., Times has published an article about Sergeant LeBel's letter. With permission I put this article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Webster (Mass.) Times, Apr. 3, 1968]

LETTER TO "MOM": MARINE TELLS WHY HE IS IN VIETNAM

Why does a Marine volunteer for duty in Vietnam?

Sgt. Ronald (Mike) LeBel, a 1965 graduate of St. Louis High School, took a rather touching occasion to express his sentiments—his mother's birthday.

LeBel enlisted in the Marine Corps in November of 1965, completed basic at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and volunteered for duty in Vietnam in October of 1967. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. LeBel of Carpenter Rd., Dudley.

Following is Mike's birthday letter to his mother:

Dear Mom,

I guess it's a little late, but better late than never. I'd like to wish you a very happy birthday . . . I wanted to send you a nice birthday card but there was none available around here. I hope this letter will mean just as much to you.

I know that you did not like the idea of my volunteering for this duty but I had . . . to satisfy a personal yearning I've had since I joined the Corps. Some of it has got to do with patriotism but deep down it's to protect the loved ones I have at home from ever encountering any type of war like this.

I've seen quite a bit of the ravages of war since I've come here and some of it I'll never forget. . . . These people have been fighting for over 300 years so it will take time to convince them we're here to help. I don't ever want a war like this to break out in the States so here I am doing my small part so the people back home can celebrate their birthdays, go for a Sunday drive, or do just about anything they please . . . I hope that with the grace of God I'll be home to celebrate your birthday next year and the years to come afterwards.

Your loving son,

MIKE.

"Crisis in Credibility"

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of knowing for some time the distinguished author of the recently published book, "Crisis in Credibility." Those of us who know Bruce Ladd, know him to be extremely diligent, resourceful, and persevering, as well as very knowledgeable and intelligent.

These attributes show up very clearly in his book, which was reviewed in the February 10, 1968, issue of the Saturday Review. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues this review and highly recommended "Crisis in Credibility" for good reading.

The book review follows:

JUST UNBELIEVABLE

To a greater or lesser extent, we have always had a "credibility" problem with the Administration on power. George Washington agitated Congress by declining to share with it data on treaty negotiations with Britain. Wilson strove unsuccessfully for censorship in the First World War, and settled for baffling the press with wordage. Of Wilson a British diplomat observed: "When he summons the newspapermen he talks to them at length and in excellent language, but when they leave his presence they say to each other, 'What on earth did he say?'"

Under Franklin Roosevelt the calculated governmental "leak" was perfected. It was Truman who extended the security privileges of Defense and State to all governmental agencies and thereby triggered a secrecy-stamp binge along the Potomac. Eisenhower had the appalling embarrassment of the U–2, Kennedy the Bay of Pigs. But in the catalogue of informational malfeasance that Bruce Ladd has compiled in *Crisis in Credibility* these practitioners are but innocents whose strayings entreat our indulgence; the true monster of misinformation stands among us at this hour. Mr. Ladd races rapidly through the fumbling and almost forgivable attempts of the almost novices among past Chief Executives until he can get to President Johnson. For in the minds of many people, including Ladd, it is Mr. Johnson—whether fairly accused or not—who has written the modern text of the black art of suppressing the truth.

There are three faces to the credibility problem, all of them with Johnsonian features; indefensible secrecy and the unjustifiable withholding of information from the public; unconscionable lying by Government officials; and news manipulation, a blanket term that covers a multitude of devious bureaucratic practices. Ladd credits Kennedy with pioneering the "backgrounder" news conference in which the Government protects itself from possibly adverse public reaction by fuzzing the source. He pictures the Johnson "briefing" of Congressmen and the selective, informal (controllable) press gathering which for a time replaced the proper news conference. He describes the well known Presidential anger over premature disclosures, his possessiveness of public information, his manipulation of budget figures, and his prefiguration of the budget's awesome size in order to create later an artificial picture of fiscal rectitude. Ladd forthrightly calls this simply "duplicity."

The author's examples will be mostly familiar to those practiced in spreading calipers over the credibility gap. He reviews the Dominician crisis of 1965—an episode so distastefully revealing of the kitchen disorder in the Johnsonian household, of the chef dashing indiscriminately from the pot of "protecting American lives" to the kettle of "preventing a Communist takeover." The episode also showed the President, upon sending in the Marines, in one of his most frantic telephonic searches for a Johnsonian consensus.

Skillfully, Ladd sketches the dimensions of the government information problem in that painfully protracted investigation—finally crowned by modest legislative success—of the House Subcommittee on Government Information, headed by Representative John E. Moss of California. It was Moss who hit on one aspect of the problem beyond the reach of calculated villainy: "There is so much information generated in government today that it is difficult for people to get the facts even when they're freely available." But the twisted use to which this is put was pointed out to Ladd by Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon: "Our leaders have taken the position that an issue is far too complicated for the people to understand even if full information is provided."

The most damaging evidence is gathered, as one would imagine, on Vietnam, for it is here, in the justification and explanation of this unwanted and hateful war, that the information policies of the Johnson Administration show up most poorly—the saying of one thing and the doing of another; the fiscal deception; the consistently erroneous predictions of military progress offered by Secretary McNamara; the hiding of one's own losses and the inflation of the enemy's; the protestations of peace and the shunting aside of peace overtures, which go on unchecked despite all our alarm.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a young San Diego girl has captured, in a short but lovely poem, the essential meaning of the life—and death—of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Liz Clarke's touching poem was brought to my attention by her classmate, Mary Ruth Jarrell, president of the junior class at Our Lady of Peace Academy in San Diego.

Miss Jarrell has asked me to help disseminate the poem, believing it should be "shared by all men, black and white."

I agree, and I also feel that Miss Clarke's untitled eulogy is an especially

appropriate tribute to Dr. King on this, the day of his funeral.

The poem follows:

(By Liz Clarke)

It was growing;
It was growing so well,
That someone thought it would overrun his garden.
So he cut it down.

It was a beautiful ebony flower.
Dark as the night and the ground it came from.
But he cut it down.

It was so hard for it to survive.
So many hated its dark color.
So many tried to stifle it.
Finally he cut it down.

His garden doesn't need that ebony blossom.
His garden doesn't want that ebony blossom.
His garden is of weeds.
So he cut it down.

But that blossom hasn't died.
It's sprouting again.
Its beautiful ebony blossom has flowered—again.

The roots are deep and firmly entrenched.
It has the determination and vigor.
It will grow and destroy the weeds by its love.

Water for the West Helps the Nation

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, although the recent events of great national and international importance have, naturally, demanded our constant attention and overshadowed other considerations, problems of regional interest remain undiminished, nevertheless.

One such is the Pacific Southwest water shortage, which affects some 20 million persons who depend on the Colorado River for most of their water supplies. The seven States of the Colorado River Basin—Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—cover a vast area of about 242,000 square miles, or about one-twelfth of the continental United States landmass.

Hopefully, we will soon have before us legislation designed to alleviate the immediate water supply deficiencies of the seven-State region and to provide a basis for meeting long-range projected needs. I refer to H.R. 3300, the Colorado River Basin project bill. And when this measure is presented here for debate, I earnestly hope my colleagues will be guided by the knowledge that in helping one interdependent region resolve its problems, they are contributing to the economic well-being of this whole Nation.

At this point I wish to insert for the RECORD the texts of endorsements from three influential California organizations: the California State Chamber of Commerce, the California Water Resources Association and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. These represent a representative sampling of the support in California—north and south—for H.R. 3300 as it now stands. The State's two most important agencies dealing directly with water resource affairs, the State department of water resources and the Colorado River Board of California, have previously expressed similar endorsements. The latter agency reaffirmed that position April 3 and that resolution also is included for the RECORD. In the larger context, these sentiments reflect the unified support of this legislation throughout other States of the Colorado River Basin.

The endorsements follow:

[From the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.]

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Colorado River must be depended upon by 10,000,000 Southern Californians to meet most of their water needs, and

Whereas, most of these Californians live in Los Angeles County, and

Whereas, two bills are now before Congress to develop new projects on the river and to increase the supply of water available, and

Whereas, House Resolution 3300 does provide for our future protection as well as establish other conditions accepted also by the six other States in the Basin as a practical approach to a solution of our common water problems in peace and security, and

Whereas, Senate Bill 1004 denies adequate protection to existing projects such as the aqueduct vital to Los Angeles County residents,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County supports House Resolution 3300 and opposes Senate Bill 1004 as it now stands, and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be sent to the County Delegation in Washington, D.C.

[From the California Water Resources Association, Glendale, Calif.]

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA-SPONSORED COLORADO RIVER LEGISLATION (H.R. 14834 ET AL)

The California Water Resources Association historically has supported the concept of cooperative development of Western States regional water resources, including Colorado River development programs that contain some of the principal features of H.R. 14834 and other identical bills—although CWRA recommendations were more comprehensive and called for broad studies of all possible sources of water to augment the Colorado River and for construction of new power-producing dams.

To date, the current official position of California is reflected in H.R. 14834 et al, introduced by 35 of the 38 California members of Congress, and represents a number of major concessions by California.

This Association urges the California Congressional delegation to hold the line on three essential features of this legislation:

1. Protection of existing uses for all states, with a minimum of 4.4 million acre feet annually for California.

2. Authorization of studies to augment the Colorado River below Lee Ferry in the amount of not less than 2.5 million acre feet annually.

3. The bulk of any surplus funds that might be available from the Hoover-Davis-Parker dam power revenues—after completion of repayment of those projects—should be earmaked to finance Colorado River augmentation works that would benefit all seven states in the River Basin.

The California Water Resources Association commends the members of the California Delegation who have introduced Colorado River Legislation incorporating California's official position and urges them to present a united front in protecting the features cited above, which are considered essential to the welfare of the entire State of California.

AN ENDORSEMENT FROM THE CALIFORNIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., MARCH 22, 1968

Our Board of Directors and our Statewide Water Resources Committee hope that the present coordination in our delegation on this most important matter can be maintained as the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee considers the compromise measure and at such time as a bill reaches the floor.

The State Chamber is particularly concerned that any House measure authorizing a Central Arizona Project include the following features:

A. Protection of existing uses against diversions by new projects on the Colorado River.

B. Investigations of means to augment the Colorado River flow below Lee Ferry.

C. Reservation of the main portion of any surplus power revenue from Hoover, Parker and Davis projects after repayment of capital costs to assist in amortizing future Colorado River augmentation projects.

D. Requirement that the burden of meeting Mexican Water Treaty provisions be a national obligation.

A RESOLUTION FROM THE COLORADO RIVER BOARD OF CALIFORNIA, APRIL 3, 1968

The Colorado River Board of California unanimously supports H.R. 3300, Colorado River Basin Project, as reported by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 26, 1968. The Board strongly urges the affirmative and active support of the bill by all Californians.

H.R. 3300, as approved by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 26, 1968, contains the three major elements essential to California's acceptance:

1. Adequate protection of the rights of existing Colorado River projects.

2. Initiation of steps which will lead to augmentation of the Colorado River.

3. Establishment of a means of financing such augmentation.

With these necessary features in the bill, California can support the other key provisions of H.R. 3300: authorization of the Central Arizona Project; authorization of seven projects in the states of Colorado, New Mexico and Utah; the criteria for operation of Lake Mead and Lake Powell; and payments to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund.

Moving Tribute to Dr. King by Pittsburgh Youth

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a moving tribute to Dr. King which was composed by Mr. Melvin Hunter, of 839 Francis Street, Hill District, Pittsburgh.

Mr. Hunter is a postgraduate student in the printing program at Connelley Vocational-Technical High School. The Pittsburgh Press, on April 7, reported that Mr. Hunter, saddened by the assassination of the Reverend Dr. King, turned his hand and mind to poetry for the first time, writing and then setting these verses in type.

Yesterday, I addressed the House memorializing Dr. King. If I had then had available to me the words of Mr. Hunter I would have included them in my remarks at that time for they are an eloquent expression of the grief which we all feel.

Mr. Hunter was quoted in the Pittsburgh Press as saying the words "represent exactly how I feel." Mr. Speaker, the moving words of Melvin Hunter represent exactly how many of us feel about this terrible tragedy.

The tribute follows:

A MAN OF PEACE

There comes a time when everyone's life must cease.
And so it came violently to this man of peace.
He fought for the right and pitied the wrong.
This man was intelligent, proud and strong.

He was Black, honored, courageous and bold,
And left behind a story to be told.
He lived and fought for a purposeful dream.
Which someone else must now pick up and redeem.

So let it be told all over the countryside,
That he helped open the door—not partially, but wide.
Who was this man of liberty?
Dr. Martin Luther King. He fought to be free.

—*Melvin Hunter.*

An Extraordinary Job

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is little, if anything, to rejoice about when considering the wanton destruction which took place in the District of Columbia these last few days. Arson, vandalism, rampant disregard for the law—all of these prompt one to exclaim, "Another Watts. Another Detroit."

Yes; but with a positive difference—the commendable behavior of civil authorities, especially the firemen and policemen, in handling the disturbance. The city of Washington fully mobilized all available resources to bring order out of chaos; and, while it is too early to measure the degree of their success, it is obvious that, in terms of what might have been, the city has done an extraordinary job.

Much has been made in the so-called riot report of the problem of police brutality. The actions of the police of the District of Columbia go far in refuting this charge and in restoring public confidence in our law enforcement system.

Firmness tempered by restraint was the order of the day—a policy valuing human life above property, as it should be. This policy of moderation, worked out by the Justice Department after its study of the civil disorders of 1967, resulted in property damage and fatalities falling far short of the tolls in Watts or Detroit.

Realizing that looters and other lawbreakers are unlikely to turn the other cheek, the police often merely told looters to replace their booty, a method that proved surprisingly effective. Tear gas was the most lethal agent used to control the situation, and in many cases this was used only after police were provoked by verbal abuse and thrown objects.

The District of Columbia police had some unique problems; for, aside from coping with a situation unlike any of recent experience, they were working under the direction of a new city government. At the beginning of the disturbance, they also were required to spread out more than was the case in Newark, Los Angeles, or Detroit.

Arrests have been high—well over 5,000—while fatalities and injuries have been comparatively low. These figures bear out the competence of District of Columbia law enforcement—meting out firm justice while scrupulously avoiding ruthlessness.

Everyone involved in handling the disturbance in our Nation's Capital deserves our respect and appreciation: Mayor Walter Washington, his deputy Thomas Fletcher, Safety Director Patrick Murphy, Chief of Police John Layton, Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance. But to the National Guardsmen, the Federal troops, the firemen, and the policemen—those anonymous heroes—must go our very special thanks.

Mobocracy Could Destroy Democracy—Reason, Not Emotion, Must Prevail

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Columnist David Lawrence, in a recent article in U.S. News & World Report, emphasizes that mobocracy can destroy democracy if this type of lawless activity becomes the accepted manner of achieving social change.

Mr. Lawrence describes demonstrations which have resulted in some instances in inflaming passions rather than in cooling tempers and endeavoring to achieve worthwhile goals and objectives in an orderly manner.

Reason, not emotion, must prevail if our country is to survive in its present form.

Because of the interest of the Congress and the American people in this most important subject, I place herewith this column in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 15, 1968. Reprinted from the Mar. 22, 1965, issue]

THE POWER OF REASON

(By David Lawrence)

There is a right way and a wrong way to try to achieve reform, whether it be in the realm of government or in the social life of our nation.

We pride ourselves on a belief in democracy—on the exercise of a rule of reason in our national life.

We have rejected mobocracy as the manifestation of anger, of bitterness, and of unwillingness to let the rule of reason and the process of law prevail.

The American people have been witnessing in recent events a failure to rely on the normal functioning of a democracy.

Whatever the provocation, the fact is that passion and threats of physical force have never bred a spirit of confidence in any constitutional system.

Unfortunately, the "demonstrations" have been led by men who should know better. The leaders have included not merely protagonists for meritorious causes, but clergymen who, while preaching nonviolence have closed their eyes to the incitement to violence which results from street "demonstrations" and, in some cases, from defiance of the law itself.

It has been argued that the police in the South are prejudiced. But how can we explain the outbreaks in cities like Chicago and New York, where the officers of the law have been attacked and, indeed, where the cry of police "brutality" has been raised? Yet the handling of disorders and incidents that may lead to violence is the duty of the local police. We cannot delegate it all to a national police force.

Understandably, "demonstrations" get publicity from coast to coast and are designed to mobilize public opinion behind worthy causes. But does this mean that we cannot utilize effectively the public forum, the printed word of the press, and the spoken word of radio and television?

Cannot a righteous cause be successfully or persuasively espoused except by mobs in street "demonstrations" or by fanatics who have carried their campaign of intimidation even to the inside of the White House, only to be dragged out by police and arrested when they ignored requests to leave?

Have we had a dispassionate discussion of the race problem itself? Have we endeavored to make people on both sides of the controversy in other sections of the country, as well as in the South, aware of the complex nature of a social problem of this kind?

Essentially, the prejudices that are expressed on racial issues are not really based upon ethnic differences. They are based on the differences between man and man. Segregation has reflected a custom—a habit of our people—not merely in the South but also in the North. Gradually, the laws have decreed that the principle of segregation is invalid.

But can the principle of integration be applied by law to the satisfaction of all who have felt the sting of discrimination? Isn't there also a problem in human relationships, in educating individuals, and in paving the way for better understanding between all groups in the nation? And can this be accomplished better by mob violence than by the process of reason?

Does anyone who is familiar with life in a Southern community believe that there is hate in the hearts of a preponderant number of the citizens toward any race or population group? Even in the days of rigid segregation, whether in railroad stations or in hotels or in restaurants or in schools, the relations between whites and Negroes were far better in many parts of the South than they have become in recent years in the North.

The key to a solution of the racial problem in community life lies in a better understanding of human nature. Does anyone who has studied this problem in the South or elsewhere think for a moment that white people who have known Negroes over the years and have had personal and business relations with them are bent on inflicting hardships upon them?

One finds that the responsible individual, irrespective of race, who is able to conduct himself or herself honestly and with due regard for the rights of others invariably wins friends who remain true to that friendship, not for just a few years but throughout their lives. Why is it that we cannot widen this relationship to that of a community? Ministers of the gospel might better devote themselves to this task than to participation in street riots.

The race question will never be solved with a policeman's club any more than by "sit-ins" or other incitement to disorder and mob violence.

We are dealing with the facts of life. Some

of the "demonstrations" have turned out to be a form of organized tragedy—a way of inflaming rather than cooling passions. If this is continued, the end result can only be a retrogression, an emergence of hate and bitterness on a wide scale, with the ultimate loss of the objective itself.

There is a right way and a wrong way. The rule of reason is the right way. "Demonstration" provocative of violence are the wrong way.

Lyndon B. Johnson, the People's President

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I know President Johnson is sincere and means what he says about not seeking reelection. I also know that the overwhelming majority of the American people support the President and his programs.

I wish to call to my colleagues' attention an excellent article by Mr. Robert G. Spivack, which perceptively reports on the public's reaction to the President's shocking announcement that he would not seek reelection.

As Mr. Spivack says:

President Johnson, a proud and strong man, would rather be remembered as the man who brought peace and prevented World War III than as just another seeker of high office, fulfilling personal ambitions.

This, it seems to me, neatly sums up the meaning of the President's momentous decision. As he has done from the moment he took office, Lyndon Johnson has put first the national interest over any personal interest.

This is the mark of a great President. And it is the style and substance of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency.

Under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Spivack's excellent article into the RECORD:

[From the Denver Post, Apr. 4, 1968]

CAN L. B. J. BE DRAFTED?

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—Maarten C. Bolle is the Washington correspondent of Het Vrije Volk of The Netherlands and other European newspapers, a perceptive veteran newspaperman, longtime observer of the American scene.

"Is it possible," he asked a group of us at the National Press Club, "that the American people do not realize the qualities of President Johnson because he talks like a Texan, or is not in high society? Would they really trade him in for an unknown model like Kennedy or McCarthy or someone else, who speak such superficialities about international affairs?

"If they let this man get away then I guess I will have to stop trying to interpret American politics for my readers, because I would have to report that they have lost their qualities of common sense and have gone crazy over glitter."

A woman boarding a bus from Virginia, reported a Milwaukee newspaperman, turned to nobody in particular and asked, "Now who will all the critics pick for a whipping boy, without LBJ?"

A Sunoco gasoline station attendant was asked early Monday morning, after the President's Sunday night bombshell, what he thought of it? "I don't know what he said," the attendant answered. When told that LBJ said he would not run the man stared in disbelief—and then burst into tears. "I like Lyndon," he said. "He can't do that. What's going to happen to us old folks." The man was so upset he forgot to charge for the gasoline.

That was the mood in the Capital on Black Monday, April 1—the city was shocked, stunned and saddened. Everywhere one travelled the reaction was the same. "A big man." "A real patriot." "I never knew how dependent we had all become on him," said a young clerk in Garfinckel's department store.

When the shock wore off and people began to discuss other alternatives the discussion always seemed to end with two questions, "Does he mean it?" and "What can we do to make him change his mind?"

Each of us who has been privileged to know Lyndon Johnson probably has his own answers and these are mine:

1. He does mean it. I think he has decided that a chief executive, who is also commander in chief, cannot work on the details for peace in Vietnam—or take the alternate course if Hanoi continues to kill and terrorize the people of South Vietnam—and at the same time devote himself to the details of U.S. precinct policies in an election year.

President Johnson, a proud and strong man, would rather be remembered as the man who brought peace and prevented World War III than as just another seeker of high office, fulfilling personal ambitions. After all he is at the summit; there is no place higher to go.

2. If it's only politicians, or office-holders and office-seekers who ask him to reconsider then I doubt that he can be drafted. But if mothers of boys serving in Vietnam, or the Sunoco gas station attendant, say "Your country needs you" I do not see how he could fail to respond affirmatively, much as he may yearn for the peace and contentment of his ranch back home.

Johnson's affinity is with the workingmen and women of this country, with the poor and the afflicted. He has little in common with the jet set or so-called "high society" or those self-styled intellectuals who are known as the "talking liberals" compared with his cabinet of "working liberals."

They don't like him. He does not like them. Although he has done more in four years to achieve the social goals about which they talk so glibly they have run out on him in a difference over one issue, Vietnam. He has fought their battles at home—and probably abroad—but they turned their backs on him.

If Johnson can be persuaded to change his mind it will have to be a spontaneous ground swell from those we used to call "the common people." If that comes and he is persuaded he can heal the nation's wounds I doubt he would be a draft-dodger. He has a genuine devotion to duty.

Trade Policy Review

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body have a vital interest in the trade policy of this country. Recently public hearings were opened by the Trade Information Committee of the Office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. A number of witnesses have already been heard and over a hundred have asked to testify.

A review of the trade policy of over 30-years standing is far past due. The world has changed greatly since 1934, including the pattern of trade. During the years since that time we have all but discarded the tariff as a means of guarding our industries and labor against the miserable, low wage scales paid in many foreign countries. As a result more and more of our industries are feeling the destructive impact of rising imports.

One of the papers submitted to the Trade Information Committee was from O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Mr. Strackbein has been on the scene for many years. Newsweek in its issue of March 30, reporting on the hearing before the Trade Information Committee, said:

Protectionists were represented by O. R. Strackbein speaking for the Committee on Import-Export Policy, a large grouping of industries worried about foreign competition.

Not long ago the New York Journal of Commerce referred to Mr. Strackbein as the chief architect of protectionist legislation. He has appeared more than once before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Labor, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to give voice to the concern of American industry and labor over rising import competition. I have always found his presentations worthy of the most serious attention and study.

I place Mr. Strackbein's paper at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, BEFORE THE TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, MARCH 15, 1968

American economic policy is now facing itself coming back. It will not be easy to trace all the outward steps, side tours and excursions taken on the round trip. Only the broader outlines can be traced here.

We start with the home base, which became marked in the post-Civil War years as a unique economic system, gestated on this continent over a period measured in generations.

We made a new departure in this land from much that had gone before in our mother- and fatherlands across the Atlantic. The process marking the departure was not an experiment, economic or political, but more nearly an unconscious development arising from the play of our economic and political philosophy and our harvest of experience on the vast resources that fell to our lot as a people. The result was the outcome also of our character as a people, diverse as this was, as it reacted to the exigencies of the rough frontier and the smell of rich resources; of our governmental vision, our religious discipline and our readiness to toil, to build, and to absorb reverses. Despite the rough usages, the exploitation, greed and lust that are sometimes seized upon as the principal thrust of our character and career across the continent, there was always at work a residual discipline. It brought up the rear and imposed its taming and civilizing influence, even if it was often slow and uncertain and sometimes fiercely resisted.

The economics of it consisted of taming the natural wilds, staking out claims or setting metes and bounds, producing food and fiber, building shelter, multiplying, toiling, expanding and improving.

In time the growth and development, phenomenal as it was under the freedom

provided by the new political system, reached proportions that required the shaping of new policies. As problems proliferated under conditions that for us were new, we met them, or essayed to do so, through our own perspective, although we had some learning imported from our European ancestry. One of the first problems or at least one of the foremost was that of curbing combinations of gigantic aggregates of capital, either in production or in service industries (e.g., railroads and banking).

It was largely the reviewers, the sideline appraisers seated principally in our academic chairs, who interpreted developments and raised the storm signals. Their alarms and excursions, given substance by crises, panics and depressions, led to the legislative reform measures that more and more engaged our legislative energies.

MASS PRODUCTION AND MASS CONSUMPTION

Behind the economic developments lay our technological and inventive genius, which derived encouragement from our patent laws and the possibility of enrichment through competent exploitations of inventions. As we moved onto the frontiers of *mass production* our economists perceived the virtues of the market economy—which is to say, the consumers' potential capacity to absorb farm and factory output. It was not immediately clear that a mass production system could endure only under the pull of *mass consumption*; but in time the equation was grasped in its full significance. Rightly or wrongly Henry Ford has been credited with the practical prosecution of the idea by instituting the $5.00-a-day wage. If mass production, generated by technological progress, was not to fall on its face, consumers must be armed with the purchasing power necessary to absorb the increasing output. A penurious wage policy would not answer the purpose.

FAIRNESS OF COMPETITION

Meantime, the reformers had placed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act on the statute books (1890). The economic understanding behind the Act included an appreciation of the nature and behavior of consumer demand. If monopoly were permitted to entrench itself the cost of goods would not be reduced, and consumer dollars would not reach as far as they might. Fair competition would assure lower prices as costs of production were reduced in response to technological progress. More people would be able to purchase more goods. As more goods were produced still lower costs could be realized, and as competition forced prices still lower yet a greater part of the public would become a market for goods; and so on. Finally the true mass market would develop. Therefore monopoly must not be allowed to stifle competition and prevent market expansion.

If Ford had produced only the high-cost prestige automobiles, he might have made a much larger profit per unit, but his unit sales would have remained very limited. He would have realized a lower total profit and the mass of the people would have stayed in their wagons and buggies.

In any event, the mass production-mass consumption equation was soon recognized by a growing number of industries, and it became the characteristic of the American system.

In spite of the reformers and regulators, who succeeded in placing the Clayton Act on the books, no less than the Federal Reserve Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act in the time of Woodrow Wilson, our economy, however, continued to operate on its cyclical system of prosperity, crisis, panic, depression and prosperity. In 1929, stoked by the economic repercussions of World War I, the structure once more collapsed, and before it could be righted the collapse almost took the system to the floor with it.

The very wisdom and soundness of the system came under serious question.

We had come thus far under the impetus of the private enterprise system and the potential vigor that was converted into activity by the incentive for private profit. During the Depression of the Thirties the virtue of this incentive system under which we had gained the industrial leadership of the world came to be viewed with a jaundiced eye. It was interpreted more and more as a system catering to the greed of enterprisers and exploiters. The human suffering occasioned by the veritable massacre of countless private ambitions, an onslaught which in many instances caught careers in mid-air and shot them down, represented a cost in terms of frustration that seemed to many to be a price that was too high to pay.

ADVENT OF THE CONTROLLED ECONOMY THROUGH REGULATION

Under the high emotion of economic frustration the electorate vowed that it must not happen again, and it sustained legislative proposals designed to reform the system; and these were adopted by wide majorities. Thus dawned the day of spreading business regulation and extensive governmental control of economic activities in this country. Laissez faire gasped its last breath. A little later we will come back to this death of cock robin, and who it was that killed him.

To tame the harsh cyclical swings measures relating to farm prices, wages and hours, bank deposits, stock-market operations, unemployment insurance and others were adopted.

REMOVAL OF WAGES FROM COMPETITION

Having grasped the significance of purchasing power to the mass output of goods, efforts were directed toward the bolstering of wages, since in the aggregate these became recognized as the overwhelming source of effective consumer demand. Obligatory collective bargaining was joined with minimum wages as one of the guarantees against shrinkage or attrition of wage-income of the people. One of the prime purposes of the minimum wage policy and of the outlawing of child labor was to remove wage-reduction from the arsenal of producers and manufacturers who might seek to reduce costs of production by cutting wages. Purchasing power must not become a victim of such "unfair" methods of competition, namely wage-cutting and hiring of children. If one employer could reduce wages as a means of reducing costs he would force the hand of those who were not inclined to follow the course. Thus a run against consumer purchasing power might erode the market's underpinning.

Cost-reduction was thus made a function of technological advancement rather than wage-reduction or wage stagnation. It became acceptable to displace workers by machines to achieve lower prices, for in this direction lay economic progress. In time the lower prices would lead to greater consumption and the displaced workers would be rehired and often additional ones put on the payroll. Thus would the economy expand although sometimes several years might be needed.

COST REDUCTION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY

This course represented good economics so long as the goods concerned enjoyed an elastic demand. It was not so sound where the necessities were concerned: in the case of food, for example, because the elasticity of demand is largely limited in that item by the human stomach. Lowering of prices does not sell much more flour or potatoes. In any event, dropping the cost farther and farther excites no growth in demand remotely comparable to the response to sharp cost and price reductions in many nonessential goods.

The notion that cost reduction would necessarily lead to a bonanza in the form of a mass market caused some confusion. It all depends actually on the character of the consumer demand. Automobiles and radio and television sets were a prime example of the elastic market; and efforts to bring costs down to the level of the mass pocketbook were well repaid. On the other hand pins and salt, nails and forks would not sell much more widely if costs were brought down. The necessities are not pursued far beyond the minimum level. It is the nonessentials that open the prospects of great variety and proliferation of demand. It is also the nonessentials that make the market more sensitive to misgivings and uncertainty, such as import competition may arouse in producers, because the consumer can on short notice, and often does, curtail or switch his purchases of items on which the price seems high, or he is under the need to retrench his expenditures. Bargains look especially good.

EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Not only for social but also economic reasons the Employment Act of 1946 was passed in that year. Full employment at wages from the minimum upward, with the upward range determined by collective bargaining, would provide a lively market for the output of our farms, mines, forests and factories.

CUSHIONS AGAINST DEPRESSION

The outlook was one of widening of prosperity if the various economic elements and factors could be kept in balance. While recessions might occur, the likelihood of a depression of the 1930 model, was remote because of the cushions that had been provided. These took the form of minimum wages (against the collapse of wages), unemployment insurance (against the disappearance of purchasing power), bank deposit insurance (against panicky runs on banks by depositors), farm price supports (against the collapse of farm prices), Federal home financing (against wholesale foreclosures), social security (against old-age pennilessness), etc.

TUNING THE ECONOMY

There seemed to be no reason why the economy could not be "fine-tuned" by the exercise of fiscal and monetary foresight by the government. Taxes, interest rates, money supply and similar instruments were at the service of governmental policy. If a recession loomed, deficit financing together with reduced taxes and lowered interest rates (plentiful money), could be utilized to get the economy "moving" again. If the economy became too active or "overheated" opposite measures could be taken.

Aside from the less inspiring and sometimes shocking aspects of human fallibility, including that of economists and Federal policy-makers, and, further the sometimes intractable recalcitrance of legislators and labor organizations (as witness the spurning of the 3.2% guideline) there always remained a potentially highly disturbing factor. This consisted and consists of the fact that the United States is not a universe in itself. Our unique economic system rubbed elbows and continues to rub elbows with other economies, some of which were and are quite disparate in point of wage base, economic philosophy and development, both in relation to us and among themselves. Commercially we were and are interdependent with them to a degree; politically perhaps more so.

INSULAR ECONOMY IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

Yet our laws governing minimum wages, maximum hours, farm prices, unemployment compensation, and similar economic and social measures do not extend to other countries. These domestic laws nevertheless exert a far-reaching influence on our economy. More specifically they affect the cost of production and at the same time produce an inflexibility in relation to costs that borders

on rigidity. More and more the effects approach a condition of rising fixed costs.

The most influential of all the cost factors by far is the payroll, and this is composed in great part of wages—salaries currently representing a relatively smaller but growing share. Of all corporate income approximately 80% is paid out in the form of employee compensation in this country. (See Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1967, Table on National Income by Sector, No. 461, p. 324.)

WAGES AS SOURCE OF CONSUMER INCOME

This country jumped ahead in wage levels during the first few post-war years and the lead became so great, compared with pre-war days, that subsequent spurts in wages in other countries made little progress toward closing the wide gap. Such progress as was made was soon erased by the failure of the wage guideposts of 1966 in this country.

Meantime a great leap in technological advancement abroad, with inestimable help from this country, assured a widening competitive margin over us in an increasing number of lines of goods. Recent years brought typewriters, bicycles, standard machine tools, sewing machines, consumer electronic products (radio and TV sets), cotton and woolen textiles, petroleum and a number of other products under severe competitive attack from abroad. Most recently footwear, meat and steel have come under attack.

CHALLENGE FROM ABROAD

Whatever may be said about rising wages as assuring an expanding consumer purchasing power that keeps our factory wheels turning, the fact is that the virtue that resides in this function is under severe challenge from the outside. This challenge is a direct outcome of the foreign aspiration to emulate our economy, particularly the mass-production aspects of it. The Second World War was sufficient to convince foreign skeptics of the great vigor and productivity of our system; and they "bought" it. It is essentially a consumer-pulled system, where the consumer derives his pulling power from employment at good wages. The push comes from producers who, assessing the market, see in it potential profits. They bombard the consumers to open their pocketbooks, but if there is little in the pocketbook or checking account the bombardment fails. It is, of course, employment at good wages that keeps the pocketbook stocked with legal tender. This aspect of our system may dampen the foreign emulation. Labor unions, moreover, do not exert as much bargaining power abroad as they do in this country. Therefore foreign industry may be expected to continue to enjoy their competitive advantage for years to come. The wage gap will not soon be closed.

ASSESSMENT OF COMPETITIVE STANDING OF U.S. INDUSTRY IN THE WORLD

If we seek to assess the competitive capacity of our various industries we must examine the unit costs of domestic and foreign producers. It is a common practice among economists of the classical mould to tax domestic industries with inefficiency if they cannot compete with imports. This indictment is made without presenting a bill of particulars and can issue only from ignorance or disregard of towering facts.

The same economists are quick with the retort that our industry has little of a substantial nature to fear from imports because we have such phenomenal know-how and productive magic. In the next breath, when confronted with undeniable instances of impossible competitive handicaps, they berate the domestic industry for its inefficiency and lack of vigor and progress. How the United States could have achieved its world industrial leadership if our industry were thus inefficient is never explained.

ECHOES OF ADAM SMITH (1775)

The peculiar logic of these economists is attributable to their insistence on reading the economic currents, events and trends of today through the eye-glasses of vintage 1775, that of Adam Smith. They will not accept as a fact the irrefutable fact that our economy is a regulated and controlled economy and that the market forces do not have an opportunity to play the game as prescribed by Adam Smith. This error leads them to some grotesque conclusions. It would be necessary to dismantle our minimum wage laws, obligatory collective bargaining, farm price supports, social security, unemployment compensation, bank deposit insurance, restrictive immigration laws and other controls if the economy were to be shaped by the free market. The trend is, of course, in the exact opposite direction, and usually with the advice and consent of the economists in question.

To assure the continuity of the equation of mass-production sustained by mass consumption we have indeed instituted a whole arsenal of controls and regulations. That is why, contrary to what would be expected by classical economics under a free market regime, wage costs in this country per unit of production may be higher than foreign costs, *and why the differential may last indefinitely*. Competition has been thoroughly hobbled by subsidies, controls, restrictions and imposed burdens that go far to nullify the free market forces. To unhobble the 7% or 8% of our economy that is devoted to foreign commerce by removing or drastically reducing trade restrictions would not free our economy from the effects produced on it within this country by the other 92–93%.

THE CONTROLLED MARKET EXPOSED TO EXTERNAL UNDERMINING FORCES

Our domestic economy, for example, is insulated internally against the effect of wage-cutting, not only by the establishment of minimum wages but by obligatory collective bargaining. This is true even of the part that is devoted to production for export—some 4%—which is, however, not thus insulated against the effect of low-wage competition from the outside. It is, of course, not necessary that foreign wages be *cut* in order to produce the same effect as wage-cuts in this country. Foreign wages are low enough as it is; in combination with productivity advancement in the industrial countries, to permit penetration of our market just as a domestic producer would gain an advantage over his competitors in this country should he engage in wage cuts. This is no longer permitted and lies wholly outside of the bounds of probability but the impact of the low-wage operation from abroad is very much a reality.

The American producer thus finds himself the victim of a double economic standard. He is obliged to sustain consumer purchasing power in this country by standards of wages, working conditions and social security that find their justification, not in the field of competitive considerations, but rather in a social philosophy that asks few questions about equality of burdens imposed by it. The demand put on the producer to employ a full complement of workers at high wages, subject moreover, to tough bargaining by powerful labor organizations, was and is peremptory—even though it was and is clear that the producer's foreign competitors were not and are not subject to the same prescription.

If the burden is too great the producer has one of several options: (1) He may reduce his cost by installing more productive machinery, if it is available and within his financial reach, thus reducing his work force. This course is indeed not only permitted but encouraged, for reasons already given. (2) If the technology is not at hand he may fight a losing battle by accepting a shrinking share of the domestic market and hope to be saved by the expansion of the market through population growth. He will, however, contribute to unemployment by not employing his share of the increasing number of workers. (3) He may transfer some of his production, perhaps the greater part of his expansion-potential, overseas where the payroll burden is not so exacting. This is the course taken by a growing number of industries.

What the producer learned over a period of time was that the cushions designed and shaped to prevent the cyclical economic crashes were not of foam rubber, but of foam gold. In terms of production costs they were very expensive. So was the instrument of obligatory collective bargaining. Nevertheless, the electorate, with memories of 1929 and the Great Depression still fresh in mind and emotion, insisted persistently on a regime that would assure our nation against a recurrence of the experience of those days; and beyond that, a course that would lead to new frontiers and a great society. Then it was surprised and sometimes angered if our producers found import competition intolerable.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY AT ODDS WITH DOMESTIC POLICY

With an oddity that defies the processes of logic this country adopted a foreign trade policy that flatly contradicted the determined endeavor on the home front, i.e., bringing competition to a basis of "fairness" by removing from it the use of low wages as a lever to gain a competitive advantage. Wage-cutting below a specified minimum was outlawed. Increased importation of goods made abroad by yet cheaper labor was, however, encouraged by tariff reduction, on the grounds, among other things, that our country would benefit from, and our industry needed, the type of competition from abroad that was put beyond the pale at home!

Also, we *imposed* controls and regulated many basic economic activities at home with an ardor equal to that with which we pursued the *removal* of controls and regulation of foreign trade represented by tariffs. In the one instance regulation and controls were embraced as the very instruments of economic salvation; in the other they (tariffs and import quotas, both of which are regulatory instruments) were anathema. We prostrated ourselves before the altar of free-trade, and even now the halo still shines, even if its rays are fast dimming.

It will be noted that despite our conscious concern over it the protection of consumer purchasing power was not total. It was permissible, as already noted, to reduce the payroll by the route of mechanization or automation. Even John L. Lewis, the redoubtable chief of the United Mine Workers, bowed to this thesis. Replacement of men by machines represented enlightened progress. *Wage reduction* as a means of reducing costs was, however, taboo. From 1950 to 1965 two out of three coal miners' jobs were abolished by mammoth coal digging machines as a means of reducing costs sufficiently to withstand competition from domestic and imported oil and natural gas. Employment dropped from 482,000 to 140,000, representing a loss of 342,000 jobs. The reduction in consumer purchasing power was impressive. If in 1966 as many coal miners had been employed as in 1950, the payroll at the 1967 level of wages would have been $2.563 billion more than it was. Appalachia could have used the money.

COAL AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Coal as a fuel survived by becoming competitive with other fuels both at home and abroad; but the cost in employment was staggering. The direct result was the problem of Appalachia, which has called for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars from the Treasury.

It is obvious that if imports press a domestic industry through low prices today the domestic industry is in turn pressed to remain competitive by improving the output per man-hour: not by reducing wages or holding them in status quo. In other words, installation of more productive machinery is called for; and this entails displacement of workers, and the cost in jobs may be very steep, even if not always as numbing as in the case of coal.

We accomplished the same end (cost reduction) in our agriculture on a grand scale. Not only mechanization, but the application of fertilizer, the use of insecticides and weed killers, and the improvement of crop strains have been applauded for the doubling of the output per acre by our agriculture during the past generation.

AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IN RESPONSE TO TECHNOLOGY

The cost? Farm employment dropped by 5.2 million from 1950 to 1967 or more than 50%. Even at present *minimum* wage levels this reduction represented a payroll shrinkage of $15.6 billion in 1967 over 1950.

The output per man-hour in our agriculture rose from an index of 49.8 in 1947 to 155.6 in 1966, or more than three-fold. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1967, Table 332, p. 236)

Such efficiency (productivity per man-hour) could not be matched elsewhere in the world. *Yet our principal farm products cannot yet compete in foreign markets without a subsidy,* as note wheat and cotton; and our agricultural exports depend heavily on Foreign Aid and Food for Peace shipments. Do these facts throw any light on our competitive position in the world?

COST OF EFFICIENCY IN TERMS OF JOBS

The wholesale eviction of workers, as already noted, was all acceptable as a means of reducing production costs. John L. Lewis was commended for his enlightenment; and the large-scale eviction of men from the farms went unnoticed. When, however, the coal industry including the United Mine Workers sought restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil in order to soften the impact on employment in coal mines they were pilloried as shortsighted and greedy, so abject was our devotion to the mystical blessings of free trade!

Yet, the hard fact is that costs cannot be reduced substantially without displacing workers. It has been estimated that a 10% reduction in the cost of steel-making would entail the displacement of some two hundred thousand workers. We lead the world in steel output per man-year but this lead is not sufficient to offset the cost advantage of our foreign competitors. We need an extra measure of greater efficiency, and this calls for more worker displacement.

The cost of our high productive efficiency has indeed been enormous. The evicted farmers and farm workers have congested our cities and aggravated our urban problems. The nonwhites have crowded into highly populated centers and live in the poverty rows of our ghettos. Appalachia and similar areas have called for federal poverty programs to alleviate the distress. Poverty among rural whites outruns that of our colored population, in point of numbers. The problem therefore is more than one of civil rights.

When, however, our voters leave the polls and become consumers they are prone to disown the products of their legislative children. What has not been properly learned is that what goes by the name of progress, prosperity and social welfare exacts a high cost. As consumers we do not wish to acknowledge our parentage as voters. We wish to eat our cake and yet have it always before us.

As consumers we are enamored of bargains. We wish to buy imported goods at lower prices than our own producers can offer the merchandise. We forget that as voters we saddled our producers with cost-escalating burdens that generated the higher prices. Then we turn around and accuse them of inefficiency, backwardness and sluggishness because they cannot compete!

Voters and consumers are one and the same. They should square away, look at each other, introduce themselves to one another and seek to understand each other.

During the long period of fashioning governmental controls and interferences with economic forces, from 1933 forward, our productivity increased handsomely; but we were faced simultaneously with higher costs (much of the increase, beyond the heavily contributing factors already mentioned, being attributable to war, defense and cold war, no less than foreign aid). We insisted nevertheless on dismantling our tariff, taking down the average rate from slightly over 50% on *dutiable* products to some 11%. In five years it is destined to go to 6% or 7%, under the Kennedy Round. Nearly 40% of our imports are duty free.

Our President is capable of pointing with unstinted pride at the "accomplishment" of the Kennedy Round, even though only one-fifth of it has taken effect. In the years to come the impulsion toward outward movement of our investment capital will grow, but public policy, trapped by the results of past policy heavily supported by the voters, may force a retrenchment, as it has already begun to do.

Today we are faced with a balance of payments crisis. We are meeting our economic system coming back to us, so to speak, armed with distinct competitive advantages picked up abroad, notably low wage costs.

On the broad front of foreign economic policy we are confronted with a phenomenon of public behavior that is not wholly inexplicable but puzzling nevertheless.

As voters the people support programs and policies that may and do produce results that as consumers they deplore. Anthropologists tell us that there was a time when man was unaware of the cause-and-effect relationship between the act of mating and the birth of offspring. Our populace gives evidence that through its electors or voters it sets into motion activities that sometimes produce results that it will not recognize as its own offspring. It will indeed disown some of these results, simply because they are undesirable or disagreeable. The connection between cause and effect is evidently not close enough to be grasped on the run.

While as consumers, to repeat, we are enamored of bargains, none of us offers to work at bargain wages, bargain salaries or for bargain profits. This would not be in keeping with our standard of living—a fact easy to comprehend; but we are glad to buy foreign goods in preference to those domestically produced because the latter carry a higher price tag. We unreflectingly react with hostility toward costs made high by our high wages, salaries and profits and the social and welfare measures that we insist on having (with high defense and cold war costs thrown in).

NEW TRADE POLICY NEEDED

Needed is a trade policy that takes account of the competitive position of our industry in the world. This is very weak, as witness our need to include exports of governmentally financed goods in our export tables in order to show a surplus; and at the same time understate the cost of our imports by recording their foreign value rather than their landed cost. On a private commercial basis we are in a deficit and not a surplus position.

Moreover, imports of manufactured goods, as might be expected, expanded six times as fast as imports of raw materials from 1960–67. The reason is simply that manufactured goods incorporate the maximum of cheap foreign labor and therefore represent the best bargain.

Little wonder that a heavy stream of outlays for foreign plants has developed in recent years. The foreign scene is competitively more attractive than the domestic.

The foregoing facts should be recognized and our foreign trade policy shaped accordingly. We should set aside a fair portion of our market for imports and permit them to share proportionately in the growth of our market. To this end ceilings should be set on imports that have made a serious penetration of our market; and import quotas imposed if the ceilings are breached.

The stimulus to domestic industry that is beset by import competition would in turn stimulate greater expansion and higher employment at home. The benefits of imports could be enjoyed without inviting their despoliation of our market.

Vietnam

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last month, following months of constant and agonizing appraisal, I made public my feelings over the conflict in Vietnam. I do not believe it is sensible to condemn a policy unless one is willing and able to offer a realistic alternative to the present policy. On the other hand, I do not believe a person should blindly follow a course of action without regard to the consequences, or without listening to those who may feel differently.

Since my statement was completed, President Johnson has made a strong peace move by ordering a reduction in the bombing. It is my sincere wish that this pause will lead to peace talks and that the United States will eventually disengage itself from the conflict in Vietnam.

Under permission granted me, I place my statement in the RECORD:

VIETNAM

The troubled cloud of insecurity casts its ominous pall over all of America today. From the halls of Congress to Main Street, U.S.A. in factories, restaurants and living rooms, Americans anxiously discuss policies and presidents, commitments and confusions, decisions and dominoes, missiles and mistakes, Vietnam.

What is Vietnam? If we listen to the many spokesmen, Vietnam in 1968 is the focal point in the ultimate struggle of the free world against the Communists. It is the strongest nation on earth at the side of a small valiant country, helping to preserve its territorial integrity and philosophic dignity. It is the place where the future of this planet is being determined.

Or Vietnam is a land that is soaking up racially and culturally integrated blood of the combatants on both sides, where "victory" fades into the haze, militarily, diplomatically and even in the understanding of sensible men. It is 100,000 American casualties and more to come while our young men search for an enemy and sometimes an ally. It is the unification of the Communist world at a cost of no Chinese or Russian men and two billion dollars a year and a division in America with thirty billion dollars a year taken from the taxpayers and America's domestic needs. But whatever it in itself is, hovering in the background is World War III.

A few years ago commitments by several of our Presidents had brought about a few thousand Americans, mostly in an advisory capacity, to South Vietnam and a commitment from South Vietnam that they would do their utmost in participation in this struggle. But we stand now with 500,000 men in South Vietnam and the certainty that more will be needed, although the many hundreds of thousands that have been sent in the past have brought us no closer to victory.

We see ahead in Viet Nam more fighting, more deaths among both military and civilian, greater demands for expenditures and the inevitable result of a much wider war. The demilitarized zone has not been a peaceful buffer. Our bombers come closer to Red China and foreign ships in Haiphong and although the odds may not be in favor of this escalating toward Chinese and Russian intervention, there must be very few who would be willing to gamble on the odds knowing the price the world would pay if we were to lose that "bet."

Many people in Congress feel that this is a time to remain silent or to be so general in one's comments that he cannot be pinned down. And although this may be the best politics, I feel it would not be the best representation for the Third District. In truth during the past few years the United States has enmeshed itself in a snowball starting its journey down a deep hill. The snowball gets larger and moves faster and we must do everything in our power to remove ourselves before the inevitable sudden stop at the bottom of the hill.

Of course the first consideration is that we are in Viet Nam to stop the spread of Communism and to demonstrate that a commitment by our nation is worth something. Although we wish our commitments to stand up, the action we are pursuing in Viet Nam may be in truth helping the Communists more than it is hurting them.

Any change in action I may suggest is made out of dedication to America and what we stand for and in opposition to Communism.

The Viet Nam war as it has been conducted has unified the Communists. It has drained the United States of 500,000 men who are 8,000 miles from home contesting their lives for hills, ridges and rice paddies. It has us consuming huge amounts of supplies and war materials while gaining us essentially nothing and it, in many places in the world, shows us to be Americans fighting orientals, destroying their land, killing and maiming their people. At home it has disturbed our economy, our balance of payments, and many of our domestic programs. We have been unable financially to fully face our problems in cities, highways, preservation of resources, pollution control, education, etc. To our thirty billion a year, the Communists are matching it with two or three. Who is "winning?"

In the beginning we felt that this commitment could be met with a limited amount of manpower and money but each time we escalated, the Communists met our escalation at a fraction of the sacrifice we had to make. And we continually ponder a vital question. Can we save South Viet Nam unless it wants to be saved and will make the sacrifices necessary? Will anything be accomplished if we "win the war for them" and then hand it over to them like a welfare dole? Viet Nam has a history of being marked by periodic warfare North and South. It has known oppression at the hands of many of its neighbors. It has been unsuccessful down the years in developing a strong national government. Much of South Viet Nam has not paid allegiance to Saigon for many years.

In the first three years of fighting out of 600,000 South Viet Nam it is stated that fewer than a half dozen officers of the rank of Major or above has been wounded and none killed, while during the same time the United States lost 109 of our officers of field grade rank or above. There are today perhaps 200,000 draft dodgers in South Viet Nam and many others receive draft deferments for little reason. In the Viet Nam war the odds are against us. A Lieutenant once stated as he viewed a battle in an outlying area where three helicopters were fluttering overhead and shots were ringing out, "Look at this, I have three million dollars of equipment and 12 to 15 highly educated and trained young men. Opposed to them over in that field is one peasant with a $50 gun. If the peasant is lucky, he wins the whole ball game." Or how about these odds—we may gamble a two million dollar airplane, ten thousand dollars worth of bombs and the priceless life of an American pilot against a $25 rope bridge which will be rebuilt tomorrow if we are lucky enough to hit it. These are the odds.

With great dedication, patriotism and love of our country after one hundred billion dollars and one hundred thousand casualties, every American may ask what have we gained for our country, for South Viet Nam, for freedom? Can we change the odds? In thinking, discussing, and many, many times going through agonizing reappraisals, I feel that I can no longer see this war as Guadalcanal, Valley Forge or the Battle of Monmouth. I am earnestly concerned in finding how we can put the Viet Nam war into its proper perspective. At the present time and as far as I can see in the future, we are serving the Communists' interests better than our own.

I often ask the people I represent for their views. I tell them I need those views so that I may properly represent my constituents. I also feel that the people I represent are entitled to know my views and I imagine that the question can very justifiably be raised—"All right, if you think what we are doing—the way we are fighting this war—is not correct, precisely what do you suggest we do? Give us an affirmative course of action." This is a fair question and it deserves an answer.

The change I recommend is made because of opposition to Ho Chi Minh, Communism, whether Chinese or Russian, and out of love and concern for America and all we stand for as a nation. First let me make it very clear what I do *not* favor. I do not believe we should turn our backs on the people of South Viet Nam. I do not believe we should substantially reduce our investment of American men or aid without giving the South Vietnamese every reasonable opportunity and assistance to help them help themselves. I *do* propose that the United States not consider escalation of the war but to, in every way practical, *de-Americanize the war* and help and permit the South Vietnamese do the job that should be done and can only be done by the South Vietnamese themselves. I am proposing that we permit them to do the offensive fighting against the invaders. In doing this we should begin to direct our military men to make plans to replace our frontline soldiers with South Vietnamese, while our men protect that nation in well fortified areas which can be defended most readily and where any assault will force the enemy to fight our kind of war. I would hope that within a reasonable time after we will be able to turn the remainder of this defense operation over to the South Vietnamese and eventually they will be able to do the entire manpower operation with aid and assistance in equipment and supplies, etc. from us. In taking this course we will tell our allies in Saigon that we had promised and committed ourselves to help them build a free non-Communist government and to *aid them* in doing so, *not do it for them.*

We are honoring these commitments at tremendous costs in lives and dollars. We have defeated the North Vietnamese in battle after battle and although we are not leaving just yet, we are cutting back to permit them to do their own fighting. It is really their country and their war, not ours. And although we will continue to provide them with supplies and ammunition, we expect them to eliminate the blackmarketing and stealing that goes on throughout South Viet Nam. The war is mainly a product of Viet Nam, not America. Many of the problems, military and civil, can only be resolved by the Vietnamese.

At the same time we should tell Ho Chi Minh that although we can continue at our present course if we wish, we do not choose to because we will no longer fight his kind of war. He will hereafter be fighting Vietnamese people. If he wishes to fight us, our American forces while they are still in Viet Nam, he will be attacking us where we will have the advantages. And we should also warn Ho Chi Minh that we guarantee him absolutely nothing. While we will confine ourselves principally to certain areas in South Viet Nam, we make no guarantee that we will not advance and thwart his offensive preparations whenever we wish to do so. We should also warn him that American power and influence will remain in the Pacific. We will also state that we feel he now has an obligation to negotiate toward peace.

We should also tell our allies throughout the world that since many of their objections to our policy have now been removed, let us see what they are willing to do to find an avenue of peace in Viet Nam.

To the United Nations and its Secretary, U Thant, we can say that since we are de-escalating and de-Americanizing this war, let him produce on the many claims he has made that if one side de-escalates, he can bring about a de-escalation on the other side.

I hope and believe that this course will help America and the free world and I hope that a change of this kind will command the support of all Americans so that we can once again unite in our effort toward solving the problems within our nation.

I believe that much of the confusion during the past years has been caused by our super Doves' and super Hawks' adherence to a few simple ideas which I do not believe are practical or correct. I believe there are factors that neither side has faced.

As for the Hawks, "An increase in bombing will stop supplies coming from North to South Viet Nam." Before de-escalation of bombing a hundred tons a day were moving into the South. We are now dropping 80,000 tons of bombs a month in North Viet Nam, as much as at the peak of World War II, and instead of 100 tons going to the South, they are sending 300 tons a day and yet some Hawks believe that if we go from 80,000 tons to 100,000 tons a day we will be able to stop the transportation of supplies. I believe this is improbable. Again the Hawks say "Let's pull out the stops—go all the way—even with nuclear weapons." No one can be sure that Russia or China or both may not come into this war next week or next year. I agree that the odds are against their entering the war but if we gamble on this and lose, instead of talking about 500,000 troops and thirty billion dollars a year, we will be talking of *five million troops* and three hundred billion dollars a year and possibly nuclear weapons on Washington and Asbury Park. Who wants to gamble on that?

And from the Doves I have received statements that Ho Chi Minh is anxious to begin sincere talks. I do not believe that Ho Chi Minh is anxious to make the United States look good or to give us an easy way to save face. And again to the Doves I would like to suggest that when people give reasonable dissent, changes can occur in a nation's policy. I would hope that this is the way to change the direction in a democracy but I am certain that violence, disruption of normal operations of the government, profanity and name-calling will contribute nothing to the solution of our problems. I feel that many of the actions of the Doves, whether

they be at the Pentagon or the draft board office, have done more to cloud their issues than to have them reasonably considered.

In a sense our actions in Viet Nam have not been unlike the compulsive gambler at the race track who, when he loses his $2 bet, places $4 on the next race. When he doesn't "win," then escalates his bet to $8 and from there to $16 and $32 until he is in the position where what he is losing may be so disastrous and beyond his capabilities to withstand that the odds against any success multiply bet by bet.

I am in favor of building up the free world and I am against Communism and its aggression. I believe that America has a debt to the less able and weaker nations who are trying to emulate us in establishing free countries for themselves. I feel that we must do all in our power that is reasonable to help them in their quest but I do not believe we have been given a Divine commission to enter into and settle every philosophic argument in every corner of the world. We cannot and should not police the world and attempt to correct every wrong.

I am not making a break with any of the leaders or the President of our country. I am aware of the immense burdens and responsibility that our President has and also his dedication to solving them, but I am urging the leaders of our country to consider these proposals and to evaluate them in the light of information they may have which is not available to me and to consider them in any reappraisals or reassessments our nation may make in regard to Viet Nam.

Coaches Never Lose

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the following poem was used for an advertisement for the Wilson Sporting Goods Co., River Grove, Ill., in a leading magazine recently, and I so enjoyed it I wanted to share it with those who may have missed the article.

COACHES NEVER LOSE

A team can lose.
Any team can lose.
But in a sense a very real sense a coach never loses.
For the job of a coach is over and finished once the starting whistle blows.
He knows he's won or lost before play starts.
For a coach has two tasks.
The minor one is to teach skills: to teach a boy how to run faster, hit harder, block better, kick farther, jump higher.
The second task, the major task, is to make men out of boys.
It's to teach an attitude of mind.
It's to implant character and not simply to impart skills.
It's to teach boys to play fair.
This goes without saying.
It's to teach them to be humble in victory and proud in defeat.
This goes without saying.
But more importantly it's to teach them to live up to their potential no matter what this potential is.
It's to teach them to do their best and never to be satisfied with what they are but to strive to be as good as they can be if they tried harder.
A coach can never make a great player out of a boy who isn't potentially great.
But he can make a great competitor out of any child.
And miraculously he can make a man out of a boy.
For a coach the final score doesn't read so many points for my team, so many points for theirs.
Instead it reads: so many men out of so many boys.
And this is a score that is never published.
And this is the score that he reads to himself and in which he finds his real joy when the last game is over.

Report From Congress

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following report is being made by me to my constituents for April:

REPORT FROM CONGRESS

After winter snows, spring in Washington is beautiful. But there's little other good news to report from the Capitol.

During 16 years in Congress, I've never before seen so much nationwide discontent and frustration. People are upset by the crisis over gold, the seemingly endless Vietnam War, the prospect for domestic violence, and the ramifications of each.

I am writing mostly about these things and hoping my later letters can dwell on more pleasant topics.

The Gold Crisis stems from the fact that between 1960 and 1968 your Government spent nearly $57 billion more than it took in and we spent $16 billion more overseas than we got back.

The extra billions staying home pumped more dollars into circulation in relation to things for sale. Consequently prices and wages went up. In simplest terms, it takes almost $6 in 1968 to buy what $5 bought in 1960.

The extra $16 billion going overseas is held by people who also watched each of these dollars shrink by 16%. They've decided dollars aren't a good investment anymore. They are turning them into gold. At Fort Knox gold ingots are going out and paper "outgots" are coming in.

At this writing we have only around $10 billion left in gold. Dollars in overseas hands far exceed this amount. It all means we're *technically* bankrupt.

Temporarily the overseas people are saying: "OK, we'll stop taking your gold so you won't *actually* go bankrupt. But get your fiscal affairs in order and stop shrinking your dollar. Stop spending more than you take in. If you don't we'll cash in for gold and let you sweat it out."

This means balancing the budget by *less* spending and *more* taxes—and spending less overseas, including a cut in the annual tourist dollar exodus.

These are bitter pills. To forestall their need I have for many years voted *against* lots of budget busting domestic and overseas programs. That was unpopular. Now I may risk more criticism by voting *for* such things as a tax boost which 65% opposed in the Poll, but which may have to come anyway. If it does, it will be hurting in my pocketbook, too!

The Vietnam War's crushing costs triggered and intensify the gold crisis. For this reason alone we ought to get the war over fast. More importantly we ought to do it to stop the killing. But stopping it isn't as easy as some glib talkers would have us believe.

Dropping A-bomb on Hanoi might do it. And possibly start another and bigger war at the same time. Just pulling out "as of yesterday" would do it. But taking a "Fortress America" posture could be just as deadly.

Between these two extremes lies a spectrum of alternatives for ending the war. Each has some favorable and some unfavorable consequences. As a nation we should analyze them all, select the best one and get on with it.

Negotiation isn't necessarily a presently available alternative unless we're prepared to offer Ho Chi Minh some or all of what he wants—So. Vietnam.

Pres. Johnson's indefinite bombing pause seems to be a step in that direction. We'll still bomb supply lines near Khe Sanh and the DMZ and in Laos, but it turns the war into an essentially defensive operation.

Thereupon, the scenario might go like this:

Ho catches signal that US is hurting enough to let him have what he wants if he's willing to be a little patient and take it under seemingly face-saving circumstances for us.

Ho indicates agreement by slowing things down and setting the stage for talks.

Negotiations ensue. A So. Vietnamese coalition government including communists, "elections" are specified or some other techniques are adopted creating the illusion that peace has descended without the communists winning.

Stage now is set for more or less rapid withdrawal of US forces.

Ho waits a face-saving period of time thereafter before taking over completely.

Whether the foregoing comes about depends somewhat on Ho's Soviet and Red Chinese partners. They might not let him relieve the US from a costly devisive war under face-saving circumstances. They may insist that he keep the pressure on. Or possibly LBJ cleared it with the Kremlin already.

If Ho doesn't play the carrot and stick game—he rejects the carrot—then LBJ's choices would be: (a) Let North Vietnam have the stick in the form of intense escalation; or, (b) Give up the game, withdraw as the French did and take the consequences.

The Prospect of Domestic Violence during the months ahead is a subject about which the President and others have had something to say.

I'm going to say little about it. Talking it around just encourages people to indulge in it as expected conduct. The Poll indicates most people want law enforcement agencies to handle such things strictly. And most people will back them up when they do so.

The Bolsa Island Nuclear Power & Desalting Plant is hitting some snags. Estimated cost is up from $444 million to $768 million. But chances for going ahead are still good. Fate will be determined in the next 90 days. It depends on some tough decisions by the partners involved (Metro. Water Dist., City of LA and SoCal Edison) and forging a strong management group to ramrod the project.

USS New Jersey, the only battleship in the fleet, has been homeported at Long Beach. Mrs. Hosmer and I attended her impressive re-commissioning ceremony April 6th as guests of the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas Moorer, USN. The ship soon will see war duty in the Tonkin Gulf.

Memo to Program Chairmen: I'll be home and open for speaking dates, etc., during the national political conventions—the weeks of Aug. 5th and Aug. 26th. Write me (Rayburn Bldg., Wash., D.C. 20515) if your group is interested.

Job Training Programs Must Be Keyed to Job Availability

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the April 4, 1968, issue of the Washington Post describes job-training pro-

grams in the District of Columbia. These programs only reach a small percentage of the unemployed in the city—7,000 out of an estimated 75,000 to 140,000. But the most shocking revelation of the article is that the training programs are not directed to providing training for jobs that actually exist. The programs are not tailored to any comprehensive job-availability survey.

There is no central coordination of job training and development programs. Due to this, there is no way of knowing where gaps and inefficiencies in programs exist. In addition, there are few statistics kept at all, particularly in the following up of trainees placed in jobs. As the Post puts it, "the success or failure of individual programs is hard to determine."

The article states that the Washington Metropolitan Area Jobs Council hopes to publish a comprehensive list of job development programs. However, it does not mention what would even be more important—a comprehensive survey of jobs that actually exist and for which job training would be appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I have long spoken out on the need to direct job-training programs to jobs that actually exist and which need additional manpower. It does no good to provide training which can never be put into use. The dashing of expectations is a most demoralizing experience.

I urge the District of Columbia, and also the Federal Government in its many job-training programs, to be sure that job-training programs be keyed to jobs which need filling.

I commend this article to the attention of the Members of the House:

BURGEONING TRAINING CENTERS BARELY DENT JOBLESSNESS

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Despite its array of job-development programs, Washington is only scraping the surface of its unemployed and under-employed population.

At best, the programs penetrate about 10 per cent of the ghetto ranks, says Frank H. Hollis, the United Planning Organization's director of manpower. Few other officials disagree with him.

"If all the job development programs were operating at maximum in this city," Hollis says, "they still would place only about 7,000 persons a year.

"There are anywhere from 75,000 to 140,000 unemployed people here, depending on who you listen to and what your definition of unemployment is.

"That means that at least 68,000 people are never reached by the programs—just never reached."

While a "sub-employed" population, estimated by the U.S. Employment Service to be 113,180 in four major slum areas, founders at the brink of financial disaster, private industries in the cities are screaming for both skilled and semi-skilled workers.

An immense gap lies between jobs and manpower. The city's job development programs only begin to close the gap.

Even when jobs are created and training is provided, there is no guarantee that those placed in employment will be permanently and meaningfully retained.

The dropout rate in training programs is prodigious. Many trainees abandon courses when domestic and social complications disrupt their lives. Some can't take the discipline of daily class attendance.

If a trainee completes a course and gets a job, problems still arise.

"Most dismissals are not for lack of training," says Elwood Jackson, registrar for the Opportunities Industrialization Center, a relatively successful training project financed by the Government. "Guys are fired for lack of discipline, punctuality and not having a constructive employee-employer attitude."

The Center is now laying greater stress on employment orientation, on helping the long-term unemployed adjust to the rigors of regular work. A few other training projects in the city are making similar attempts.

Job placement is still stymied by racial discrimination. Radio and TV repair shops, for example, are reluctant to hire qualified Negroes and have them go into the homes of white customers.

Many trade unions have traditionally excluded or limited Negro membership.

Jackson recalls one union which, in an apparent gesture of cooperation, offered to accept OIC-trained Negroes who were older than 18 and had a high school education.

"At first, we thought that was a nice idea," he said. "But when we started looking around, we couldn't find any Negroes over 18 with a high school education. You know why? They're all in college or Vietnam . . . I think that union knew it, too."

The picture of employment in Washington is one of opposing or, at best, uncoordinated forces. Unions are leary of both management and Negro-oriented training programs.

Business is timid about placing Negroes in sensitive positions. The Negro unemployed don't know where to go for training, or are skeptical, or frightened, or both. Training programs are not tailored to any comprehensive job-availability survey.

Nowhere in this city is there one central office that maintains a definitive compendium of available job-training and development programs.

Each agency—OIC, USES, UPO, the Labor Department, The Office of Economic Opportunity, the D.C. Welfare Department—keeps its own statistics, which may or may not relate to others or use the same definitions for such crucial terms as "unemployed," "orientation" or "remediation." Some agencies keep few statistics at all, especially in following-up on trainees they have placed in jobs. The success or failure of individual programs is hard to determine.

Because there is no central coordinating point in the job-development picture, there is no way of knowing where the gaps, overlaps, duplications and other inefficiencies are occurring.

Officials suspect that gaps and duplications exist, but because of the confusion of interweaving, multi-purpose programs, it is difficult to spot the trouble.

The recently formed Washington Metropolitan Area Jobs Council hopes to become a central clearing house for job information and to publish a comprehensive list of job development programs in the area. The list, when completed, will have to be updated continually as specific Federal programs begin, end or are renewed.

With that basic information, says Council Executive Director David Freeman, it is hoped that an area-wide analysis and coordination of development programs can be provided.

Similarly, the District government hopes to exert influence on program coordination through its new manpower administrator, Horace R. Holmes.

To cap job improvement efforts, the presidentially created National Alliance of Businessmen has set a quota of 4,600 summer jobs and 2,000 permanent jobs for the hard-core unemployed by September. Private businessmen are encouraged to pledge job openings for the unemployed.

JOB PROGRAMS—WHAT THEY DO, WHO RUNS THEM

Institutional training	Administration	Financing	Enrollment	Target population	Type of training	Address and telephone
1. Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA).	U.S. Employment Service (USES).	Labor Department	300, current	General unemployed	Clerk-typing, stenographer, cooking, keypunch operator, practical nursing, medical laboratory assistant, service and maintenance work.	555 Pennsylvania Ave. NW. (393–6151).
2. Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC).	OIC	Labor, HEW, OEO, private.	375, current	18–60, earning less than $1,500 per year plus $500 for each dependent.	Clerical and sales, automotive trades, industrial trades, offset duplicating, radio and TV repair, etc.	1711 14th St. NW. (265–2626).
3. Work and Training Opportunity Center (WTOC).	District of Columbia Welfare Department.	HEW, District of Columbia Welfare Department.	220, current	Unemployed heads of households.	Clerical, shorthand, business math, machine trades, bench-work, structural work, processing occupations.	921 Pennsylvania Ave. SE. (544–8600).
4. Building Service Employes International Union (BSEIU).	Central Labor Council.	Labor, HEW	50, current	Janitorial workers seeking upgrading.	General janitorial, custodial, maintenance, and service work.	1126 16th St. NW. (659–8044).
5. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—special impact.	CEP	Labor	65 per cycle	Hard-core unemployed in Cardozo-south, and Anacostia-Congress Heights.	Prevocational training in employment attitudes, shop exposure, etc.	2013 14th St. NW. (659–1100).
6. Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR).	DVR	District of Columbia Government, HEW.	823, current	All categories of the handicapped.	Clerk-typing, auto mechanic, woodworking, nursery school attendant, barbering, keypunch operator, computer programing, TV repair, shoe repair, cashier, cooking, etc.	1331 H St. NW. (629–4255).
7. Vocational education (VE).	District of Columbia Department of Education.	District of Columbia Government.	2,377, current	General adult	Carpentry, ironwork, electrical work, masonry, cosmetology, drafting, drycleaning, photography, welding, watch repair, TV repair, nursing.	4121 13th St. NW. (629–7331).
8. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—basic education.	CEP	Labor	150 per cycle	Hard-core unemployed in Cardozo-south, and Anacostia-Congress Heights.	Employment orientation, basic reading, basic math, etc.	1100 Vermont Ave. NW. (659–1100).

JOB PROGRAMS—WHAT THEY DO, WHO RUNS THEM—Continued

On-the-job training	Administration	Financing	Trainees	Target population	Type of training	Address and phone
1. District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council (DCAC).	DCAC	District of Columbia Government labor.	529 in 10 projects, 1st 6 months of fiscal year 1968.	Persons seeking apprenticeable trades.	Most apprenticeable trades	1145 19th St. NW. (629-2842.)
2. Urban League (UL)	UL	Labor	300 to 400 per year	General unemployed	General skilled and semiskilled jobs.	626 3d St. NW. (737-8600).
3. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—On-the-job training.	CEP	do	350 for fiscal year 1968	Hard-core disadvantaged over 18 in Cardozo South and Anacostia-Congress Heights.	Apprenticeable and nonapprenticeable jobs.	1816 12th St. NW. (462-3375).
4. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—New Careers.	CEP	do	255 for fiscal year 1968	Hard-core disadvantaged in Cardozo South and Anacostia-Congress Heights.	Work in human service agencies, such as Welfare Department, Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA), etc.	1000 U St. NW. (265-2818) 1331 Savannah St. SE. (561-6400).
5. Project Build	Central Labor Council.	do	80 trainees per 6 months (now recruiting 1st cycle).	Youths interested in apprenticeable trades.	Building construction trades, plumbing, electrical, carpentry, bricklaying, paperhanging, sheet metal work.	1126 16th St. NW. (659-8044).

Placement programs	Administration	Financing	Placements	Target population	Type of work	Address and phone
1. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—Jobs now.	CEP	Labor	1,600 for fiscal year 1968	Underemployed in Cardozo-South and Anacostia-Congress Heights.	Direct placement in semiskilled Government and private industry jobs.	1000 U St. NW. (265-2818), 1331 Savannah St. SE. (561-6400).
2. Concentrated employment Program (CEP)—Federal employment.	CEP	do	450 for fiscal year 1968	do	Skilled and semiskilled jobs in Government.	Do.
3. Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC).	United Planning Organization (UPO).	do	3,400 current	High school and dropouts	Filing and clerical, messenger service, landscaping.	1406 M St. NW. (659-1100).
4. Offender rehabilitation project (ORP).	ORP	OEO	125 jobs and 50 training placements since June 1, 1967.	Persons on bond pending prosecution.	General skilled and semiskilled work.	711 14th St. NW. (737-4337).
5. Veterans affairs program (VAP).	UL	UL	80 since Oct. 1, 1967	Returning Negro veterans	do	626 3d St. NW. (737-8600).
6. Neighborhood center	Central Labor Council, USES.	Central Labor Council, USES.		General unemployed	do	1148 7th St. NW. (483-2273).
7. Pride	Pride, Inc.	Labor	1,050 current	Teenagers	Cleanup and rat eradication	1536 U St. NW. (483-1900).
8. Fairmicco	Fairchild-Hiller Corp., MICCO.	Government contracts.	200 maximum (now recruiting).	General unemployed	Manufacture of wooden loading platforms for Department of Defense.	59 M St. NE. (347-6113).
9. Part-time jobs	Board of Trade	Board of Trade		Needy students at Eastern, Dunbar, and Roosevelt High Schools.	Semiskilled jobs with area private employers.	1616 K St. NW. (ST 3-3535).

Special training, counseling, placement, and on-the-job training programs	Administration	Financing	Enrollees	Target population	Type of training	Address and phone
1. MA-1	Institute of Computer Tech.	Labor	360 trainees in 18-month period.	"Hardest of hard core"	No specific training. Emphasis on employment orientation and remedial training in reading, writing, math, etc., followed by job and OJT placement.	2600 Virginia Ave. NW. (337-7200).
2. Job Opportunity Week	Board of Trade	Board of Trade	3,500 interviewees	Area employers interview high schoolers not going to college (May 20-24 this year).	None	1616 K St. NW. (ST 3-3535).
3. Prep clubs	do	do		Lectures, tours, etc., on work world, conduct at Anacostia, Eastern, Bell Vocational, McKinley Tech.	do	Do.
4. Job opportunities in business (JOBS).	Board of Trade, Northern Systems Co.	Labor	1,400 in 2-year period	Hard-core unemployables	4 months institutional training, 8 months OJT in culinary, automechanical and building trades. (To open in next few weeks.)	Do.

Supportive Programs	Administration	Financing	Function	Address and Phone
1. Small Business Administration (SBA).	SBA	SBA	Issued 50 loans, averaging $12,000 each, between Jan. 1, 1967 and Feb. 29, 1968, to open new businesses or revive old ones. Created 50 jobs with maximum of 247 expected.	1321 H St. NW. (382-3525).
2. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—Health service.	CEP	Labor	Provide limited medical and dental care for CEP enrollers	1000 U St. NW. (265-2818), 1331 Savannah St. SE. (561-6400).
3. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—Day care.	CEP	do	Provide day child care for women so they can participate in CEP programs	Do.
4. Concentrated employment program (CEP)—Transportation supportive service.	CEP	do	Provide information and money for CEP enrollees to get to job sites	Do.
5. National Business League project (NBL).	Sterling Institute	NBL	Negro businessmen undergo short, intensive courses in how to tap business and organizational talents of ghetto dwellers.	2650 Virginia Ave. NW. (333-2010).
6 Coordinated 2-way express transit service for center city and subruban employees.	Council of Governments (COG), Transit Commission (WMATC), UPO, USES.	HUD (approval pending).	Operation of public transportation to take ghetto workers to suburban worksites and return to town with suburban commuters. (HUD approval of proposal expected this spring).	1250 Connecticut Ave. NW. (223-6800).
7. Merit Employment Training Committee.	Board of Trade	Commerce	Aims at getting commitments from private businesses to hire disadvantaged persons and help coordinate job-retention and employer-education programs.	1616 K St. NW. (ST 3-3535).

Baltimore News American and President Johnson's Momentous Decision

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., has stated in the Baltimore News American what has become evident to more and more Americans: President Johnson's dramatic decision not to seek reelection made him a "towering figure whose statesmanship, courage, nobility, and sincerity now are beyond all challenge."

The decision was made to promote national unity in a divided nation and bring peace to a war-torn Asia.

Partisan politics would otherwise have swirled around the Presidency, further dividing an already troubled country. Peace overtures otherwise would have continued to be attacked as politically inspired. Pleas for unity would have been assailed as partisan maneuvering. Thus, the President decided, took politics out of his Presidency.

Now the President's dedicated efforts toward peace are accepted, as they always should have been, as sincere efforts

to end a cruel war. Now the President's calls for an end to division are accepted as calls for a national commitment to shared goals of social justice and peace.

The President has raised a standard of self-sacrifice to country which can be a beacon to our people.

Mr. Hearst expresses the sentiments of most Americans in concluding that history will judge Lyndon Johnson as a "great President, a great patriot, and a great human being."

I insert in the RECORD the article in the Baltimore News American by William Randolph Hearst, Jr.:

L. B. J. SHOWS WAY TO STATEMANSHIP

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

MONTEGO BAY, JAMAICA, April 4.—President Johnson's historic speech and its vast potential effects have had the same electric effect in this sleepy island as in the rest of the world. After the first stunning impact of the news, speculation on what may happen as a result has dominated conversation almost completely.

As one of the editors and publishers attending the hemispheric conference of the Inter-American Press Association, it has been especially interesting to me to note the major reaction of my fellow news executives.

Almost unanimously they express the opinion that Lyndon B. Johnson, by renouncing his claim to another term in the White House, has changed his image overnight.

Overnight, by his magnificant act of self-sacrifice in the cause of his nation's unity and world peace, the President has been transformed into a towering figure whose statesmanship, courage, nobility and sincerity now are beyond all challenge.

The transformation has happened even though the President's purposes may not be achieved by his action. Thus there is still wide division in the United States, both over the war and between the black and white races. And certainly the chance of achieving an early peace in Vietnam still cannot be rated too high.

In any event, once and for all, Mr. Johnson has dramatically closed what his critics refer to as his "credibility gap." For my part—as readers of this column well know—I never believed there was any such gap.

What was called a "credibility gap" resulted simply because the President played his high-stakes games the way they always have been played in Texas—and in Washington. The first rule is never to tip your whole hand, to keep open as many options as possible.

It is the prudent way to operate but unfortunately, as has been seen, it can give rise to unfair charges of deviousness and lack of candor.

There is a deep personal tragedy involved in Mr. Johnson's decision to reject another term in office. It is hard even to imagine the anguish he unquestionably suffered in concluding that all his efforts—as progressive, correct and patriotic as they have been—seemed doomed to hopeless misunderstanding and were a cause of the division he so deplored.

It is appropriate to note that the course which has led the President to end his political career after 37 years of public service is a course set long before he took over the White House in November of 1963.

As a protege of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Johnson has run up a record of social legislation rivaled only by FDR himself and certainly not exceeded by him. It is one of the ironies of the Johnson career that this fact is not acknowledged or appreciated by many of the critics who urged passage of the social legislation he sponsored.

It seems that any leader cast in the mold of a "common man" automatically is incapable of pleasing our so-called intellectuals.

Mr. Johnson also followed another trail blazed by his New Deal mentor. This was our national policy, in effect ever since World War II, to resist aggression wherever it happens.

It is another irony that this policy is clearly understood by a lot of people when it applies to Europe, but not by the same people when it applies to Asia. Despite all his efforts, the President has been unable to convince these people that there is no difference.

Because of his long-proven convictions, it must be assumed that Mr. Johnson has no thought whatever of abandoning our anti-aggression policy or deserting free people in their battle against would-be tyrants.

Throughout his long career, he has never swerved in following the course he thought best for his country and he followed it to its ultimate, self-sacrificing conclusion in his speech last Sunday night.

Perhaps the biggest political speculation which has followed in the wake of the President's speech involves the course of the war. What will happen if Mr. Johnson somehow is able to produce peace in Vietnam in the next few months?

The conviction here is that if this happens the Democratic convention in Chicago will seek to nominate him for re-election by acclamation. And there is no doubt in my own mind that this would happen.

Whether the President would then accept is another matter. I have grave doubts that he would. The utter sincerity of his decision "not to accept" re-nomination is self-evident in the personal agony which produced that decision.

Beyond that, Mr. Johnson has already had all the trappings of power and in themselves they hold nothing new. He has seen his daughters married while in the White House and now is a grandfather. It would not be human not to look forward to honorable retirement with his charming wife on the Texas ranch he loves so much.

Therefore, even if another term is offered to him under the circumstances cited. I think the President will have had more than enough of that job by the end of this year.

Mr. Johnson's "irrevocable" decision to return to private life means that a tremendous burden will be passed on to some other man next January. That man could be Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, Sen. Eugene McCarthy, or possibly Vice President Hubert Humphrey. It could be Richard Nixon (obviously the No. 1 Republican candidate at this time), or it just might still be Gov. Nelson Rockefeller or some other GOP long shot.

Whoever wins will have to be able to demonstrate to the American people—all of them—that their home front problems are being solved, and simultaneously demonstrate to the world that this nation will never accept a dishonorable peace.

Whoever wins, and whatever happens in the future, it will be impossible to deny the verdict of history—that Lyndon B. Johnson was a great President, a great patriot, and a great human being.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 78th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

JUSTICE—A Program To Employ Minority Group Members in the Construction Trades

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, progressive labor and industry leaders in Buffalo, combining their efforts with minority group representatives, have devised a new and unique program to recruit and train unemployed and unemployable minority group members as journeymen in the construction trades. The program, JUSTICE—journeymen under specific training in construction employment—implements a policy long espoused by the Federal Government—employment of more minority members in the construction trades.

For the past several weeks. Bob Logan, executive vice president of the Construction Industry Employers Association; Charles Pillard, president of the Buffalo Building and Construction Trades Council; and Dr. Allan Bush, executive director of the Opportunities Development Corp., representing the minority groups, have been consulting with U.S. Labor Department officials on funding for the program. I have received assurances from a Department official that the program will be funded, hopefully by the middle of April. My congratulations to Messrs. Logan and Pillard and Dr. Bush for a job well done.

Additional information about the program is in the following article by Ed Kelly of the Buffalo Courier Express:

LABOR COMMENT: NEW BUFFALO JOB PLAN MEANS WHAT IT SAYS—JUSTICE

(By Ed Kelly)

The made-in-Buffalo plan to recruit and train minority group members as journeymen workers in the construction industry is even more unique than it first appears.

Not only is the venture believed to be the first of its kind in the country, but it also represents—locally, at least—two other "firsts," each a major breakthrough in hidebound policies and traditions which have existed in the industry for decades.

To make possible Project JUSTICE—Journeymen Under Specific Training in Construction Employment—both this area's contractors and building trades unions had to make massive concessions in positions to which they've steadfastly clung.

Specifically, Project JUSTICE—once implemented—will mark the first time that local contractors have employed and paid unqualified workers while the latter are attempting to learn how to perform their jobs.

And Project JUSTICE also will mark the first time that union men in the construction field have agreed to work side by side with non-union men who are receiving all wages, fringe benefits and other protections afforded by the contracts negotiated between the building trades unions and contractors.

To clear the way for a program as ambitious and as pioneering as this, it's obvious that a great many people—within management and labor—had to do a vital job of selling their colleagues on the necessity for and the long-range benefits of such a radically new approach.

Much credit, therefore, belongs to Bob Lo-

gan, executive vice president of the Construction Industry Employers Association, and to his opposite number on the union side of the table, Charley Pillard, president of the Building & Construction Trades Council of Buffalo & Vicinity (AFL–CIO).

Too, congratulations must go to Dr. Allan Bush, executive director of the Opportunities Development Corp., a nonprofit educational group made up of representatives of civil rights and community groups, and the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce.

His task of explaining the project to, and insuring cooperation among, the great diversity of minority group organizations, was undoubtedly as taxing and often as delicate as the efforts of Logan and Pillard within their own spheres of influence.

The project has a bold, frontal approach. It fractures some old traditions, slashes red tape, goes straight to the heart of things.

For one, it's aimed directly at those who—according to many minority spokesmen—are most in need of assistance and opportunity: Well-motivated men who have head-of-the-family responsibility, little mechanical experience and who are too old to learn a trade through normal apprenticeship-training channels.

For another, JUSTICE challenges the Federal Government to finally implement policies it's been espousing for years in the industry. Washington, pressing for more opportunities for minority members, has been calling for affirmative action programs in the construction industry. This project is such action.

To be successful, however, it needs government funds—the task to which Pillard, Logan, Dr. Bush et al have now committed their persuasive powers.

Project JUSTICE would give potential journeymen-trainees 27 hours of paid orientation training and 54 hours of paid specific craft training, capped by 20 weeks (at about 40 hours a week) on-the-job training at the regular pay rate for journeymen in that craft.

If at the end of the cycle the journeyman-trainee passes a qualification exam, he's admitted to the craft as a full-fledged journeyman. Only then does he join the union which has jurisdiction within his craft.

To make Project JUSTICE work, employers and unions—assisted by the Opportunities Development Corp.—had to do nothing less than substantially amend the status quo.

That they're willing to do so merits a community salute and offers hope that the problem of minority opportunity in construction may be solved more quickly and amicably than anyone dared hope a year ago.

Violence in the Streets Has Nothing To Do With Civil Rights

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the violence in the streets of cities all over the country has nothing to do with civil rights. Any attempt to so rationalize the outrages we have seen all over the country in the past few days just would not wash, as pointed out by State Senator Charles Chew, a Negro and a member of the Illinois State Legislature, in a story appearing in the April 9 edition of the Chicago Tribune.

I place the article at this point in the RECORD as well as the following: An article by George S. Schuyler, prominent Negro columnist, "A Cool Appraisal of King," which appeared in the April 8 edition of the Chicago American. An editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, April 8 edition, "Violence Mocks Dr. King," and, finally, a letter to the editor of the Chicago Sun-Times from a Negro citizen of Chicago who presents some food for thought that all of us, black and white, should ponder and then follow by constructive thoughts and actions in our everyday activities:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 9, 1968]

BE TOUGH ON LOOTERS, NEGRO LEADER URGES

(By Edward Schreiber)

State Sen. Charles Chew (D., Chicago) called yesterday for stepped up police action against looters, whom Chew described as "thieves in hiding" who represent less than one per cent of the Negro community.

"The people who did the looting and are now in hiding are thieves all around and would use any measure in their secret desire, which is to steal," Chew told City hall reporters.

"The police department should be aware that decent citizens, I mean the Negroes in Chicago that have tried to contribute something to the growth of the city would support police action in a 'get tough' policy. This is what is needed. The thugs and looters don't make up one per cent of the Negro people."

AMAZED AT RESTRAINT

Chew said he was astounded when he saw looters carrying out goods from destroyed buildings over the week-end and then saw the restraint by the police in interfering.

He said he could understand that the police department was trying to eliminate the possible spark that might have come from mass arrests, but he said the people who have had businesses in these areas for years shouldn't have them destroyed.

Chew said he believes the mayor and police department were lax in the immediate apprehension of looters.

NEGROES LOSE, HE SAYS

"I would like to see the law enforced at all costs, and I don't care whose toes are stepped on," said Chew. "The only people who lose thru this destruction are the Negro people."

Chew said he made the same statements Sunday in an appearance before the congregation of the Greater St. John Baptist church, 4821 Michigan av., and they were met with approval from the congregation.

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 8, 1968]

A COOL APPRAISAL OF KING

(By George S. Schuyler)

NEW YORK.—The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. tragically emphasizes again the fact that "militant nonviolence" always ends violently.

Countless mass demonstrations, which started to advance a good cause, have ended in clashes with police, looting, vandalism, and killing, rather than the good will and understanding intended.

Behaviorists long have known that, the larger the assemblage, the lower the mass intelligence, and the greater likelihood hysteria will result.

It was Dr. King's determination to influence the course of an ordinary labor dispute by his charismatic presence that led him to Memphis, doubtless at the behest of associates there, and exacerbated an already dangerous situation. The recent rioting, vandalism, and casualties were a direct result, and there would probably have been more of the same had he led another demonstration.

Labor disputes should be handled by officials of the AFL–CIO and the employers concerned, and not by demagogic outsiders with appeals to racial passion.

EVEN GANDHI LACKED CONTROL

It is noteworthy that Dr. King's idol, Mahatma Gandhi, who preached nonviolence, on several occasions had to call off his drives and go into seclusion until his millions of adherents had cooled off and cured the wounds received from battling police who were dedicated, there as here, to preserving law and order, and upholding the rights of others not involved in the struggle.

From Dr. King's original effort, the Montgomery improvement association's bus boycott, he contributed little to the solution of the touchy problems of race relations in the United States. If these problems are to be solved, it must be in moderation and through innumerable compromises rather than by the use of abrasive tactics that produce irritation and ill will rather than understanding and cooperation.

Wherever the Negro lives, he prospers only to the extent that he has the good will, tolerance, and acceptance of his white neighbors and fellow-workers. This is necessarily a slow process, when trying to maintain the most delicate balance. It cannot be speeded by razzle-dazzle action which brings reaction. As President Eisenhower said: This is a matter of education.

Because Dr. King believed he was right and had Holy Writ behind him, he persisted, even to the point of irresponsibility.

HIS CHICAGO ACTIVITIES

It merely increased apprehension, exasperation, and frustration in Chicago and environs when Dr. King and his Janizaries boldly marched in, painted "end slums" all over a section of the city, took over one landlord's property for rent collection and renovation without permission, and led parades thru all-white neighborhoods where the marchers only escaped severe casualties because of the vigilance of the much-maligned police.

Because of Dr. King's stubbornness—or, if you prefer, extreme dedication—the Birmingham shambles was unavoidable. Warned by responsible Negro leaders not to visit the city; told that they had the situation in hand as much as it could be, he and his staff went there just the same. This persistence, aided by the atmosphere or mob-mindedness among colored and white, led directly to the deplorable events that followed.

Similarly, the troubles in St. Augustine, Fla., were deliberately provoked, and to this day nobody knows what was gained by it. To be sure, there was a vast uproar in the press, radio, and television, there were threats and jailings, but no one in St. Augustine can say today what help it was to race relations—except for more speaking engagements for Dr. King.

There was an increasingly widespread belief among sober-minded Americans that Dr. King was, to say the least, unfortunate or unwise in the choice of his associates and advisers. They were largely of the left-wing variety.

MIXING RIGHTS AND WAR

Added to these were the Vietnik peace forces headed by Dr. Spock and an assortment of Hanoi-lovers who influenced Dr. King to lend his indorsement and influence to elements inimical to the best interests of the United States, and even to allowing Mrs. King to accompany a delegation of women to the Ho Chi Minh capital.

Moderate organizations, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban league warned against tying the civil rights movement to the so-called peace movement, but Dr. King persisted stubbornly, even giving leave to one of his associates, the Rev. James Bevel, to help organize the peacenik demonstrations in New York's Central park and in United Nations plaza, where King spoke and American flags were burned.

In short, as Dr. King's influence waxed, his judgment seems to have waned. No more was said about praying en masse for white folk but there was much talk about civil disobedience and defiance of the powers-that-be.

Dr. King was talented and adroit. He was never at a loss for words and he evidently was dedicated to the cause of improving race relations. It was the methods he used which, considering the high emotionalism which surrounded his goals, were objectionable. There are too many half-witted, criminally inclined people in our population whose expectations have to be kept in check; they provide the fuel for great social conflagrations. This becomes truer every day as our population soars and our society becomes more complex.

WILL THEY USE CAUTION?

What will the followers of Dr. King do now that he has gone? We already have seen what has happened in the wake of news of his assassination, with a spate of vandalistic orgies across the country. Will those subleaders of the departed disciple of Gandhi drop the policies and tactics that gained him world face and chart a new course?

Will they call off the scheduled mass demonstration of 3,000-odd trained "invaders" of Washington, and wait until things cool down? Or will they continue to court disaster? The present temper of the nation suggests need for caution.

The goal of the overwhelming majority of American Negroes is middle-class co-existence. Millions have attained that status, and more are doing so all the time. There is lessening economic discrimination and, everywhere they wish to vote, they are doing so. It will not speed the process to continue tactics of harassment and annoyance, but may well cause retrogression in race relations to the disadvantage of all. Dr. King, tragically, never learned this. His followers had better.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 8, 1968]

VIOLENCE MOCKS DR. KING

The violence in the streets of Chicago has nothing to do with civil rights. It desecrates the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who sought justice through nonviolent means. It worsens the lot of those he sought to lift up and endangers all citizens of the city.

Looting is stealing. Burning is arson. Sniping is done with murderous intent. A thrown rock is meant to injure. Such criminal acts were properly assessed by Lt. Gov. Shapiro as insurrection that required the full resources of the law.

Shapiro is to be commended for his swift action, first in calling up the National Guard, then in requesting the assistance of federal troops, an extreme but necessary measure. Mayor Daley also acted wisely in setting a curfew with stiff penalties, in curtailing liquor sales and in ending the sale of guns. The police and fire departments have done a nasty job with skill and diligence. Criminal force simply must be met with the force of law.

The assassination of Dr. King was itself a vicious, criminal act, but to use that death as an excuse for pillaging is a mockery of what Dr. King taught and prayed for. He sought to serve humanity and heal its sickness, not to rip up and destroy.

In February, he spoke in Atlanta of his thoughts of death and the eulogy he would choose. He said:

"I want you to say that day that I tried to be right. . . . I want you to be able to say that day that I did try to feed the hungry. I want you to be able to say that day that I did try in my life to clothe the naked. . . . And I want you to say that I tried to love and serve humanity."

Dr. King spoke of a humanity both black and white, and he knew there was sickness on both sides that cried for a prescription of nonviolent progress. He certainly would have deplored the fact that hundreds have been left homeless by arsonists' fires and that others have been killed and wounded.

Dr. King sought jobs and homes. In Chicago last year he praised the efforts being made toward fair housing by the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, a group set up after his 1966 conference with Mayor Daley. His own Operation Breadbasket, headed by the Rev. Jesse Jackson of Chicago, was a major step toward jobs for his people and toward the economic power he wanted them to have.

Jobs do not rise from the ashes of a charred school. A bullet doesn't build homes. Every scream of agony and every siren is tribute only to the hate-mongers and to those who are directed by neither hate nor love but by criminal selfishness.

Dr. King had visions of equality and progress, and in Chicago those visions are being realized, if slowly and painstakingly. The torn West Side was and is high on the priority list of areas to be helped with housing and employment and recreation.

But those who set neighborhoods aflame created a hell in which they, and the true followers of Dr. King as well, now must live until law and order is restored. The time it takes to wrest sanity from the ashes will be time lost from constructive efforts. The time it takes to heal the divisions caused by violence will postpone by that much and more the work that must be done for Dr. King's people.

And the delay will, in fact, be time stolen from the pursuit of a great man's dreams.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 8, 1968]

PLEA FOR SANITY

I am a Negro, not prominently known as a politician or a high government official. I am just a citizen who has a hell of a stake in this country.

I am moved to write this letter because of the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Each American everywhere must help in his own small way in this situation. I do not mean police or government officials but we who comprise these United States.

At a time such as this, sanity of all the 200,000,000 Americans must prevail. If all of us—you, me and the other 200,000,000 Americans will just contain one wrong impulse and cast it down the drain, 200,000,000 wrong impulses will never materialize and bring about our country's downfall.

There are injustices. I have faced them and fought them by endeavoring to rise above them and, most importantly, maintaining my dignity of being a man.

I would like to think of us as being optimists, not pessimists. I would like to say our cup is half full, not half empty.

Law and Order First

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the Chicago Tribune have again felt the need—and I think rightly so—to remind us that "The lesson of all recent riots has been that when public officials and the public at large lean over backward in an attempt to appease the lawbreakers their cities are in deep trouble."

In the editorial, "Law and Order First," the editors advance several points which must be considered and acted upon if we are to deal effectively and efficiently with criminals. It must be understood that, as the Tribune stated:

We are not dealing with the colored population but with a minority of criminal scum.

It is unfortunate that criminals are people, too, but our concern should primarily be for the maintenance of riot-free streets.

I include the editorial, from the April 7, 1968, edition of the Chicago Tribune, in the RECORD at this point:

LAW AND ORDER FIRST

There is no such thing as temporizing with the lowest elements of criminality which have defaced Chicago and 40 other cities with arson, murder, assault, looting, and sniping. The rioters here have taken advantage of the wave of sentimentality and assumed guilt that has swept the country because a single individual, presumably demented, gunned down the Rev. Martin Luther King.

There is no such thing as collective guilt, either among white people or black people. Those who say that every white person shares the guilt for the crime at Criminals must be punished. Justice demands that none of the guilty escape. At the same time it must be clear that the characteristic of criminals is that they are individuals, not nations or races. They should be punished for what they individually did.

The officials of Chicago are sworn to maintain law and order. To do so, they must employ all necessary force. No one questions the sincerity of Mayor Daley or his deep desire for racial concord in this city. But the mayor conceded yesterday that the city not only underreacted at the outset of the crisis but that it did not move with sufficient speed. He has taken action to correct these deficiencies.

A curfew will be in force. Downstate elements of the national guard have been called. A request for federal troops is under consideration. These steps would have prevented much of the violence.

The lesson of all recent riots has been that when public officials and the public at large lean over backward in an attempt to appease the lawbreakers their cities are in deep trouble. If the response is delayed, haphazard, feeble, and more harmful to the innocent than the guilty, disaster results.

It is silly to seek excuses in the sociological argument that resistance and punishment do not go to "the causes of crime." Attorney General Ramsey Clark, for example, says that "in the long run only the elimination of the [social] causes of crime can make a significant and lasting difference in the incidence of crime." It has been observed that this is equivalent to saying that a fireman should refuse fire-extinguishing equipment on the ground that "in the long run only the elimination of the causes of fire can make a significant and lasting difference in the incidence of fire."

A true analysis of the root cause of riots is that people commit crimes because, given their condition, the desire for the satisfaction felt or sought prevails over the desire to avoid the risk of penalties. The cost of riots to the rioters is more easily and swiftly changed than the conditions producing the inclination to riot.

Permissive attitudes, in Chicago and elsewhere, can only lead to more and worse rioting. If the whole guard is needed, it should be called up at once when trouble breaks out or is threatened. If federal troops are required as reinforcements, they should be requested without delay. A curfew should be enforced the moment the safety of the streets and of property is threatened. People should be kept off the streets.

Gov. Romney of Michigan, Mayor Cavanaugh of Detroit, and President Johnson were all blamed a year ago for being in-

decisive and slow to apply force in the ferocious Detroit riots. Friday the governor and mayor profited from experience and got police and the guard on the streets early and established order. As Mr. Cavanaugh said, "We think it is better to overreact than underreact." Mayor Tate of Philadelphia felt the same way, and his swift action paid off.

Here in Chicago we are not dealing with the colored population but with a minority of criminal scum. We believe that a huge majority of both white and black is united in concern for civil order. Chicago, with a united front against lawbreakers, can demonstrate that it is one city that will not tolerate the subversion of law and order. We hope Mayor Daley will not fall into the same category as spineless and indecisive mayors who muffed early riot control in such cities as Los Angeles and Newark. Chicago may have to recall O. W. Wilson to restore order.

Criminal Gangs, Immune From Police Action, Rampaged in Capital City

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Daily News following the recent outbreak of violence and lawlessness in the Nation's Capital, declared:

The only way to stop a riot is by superior force, promptly applied, regardless of the cause for which law breakers feign to be rioting.

This editorial emphasizes that looters and rioters used the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King as an excuse to vandalize, pilfer, and destroy and burn.

This is an excellent editorial and because of its interest to my colleagues and the American people, I place it herewith in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 8, 1968]

WHILE WASHINGTON BURNED

If the authorities persist in viewing these riots primarily in terms of black vs. white, this certainly threatens to be another long, hot summer.

Here last week, as in Detroit last year, officialdom hesitated to take charge when a relatively small band of young black hoodlums sacked and burned large sections of the capital. Troops to re-enforce beleaguered police were available within a few minutes ride. When they finally arrived the looting was stopped. But the call was delayed for fatal hours while the criminal gangs, believing themselves immune from restraint, spread destruction.

If there was any good reason for this delay, beyond a hand-wringing lack of decision in high places, it must have been fear that this was a general Negro uprising in resentment against the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Any such idea is a gross libel on predominately Negro Washington and on Negro citizens generally. It is evidence of a lingering, unconscious race prejudice to which even some Negro spokesmen are not immune—an assumption that a black skin somehow sets a person apart as different in kind from his white neighbors.

Mugged, the Negro bleeds. Burned out, he is homeless. While officialdom fiddled, our citizens, white and black alike, were denied the equal protection of the law to which all citizens should feel entitled.

The mobsters couldn't have cared less about Dr. King, alive or dead. They violated every decency for which he stood, seizing upon his death as an excuse to steal and destroy. Those of Dr. King's race who sincerely mourned him weren't out screaming in the streets. They were in church, if they dared to leave their homes.

No one denies gross injustices continue to exist and that Negro slum dwellers are the outstanding victims. But every bit of destruction lessens the resources available for reform by just that much. The millions in property losses in one day in Washington are the equivalent of thousands of school teachers, hundreds of homes.

The prime civil right of any citizen, black or white, is security in his life and property. Until this right can be established, the chance of eradicating the slums is dim.

The only way to stop a riot is by superior force, promptly applied, regardless of the cause for which law breakers feign to be rioting.

This is a hard lesson which, as experience here indicates, is yet to be learned.

Toward a Better Understanding of Urban America

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, today, a resolution which would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Central City Affairs for the purpose of synthesizing and recommending action on the various reports and studies which have been made in this area. One of the tasks of such a joint committee would be to receive and report to the Congress on the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders released early last month. Equally important would be the joint committee's responsibility to draw together the work which has been done by the Congress through its various committees which preceded the Advisory Commission's study and which to a large extent has been ignored by that executive Commission.

The Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee conducted a study of urban problems beginning in August of 1967. I had the privilege of preparing a paper for the subcommittee, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point:

TOWARD A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF URBAN AMERICA

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS*)

THE TRENDS

To question and evaluate urban problems and policies, it is first necessary to understand the underlying dynamics of urban development. When we first understand the historical and economic trends of the city, we can then ask the more immediate questions concerning government and particularly Federal Government expenditures on the core region of the large city and on the shape and function of the core region itself.

History shows us that the two economic factors of the industrial power source and the labor supply have molded and directed the growth of the American city. In the late 18th century and in the earliest part of the 19th century water as our major source of industrial power necessitated that the mills locate near waterfalls. In fact the geography of this power source not only limited the areas where industry could locate, but also limited the size of the city since only a few mills in a given area could utilize the falling water. However, mass production had not really come into play to require the concentration of a mass work force in a limited area.

Then came steam and mass production and the growth of the high rise city. Coal, the new source of power, could be transported to centralized industrial areas, and labor aggregated in these industrial centers to be close at hand to meet the needs of mass production. Centralization became paramount and the maximum utilization of urban land was essential for industry. The result was the great architectural movement upward and the growth of the high rise city.

After 1920, however, the high rise city began to die. Electricity and the automobile initiated the decentralization of the city. Electricity was a mobile source of power and the automobile and the highway provided mobility for labor. This new mobility meant that industry no longer had to fight for the precious space in center city, but could instead move out into the surrounding country while electric cables would follow along supplying power for any location desired. And the family through rural electrification, telephones, and highways could do the same in the pursuit of better living. Labor no longer had to live in the immediate area of the industry since the car could take a workman as far away as 40 miles or more a day to his place of work. It is interesting to observe that the only urban giant in this country not characterized by high rise industry is the city of Los Angeles which was largely built up after 1920.

Now automation has caused an even greater dispersions of industry since automated production processes are carried out most efficiently in the sprawling one- and two-story factories, not to mention the amazing developments in new and more flexible forms of transportation and communication. The land needed for the automated complexes and better family living is found in the spacious countryside and not in the cramped confines of center city, and the countryside can accommodate this expansion as technological advancement has continued to diminish the amounts of land needed for agricultural and forestry purposes.

This historical perspective leads to questions which I feel have been too little examined by advocates of maintaining or going backward to the concentrated core of our cities. It seems that the historical trends are in fact going away from the further development of the old high rise core region and that advocates of restoration of the high rise city are working with vested interests and counter to healthy progress. Indeed, one could make the stronger charge that they are the unwitting mouthpieces of those with a vested interest in maintaining the outmoded values of center city property.

Population statistics clarify the trend toward decentralization (see chart I). Between 1950 and 1960, eight of the 10 largest cities in this country lost great numbers of people while the surrounding counties in their metropolitan regions continued to grow at a steady rate. Among the 15 largest cities, population estimates reveal that Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and San Francisco have decreased significantly in population since 1950. During this period, population figures for their metropolitan regions have swelled, indicating the decentralization and dispersion characterizing these urban areas.

*U.S. Representative from Missouri; U.S. House of Representatives.

CHART I [1]

	1950–60	1960–65 estimate
New York (−+=+):		
Metro	+1,138,690	+653,367
City	−109,970	+211,016
Counties	+1,248,660	+442,351
Chicago (−):		
Metro	+1,043,045	+412,087
City	−70,558	−84,404
Counties	+1,113,603	+496,491
Los Angeles (+):		
Metro	+2,375,085	+33,004
City	+508,657	+317,205
Counties		
Philadelphia (−+=−):		
Metro	+671,849	+324,103
City	−69,093	+44,488
Counties	+1,248,660	+279,615
Detroit (−):		
Metro	+746,163	+209,640
City	−179,524	−30,044
Counties	+925,687	+239,684
Baltimore (−):		
Metro	+321,624	+129,977
City	−10,684	−27,024
Counties	+332,308	+157,001
Houston (+):		
Metro	+436,457	+451,842
City	+342,056	+153,581
Counties		
Cleveland (−):		
Metro	+331,084	+174,405
City	−38,758	−40,805
Counties	+369,842	+215,210
Washington (−+=0):		
Metro	+537,808	+411,103
City	−38,222	+38,044
Counties	+576,030	+373,059
St. Louis (−):		
Metro	+340,815	+178,897
City	−106,770	−51,026
Counties	+447,585	+229,923
Milwaukee (+):		
Metro	+237,342	+74,710
City	+103,932	+9,684
Counties		
San Francisco (−):		
Metro	+542,592	+151,641
City	−35,041	−116
Counties		
Boston (−):		
Metro	+178,736	
City	−104,247	−52,192
Counties	+282,983	
Dallas (+):		
Metro	+340,100	+205,399
City	+245,222	+130,316
Counties		
New Orleans (+):		
Metro	+183,075	+157,520
City	+57,080	+24,475
Counties		

[1] Col. 1 shows the population increases between 1950 and 1960; col. 2 shows the population increases between 1960 and 1965.

The symbols with each city are described as follows: A "minus" in parentheses indicates a loss in population for both periods, and a "plus" in parentheses indicates a gain in population for both periods; where there are 2 symbols, the 1st refers to the 1st period and the 2d to the 2d period; the symbol to the right of the equality sign indicates either an overall population increase or decline for the entire 15-year period.

Cities are listed in the order of population.

Five of the largest 15 cities—Los Angeles, Houston, Milwaukee, Dallas, and New Orleans—have registered population increases steadily for the past 17 years. The population gains within the boundaries of these cities, however, actually maintain the overall pattern of decentralization. The average density for these five cities (combined) in 1965 is 4,869 people per square mile. Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and Boston, each of which has lost over 150,000 people during the last 17 years, in 1950 had an average density (combined) of 15,248 people per square mile. Since these four cities are losing great numbers from within their city boundaries, their densities are now slightly lower.

In other words, cities with the greatest density present a pattern of people moving from within city boundaries into surrounding suburban counties. On the other hand, the cities which are now growing most rapidly at present have a very low density. Of the expanding cities, Los Angeles and Houston are the two largest cities in the United States (i.e., in square miles) and Dallas and New Orleans rank fourth and fifth, respectively. The area covered by these cities (e.g., Los Angeles at 455 square miles) means that these cities can continue to grow for some time without turning into centralized high rise cities.

"Sprawl"—used as a derogatory term—is often ascribed to these expanding cities. A study of the facts, however, reveals that these cities are actually gaining in population because their boundaries are spread out far enough so that these cities can actually encompass the forces of urban dispersion. The advocate of metropolitan consolidation, I might add, should be very pleased with this development.

Many people involved in urban politics and city planning have told me that the solution to major urban problems lies in a recentralization and intensification of people within the boundaries of our cities, especially our older cities. Not only is this contrary to the prevailing historical and economic forces, but this solution also contradicts and frustrates the desires of the majority of our urban citizens—a desire to live in low-density residential neighborhoods.

A brief look at Los Angeles County, in fact, supports my contention that a majority of urban residents choose to live in low-density neighborhoods as opposed to high-density high-rise apartments. Los Angeles County is one of the fastest growing areas in the United States. Statistics published by the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission reveal how the people in this growing region have selected their homes. As of January 1, 1960, the commission estimated that 65.05 percent of all dwelling units in the county were single-family units with multiples totaling 25.05 percent and duplexes 9.45 percent. Combining the single-family and duplex figures, we see that 74.50 percent of the dwelling units in Los Angeles County were in low-density neighborhoods. In short, in Los Angeles County, one of the fastest growing areas in the country and our second largest metropolitan region, the single-family residence has been chosen as the basic housing unit and the great majority of dwellings are in low-density areas.

Low density requires urban decentralization and dispersion. In fact, since our most rapidly growing metropolitan regions are decentralized and of low density, I must conclude that our people greatly prefer low-density living and urban decentralization.

At first glance, New York City does appear to contradict the trends which I have been discussing. Although New York City did lose 109,970 people during the 1950's, it became the only old and crowded city in this country to gain population between 1960 and 1965. In fact, the 211,016-person increase in population in the first half of this decade meant that New York City actually had an increase of slightly over 100,000 people between 1950 and 1965.

A closer inspection of the population statistics for each of the five boroughs shows that New York, instead of providing an exception to the trends, actually reinforces them. Manhattan, the most densely populated borough, had a density of 89,096 people per square mile in 1950. In 1960 Manhattan's density fell to 77,195 per square mile and when last recorded in 1965, the density (estimate) was down to 70,955 people per square mile. The actual population loss for Manhattan between 1950 and 1960 was 261,820 and another 137,281 people left Manhattan between 1960 and 1965.

Queens provided the most consistent population increase with a 258,729 rise in the 1950's and an additional 138,422 people through 1965. In density, Queens ranked fourth among the boroughs with a density of 13,724 people per square mile in 1950; in 1965, Queens was still fourth in density with 17,239 people per square mile.

New York City's fifth borough, Staten Island, actually bears a close resemblance to the residential density of Los Angeles County. Staten Island gained 20,436 people in the 1950's. It almost doubled this rate of increase with an additional 38,009 people moving onto Staten Island between 1960 and 1965. Even with this increase, Staten Island still has a density of only 4,333 people per square mile, compared to 4,346 people per square mile in Los Angeles. The opening of the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge is expected to continue the proliferation of low density housing on Staten Island.

A study of employment statistics clarifies the trend of urban dispersion. An analysis of 40 of the largest SMSA's (standard metropolitan statistical areas) in the United States reveals the rise in employment in the suburban rings of these SMSA's.

In 1948 only 36.5 percent of SMSA manufacturing employment was located in the suburban ring. This figure rose to 45.6 percent in 1958, and it is estimated that it now exceeds 50 percent. As of 1963, 31.5 percent of SMSA wholesaling was located in the suburban ring, while only 9.5 percent of SMSA wholesaling was in the ring area in 1948; 47.5 percent of SMSA retailing was in the ring in 1963 as compared to the 25.3 percent retailing figure for the same area in 1948. Finally, the suburban ring percentage of services rose from 17.4 percent in 1948 to 34.2 percent in 1963.

The outward movement of population and employment is statistically obvious and logically irrefutable. No matter what the empirical approach, the same trends result. For example, 37 out of 40 cities have declined in retail jobs between 1958 and 1963, while only 27 out of 40 had declined between 1948 and 1954. Parallel figures for wholesaling showed the decline spreading from 16 to 21 cities, and the parallel figures for services showed employment declines in services expanding from seven cities to 15 cities.

Conducting a study of urban population and employment, Harvard economist, John F. Kain, independently has arrived at the following conclusion which completely concurs with my thesis of urban decentralization:

"First, I know of no good statement of why these trends *should* be reversed. It is not obvious that a reduction in central area employment and population densities is detrimental. The most frequently used argument that it is bad holds that such dispersal jeopardizes the tax base of central cities; while true, there are many more straightforward, and more efficient, ways of solving the admittedly difficult fiscal problems of central cities than by redirecting metropolitan growth. Attempting to reverse a massive, nationwide social and economic movement (i.e., suburbanization) strikes me as the most costly—and least likely to succeed—method of helping pay for needed central city services." [1]

It is my firm belief that instead of bucking the tide, we can harness its force for the betterment and improvement of living conditions in metropolitan America.

The new emphasis on homeownership can, to some degree, be interpreted as a response to the forces of low-density living. For income groups from $3,000 to $6,000 per year, the new homeownership approach would be preferable to high rise rent-subsidized apartments. In fact, homeownership legislation would not only provide more satisfying living conditions for this lower income group in our cities, but preliminary research indicates that homeownership is economically more feasible than many of the current rent subsidy and public aid programs.

[1] James Q. Wilson, ed., *The Metropolitan Enigma: Inquiries into the Nature and Dimensions of America's "Urban Crises,"* John F. Kain, *The Distribution and Movement of Jobs and Industry* (Washington: Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1967), p. 26.

HOMEOWNERSHIP

To digress briefly from my analysis of urban trends, I would like to briefly analyze some of the economic and social benefits of the homeownership approach in contrast to the rent subsidy and public aid approach. Studies of programs in Chicago and St. Louis provide much of my comparative material.

According to one of the major Chicago rent management companies, aid recipients account for almost 85 percent of rent delinquencies. In a revealing study of Chicago, David A. Satter observes:

"Those buildings in Lawndale that are unavailable to public aid recipients are in as good condition as they were before Lawndale became a slum. But buildings where even a fraction of the apartments are available to aid recipients are terrible. Apartment buildings that differ in rent from one another by as little as $10 a month show striking differences. The crucial factor seems to be the presence or absence of welfare recipients—people not having paying jobs or having them. Aid recipients make up between 30 and 50 percent of the tenants of buildings that rent for under $105 monthly. The story is always the same. They do not pay their rent and are destructive." [2]

In my own city of St. Louis, a private organization, the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Association of St. Louis, has already successfully initiated a homeownership program, a small scale preview of the National Home Ownership Foundation. The following remark by a staff member of the Bicentennial Improvement Association strikes a most interesting contrast to descripton of the Chicago public aid recipients:

"I can say that our experience as far as the families go has been excellent. There are no school dropouts in our families. They pay property taxes whereas before they received tax benefits and various aid programs. They now have jobs whereas before they did not. The families are living together and maintaining their homes whereas before they did not live together and had no home to maintain." [3]

A report from the Bicentennial Improvement Association further amplifies its record of success:

"Since 1963, over 40 families have been placed in rehabilitated homes within the boundaries noted. These families are paying for the homes with wages earned from jobs in local industry. In the 2 years since the first family was placed, only two payments have been late and none have become delinquent. The same is true for utility bills and other basic costs of running a household." [4]

Successful private homeownership programs are also in operation in Philadelphia and Indianapolis. The final step that remains to be taken rests with the Federal Government. Through Federal legislation removing the impediments it presently ignores in its tax laws, work and welfare programs against homeownership, it would become possible for privately managed and locally controlled homeownership programs to be successfully promulgated throughout the United States.

Possibly in a mild way additional Federal legislation other than just removing serious impediments could provide for the establishment of a nonprofit foundation which would raise private funds through issuance of Government debentures. These funds will be made available for low-interest mortgages to assist low-income families in acquiring equity in their homes. The foundation would operate at very low Government expense and control. Furthermore, its three pillars of emphasizing individual development, maximizing utilization of private resources, and minimizing the role of Government tower above the morass of confusion and inefficiency which characterizes the old generally discredited high rise public housing and the present urban renewal programs and their accompanying antipoverty projects.

In fact "positive" and "negative" are two words which succinctly capture the difference between the homeownership approach and much of the present public aid and rent subsidy approach. The homeownership plan comprises an interrelationship of various incentives. Tied into the plan are job training, job location, and education programs which will increase the possibilities and prospects for enduring homeownership. The homeownership approach also offers such positive incentives as allowing the home buyer to contribute his own labor as equity in his home.

Related welfare and social security legislation can effectively augment the homeownership approach. At the present time the aid to dependent children and the old-age assistance programs appear to be biased against homeownership. Most States do not provide that welfare can be used for capital improvements for substandard housing; and consequently, the ADC and OAA agencies pressure families entering ADC or OAA to relocate out of the home into a rental place.

I believe that relocation into a rental place—and I have personally worked with a case in which this relocation occurred at the death of a father of seven children—constitutes a traumatic experience for the widow and the children. I also oppose this relocation for the sound economic reason that the relocation process is actually more expensive than the capital improvements necessary to eliminate the substandard situation.

I have succeeded in getting into the House social security bill a provision that the Federal Government will match on a 50–50 basis up to $500 payments by States to OAA people for home improvements. This amendment also gives similar aid to the blind and disabled. However, I would like to have this amendment extended to include ADC people, and I want the maximum payment raised to 1,000 on the same 50–50 matching basis. The present homeownership proposal, the National Home Ownership Foundation Act, is often criticized for supposedly covering those earning incomes of $4,000 and over. My amendment, especially the proposed extended version, addresses itself to the homeownership problems of the lower income groups entering welfare programs—groups not fully covered by the NHOF.

By attempting to increase the aid provision in my amendment to $1,000, I am not making an unreasonable grab for more Federal money. Mr. Lacy Smith, the Rehabilitation Coordinator of the Federal Housing Administration, supplied me with the following information. An average of $2,500 to $3,000 is required to bring substandard housing up to code requirements. Section 115 of the Housing Act provides grants up to $1,500 for repairs and capital improvements and, the average grant for substandard housing has ranged round $1,200. Section 312 of the Housing Act provides direct loans for repairs and capital improvements at an interest rate of 3 percent over a 20-year period. This average loan is $3,000. (The $3,000 is sometimes split between a grant and a loan, and such a split is usually on a 50–50 basis.)

By asking for the increase to $1,000, I have arrived at a figure which FHA experience indicates would provide substantial aid toward ADC and OAA substandard housing problems. Furthermore, a person who receives $500 or $1,000 from my amendment plus $1,500 from section 115 of the Housing Act is in a position to provide sound and lasting repairs and improvements for a substandard property. To qualify for aid under section 115, a person must be meeting mortgage and upkeep payments amounting to 25 percent or more of his (or her) monthly income and earning an income of $3,000 a year or less.

Finally, the capital improvement amendment to the social security bill insures a coordinated response to the needs of the ADA and OAA people with housing problems. Whether or not an ADC or OAA person benefits from section 115 of the Housing Act, he is guaranteed immediate aid through my amendment.

To document my contention that certain welfare programs discriminate against homeownership, I had hoped to compare the percentage of homeownership for people before they entered ADC and OAA to their percentage of homeownership after they entered ADC and OAA. Unfortunately, the welfare agencies have not been able to furnish us with the percentage of homeownership for ADC and OAA people before they entered these programs.

By comparing homeownership statistics from the 1960 Census of Housing to the percentage of homeownership of people on ADC and OAA, I have been able to observe the following correlations. In 1960 OAA recipients had an annual income (including assistance) of $968.88, and 48 percent of their housing units were owned or being bought. The national figure for household ownership for people earning annual income of less than $2,000 was 51 percent. This OAA homeownership comparison, in itself, is not statistically that significant. OAA homeownership is only 3 percent lower than the national average for a somewhat comparable income group.

The ADC figures, however, are striking. Including assistance payments, the annual income for ADC recipients is $1,677.36. While 51 percent of all households earning less than $2,000 per year are owned by the occupants, only 21.8 percent (as of November-December 1961) of ADC households are owned or are being bought by a person living in the housing unit.

The ADC percentage of homeownership is 29.2 percent lower than the national percentage of homeownership for the comparable income group. Stating these same statistics differently, one observes that ADC homeownership is approximately two-fifths the national average of homeownership for people earning less than $2,000 a year. ADC recipients, however, are not entitled to homeownership by the social security homeownership amendment, and the statistics indicate that an excellent case can be made for giving them this aid.

In summary, homeownership can serve as a basis for a rehabilitated family. The homeownership program serves to strengthen the family, stimulates economic self-improvement, provides incentives for self-education, and, more important, an atmosphere conducive to educational development for the children in the family. It's his to fix up and gain the fruits of his labor. It's his to keep neat and in repair. Through ownership, the house can truly become a home. With homes, the residents can then grow the roots for building strong and healthy neighborhood communities. Furthermore, it is a form of real savings—something of his to pass on to his children—to the oncoming generation.

Public aid and rent subsidies, on the other hand, do generate some undesirable "negative" forces which discourage self-help and personal improvements. The most objection-

---

[2] David A. Satter, "West Side Story: Home Is Where the Welfare Check Comes," *The New Republic* (July 2, 1966), p. 17.

[3] Personal letter from staff member of the Bicentennial Civic Improvement Association during summer of 1967; also refer *Congressional Record;* vol. 113, pt. 8, p. 10382.

[4] Report from *The Bicentennial Civic Improvement Corporation* (August 3, 1966), p. 9.

able of the negative effects is the public housing provision that when a family's income rises to a minimum figure the family must leave the project. Instead of encouraging personal economic improvement, this provision stifles enterprise and perpetuates low incomes. Furthermore, studies seem to indicate that the income ceiling causes a pessimistic atmosphere of frustration to pervade the downtrodden public housing community composed solely of families with low incomes.

For greater success in our urban renewal and rehabilitation efforts, we must expand our capacity for putting people on their own economic feet. Initial observations and preliminary investigation indicate that increased homeownership will provide substantial progress in this crucial area of concern.

THREE MYTHS AND THE PROPERTY TAX

Following my initial observations on the direction of the historical trends, I would like to offer for exploration three myths which have been advanced in connection with prevailing ideas of effective methods of development of central cities. These myths have generally been advocated by those proposing to turn over to municipalities either Federal block grants or large amounts of Federal funds. The first myth is that the Federal tax system (essentially income taxes, personal and corporate), a tax on economic activity, has proven to be so efficacious that there is a "dividend" which may be declared. The converse is true. The Federal income tax rates, I would argue, even with the 1964 cuts, are still beyond the point of diminishing returns and are still causing judgments to be reached for tax reasons rather than economic reasons.

In other words, the high rates still impede the full development of the present Federal tax base (economic activity) and also stunt the growth of the ultimate base upon which this base of economic activity itself relies; namely, wealth. The tax take is, therefore, less than it would be if the rates were lower and applied to a larger base. We could today embark upon a 20-year program of reducing Federal income tax rates every 2 years and continue to increase our Federal revenues.

The second myth is that Federal block grants provide swift and flexible remedies to urban problems. The economics of the Federal block grant is unsound for the same reasons that the Federal dividend is untrue and economically unsound. On political grounds, I consider the block grant undesirable since it must invariably involve Federal control—Congressional responsibility to the taxpayers it affects could not allow otherwise. The political pain of imposing taxes must always be tied to the pleasure of spending tax money if expenditure discipline is to be maintained to insure that programs are carefully designed and administered.

The third myth is that the real estate property tax is overburdened. To establish this point, of course, I now must move against innate prejudice while, in discussing the other two points, I had it going with me. No taxpayer thinks any tax or tax system is not an overburden. However, the property tax has certainly responded in a remarkable fashion since World War II in providing the revenues for building and maintaining schools, streets, sewer lines, and disposal plants, and so forth, and rendering expanded services to the community in policing, fire prevention, education, and so forth. But because it has expanded greatly and rapidly does not warrant the conclusion per se that it is overextended. It might warrant the opposite conclusion. One test to reach a proper determination is: Has the wealth which is its base expanded more rapidly than the tax? Have the benefits: cost ratios, proven to be economically sound? Wealth, particularly related to these expenditures, actually has increased more during this postwar period than GNP, economic activity. Another test is found in the fact that the community bond issues for schools, sewers, streets, parks; and other community facilities are consistently voted affirmatively in over 70 percent of the submissions and many of the 20-odd percent bond issues which are rejected are then restructured and resubmitted, at which time they then receive an affirmative vote. The wealth of State and local government, and of the private sector, that is the value of the assets minus the outstanding debt, has increased considerably. Putting it another way, the ratio of debt to wealth of the States and local communities has decreased markedly since World War II in a commendable fashion, albeit debt itself was rising rapidly. It is to be noted that on the contrary the ratio of Federal debt to Federal wealth has had a very disturbing incline and today is a negative ratio and at a very dangerous level. Yet, local and State debt in aggregate, not ratio, because wealth has increased more greatly, have increased more rapidly since World War II than has Federal debt. Nor is it any consolation that Federal debt as a ratio of State and local debt, or of private debt, is less today than it was in 1946: 1946 is the poorest year to pick as a benchmark. We are merely seeing an adjustment back from World War II Federal expansion to what is peacetime and growth normalcy.

Other statistics also belie the unbearable "burden of the property tax." For example, many States, including States with populous metropolitan regions; for example, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, and Texas, are now paying less in State and local taxes as a percentage of personal income than the national averge for both State and local tax obligation and also State and local property tax obligation. In other words, many local governments could significantly increase their property tax rates—let alone maintain their present rates—without exceeding the national average for State and local taxation as a percentage of personal income.

There is additional evidence attesting to the unrealized potential of the property tax. A conference on urban taxation meeting at Claremont College in the summer of 1965 estimated that the market value of real property in the United States (land and improvements) is approximately $1 trillion. As of 1965, this tax base produced taxes of some $17 billion or only 1.7 percent of the tax base.

Much potential revenue goes unrealized because tax assessors assess vacant land far below its asking price. For example, idle land priced at $20,000 an acre on Long Island is commonly assessed as low as $500 an acre. In fact, idle land across the country is assessed at a lower percentage of its market value than is developed land. The 1962 Census of Governments showed vacant lots assessed an average of 20.5 percent of "true value" whereas the figure for nonfarm homes was 30.6 percent.

The Committee for Economic Development and the Tax Foundation have taken steps in the right direction to uncover the fallacy which I have just discussed. For years I have been trying to point out that here is the Cinderella of taxes dressed in shabby clothes, with smutty face, keeping the household going while her much less beautiful and productive sisters, in glamor clothes go to the ball. If only we could recognize the beauty of Cinderella, wash the smut off her face and hands, and dress her in modest, but up-to-date clothes. Toward this end, it is my hope that this compendium will help to move the dialog forward.

The property tax needs more understanding and certainly a lot of updating if we are to enjoy its maximum advantages. The property tax is dependent upon sound and equitable assessment policies which, in turn, depend upon sound zoning laws and up-to-date building codes equitably enforced. It requires an understanding that idle land—raw land—should be taxed at a somewhat higher rate than improvement on the land, so that there will be an encouragement to put land to its most productive use. The property tax is the one tax of all the taxes available to governments that is antihoarding and hoarding, I submit, is the basic sin to a productive economy.

Not only should urban land be taxed at a somewhat higher value than improvements, but urban land should also be assessed and taxed with major consideration given to the location of the land—its "site value." These tax procedures can readily and effectively be coordinated with zoning laws, local policy, and the work of the city planner.

I also advocate a payment to State and local governments of sums in lieu of real property taxes on Federal property located within a local jurisdiction. This tax reform is only basic equity inasmuch as the Federal agency derives the same benefits as other citizens from schools, streets, sewers, fire and police protection, et cetera and it would, in an immediate and obvious sense, provide additional revenue for the State and local government. This tax change would also serve to impose a greater degree of discipline on the Federal Government in its acquisition and retention of land for Federal purposes because of its conformance with up-to-date cost accounting.

As a related factor, one should also observe that the failures of Federal fiscal policies have led to inflation and subsequent distortion of local assessments based as they are on dollar values covering a score of years. This result of the inept Federal fiscal policies has necessitated politically painful and costly reassessments of all local property at the same time in terms of the then current dollar value.

The property tax adheres to the sound economics of having the "users pay"; the benefit-to-cost ratio, is maximized. Furthermore, the property taxes pay for services, and improvements which actually increase the value of the property. For example, a 4.6-mile section of Toronto's Yonge Street subway which was opened in 1954 caused property values along its route to rise 37 percent between 1954 and 1958 while the rest of the city improved an average of 20 percent.

The irrefutable logic of taxing the value added to raw land is most clearly illustrated by the rise in land value on Staten Island when the Verrazano Narrows Bridge was built. The bridge itself cost the taxpayers $350 million. Owners of idle land then enjoyed a tremendous rise in land prices while at the same time the low assessments on idle land enabled them to carry the smallest proportion of the tax burden. The economic justice of having the benefactors of a service pay for the service was reversed in this case. Those who benefited the most—the owners of vacant land—paid the least.

My hometown, Webster Groves, Mo., also provides an excellent case in point. Good property taxes over a period of years have resulted in an excellent local school system which, in turn, has enhanced and maintained local property values. A house in Webster Groves may sell for as much as $5,000 more than a comparable house in surrounding communities having school systems without the equivalent reputation.

TAX EQUALIZATION

Some critics of State and local taxation notably ignoring the equalization laws within States and sometimes within counties argue that there are great differences between the 50 States and that a Federal mechanism is necessary to equalize between the rich and poor States. Revenue for primary and secondary education often falls prey to this superficial argument. It is said that many of the children who need to be educated are in the poor States which cannot afford to bear the costs of education while the ability to pay taxes lies in the richer States. Well, I have often sought to answer this syllogism. I ask, where are these so-called poor States?

The answer to that question is quite ready, in the South, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, etc. I then ask, but on what basis do you say these are poor States? The answer to this is also quite ready. "Take a look at the per capita income of these States." Indeed, the per capita income in these States is relatively low. But then, I ask the next question, and the answer to this is not quite so ready. But these States do not pay for education out of taxes or income, do they? Don't they pay for education costs and community facilities of all sorts essentially by use of the property tax? If this is so, and it is so, let's take a look at the assessed valuation in these States which allegedly are so poor. Here we have the true answer. There are not really any poor States in the United States. The States so often cited are States where there are poorly developed and enforced property taxes, where there is a considerable amount of absentee ownership, among other things. Where the assessment on real estate hardly match the true value of the land and structure.

For example let's take a close look at Alabama. Although Alabama has a statute which calls for the assessment of property at 60 percent of its fair and reasonable market value in 1964–65, the tax evaluation of property in Alabama averaged no more than 18.6 percent of market value. This figure is significantly lower than the national average of 29 percent. A study by the National Education Association Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities further reveals:

"The extension of exemptions to corporate and individual owners of large landholdings and the unrealistic assessment practice of the publicly elected tax assessors have so eroded the property base that in 1965 ad valorem tax proceeds provided only 18 percent of the total tax revenues of the State and local governments in Alabama. No other State derived such a small percentage of its tax revenues from property assessment.[5]

This situation in Alabama and in similar States results in the loss of an overwhelming proportion of potential property tax revenue.

These are the very States, by the way, which are digging themselves further in the hole by waiving property taxes for a period of years to entice businesses to locate in their area—on the assumption, I suppose, that having the payrolls will assist them to have a better tax base than one based upon property wealth. This is surely regressive thinking for the 20th century. This theory can be found entrenched in most of our Latin American neighbors and throughout the world and until the theory is abandoned, I could argue, these societies will not move ahead.

No, there is no need for the Federal Government to get into the business of Federal equalization laws, although there is still plenty of reason for all the States to continually update their State equalization laws for education. And there is much room for counties to pass education equalization laws so that tax revenues can be spread from wealth areas, measured in terms of property wealth to areas of less property wealth. Above all, there is ample room for modernizing our property tax laws and keeping them up to date—which means, among many things, modernizing our zoning laws and keeping them up to date. No community can support schools or community facilities—except the very few unusually wealthy communities—with a property tax based heavily on home assessments. A properly zoned community will derive only 30 percent of its revenues from the property tax on homes, the 70 percent coming from the property tax on commerce, industry, and utilities.

[5] *Wilcox County, Alabama: A Study of Social, Economic, and Educational Poverty* (Washington: National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association of the United States, 1967), p. 72.

EFFICIENCY

While on this subject of education and taxation, I would also like to mention the often overlooked factor of economic efficiency. The Federal Government not being the sector of government which is charged with spending the education dollar has the difficult and costly job of transferring the tax dollars collected to the local governmental agencies which are charged with the spending of them. As has often been observed, send a tax dollar to Washington, D.C., to be returned to be spent in the community and it comes back bady clipped. We certainly can cut down on the amount the dollar gets clipped when it is sent on its long journey to Washington and thence back to the community, but we must recognize that there will always be considerable cost in undertaking the round trip journey in the first place. And we may well ask, is this trip necessary?

I want tax collection for efficiency's sake to be pretty close to the agency of government that is going to spend the money so that there is a minimum of cost in transferring the money from the agency that collects it to the agency that spends it. Also a closeness between the people who raise the revenue and those who spend it imposes a discipline on the spending agencies since they have a better understanding of the cost of spending.

BUILDING CODES

In addition to proper state and county tax equalization measures, equitably enforced building codes are an imperative if we are to reap the full benefits of the property tax. An editorial in one of my home town newspapers, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* on June 16, 1967, presented disturbing examples of selective housing code enforcement. Its disclosures reveal such inequities as the following:

"Sixteen investment companies have been named by representatives from community agencies as the most recalcitrant owners and managers of slum properties. These companies control much of the substandard housing in St. Louis. One company owns an estimated 1,500 units, most of which are in violation of the housing code.

"While the residences of individual owners are inspected and unresolved cases are referred to court, hundreds of dwellings owned by investment companies escape. From January to November 1966 approximately 300 housing cases were referred to the Associate City Counselor for prosecution. Only 10 per cent of these cases involved investment companies.

"A resident owner was fined $500—$450 of which was stayed, while one of the largest investment companies was fined $10 for his failure to abide by city standards on one piece of property. Another was fined $10 for two buildings. Still another was fined $15 for three buildings." [6]

If injustices such as these persist in our cities, many of the beneficial aspects of local tax procedures and zoning regulations will be completely lost.

As far as I am concerned, all the preceding material has pointed in one direction—against the involvement of the Federal Government. Our emphasis should be placed instead on the State and local government. To most effectively cope with the economic and political problems of the metropolitan community, we must concentrate our energy on the development of the economic and political task of the State and local governments.

There is, however, a Federal component to building code enforcement. The Department of Housing and Urban Development at present is authorized $750 million for urban renewal and code enforcement. Of that amount HUD has allocated only $56 million for code enforcement. In fact, a Republican proposal to require 20 percent of renewal funds to go to code enforcement was defeated in 1965.

The code enforcement approach through HUD funds is available when the Federal Government is confronted with a sudden need for rat control and other pest control programs. Merely by increasing the amount of money available for code enforcement (either by raising the present $750 million HUD authorization or by allocating a greater percentage of the present $750 million for code enforcement) the Federal Government can efficiently utilize existing agencies and standards (which are required under every city's "workable program" for urban renewal aid). This approach also has the advantage of including low-interest loans to slum dwellings owners to eliminate health hazards (such as rats) and keep the building in a healthful state. Through this provision "the slumlord" is given a financial interest in maintaining a healthy environment.

[6] "Escaping the Housing Code," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (June 16, 1967).

THE PROPERTY TAX AND THE TRENDS

There is a crucial and potentially valuable relationship between the property tax and the historical and economic trends of the city. With the end of the old high rise industrial core region much industry relocates in suburbia and provides a great source of revenue for the suburban communities. In fact the tax policies which assess land at a higher rate than improvements and in terms of "site value" complement the effects of decentralization. Industry may assume as much as 75 percent of the tax burden in urban and suburban areas. Crestwood, Mo., in my own district, conforms almost completely to this kind of industrial tax situation.

The property tax becomes most productive when effectively coordinated with policy formulation. For example, Melbourne, Australia, is meeting approximately 60 percent of the cost of a new subway through higher assessment and taxation on the property—business property—which would benefit from the new subway. In Melbourne, local property owners in the area served by the subway are to help pay for the system by annually turning over to the city one-fourth of the increase in assessed valuation during the first 10 years the subway is in operation. Highway and expressway construction, can, in a similar way, utilize the property tax to meet construction costs. Furthermore, this use of the property tax meets the expenses of expanding transportation facilities in the metropolitan area—a direct and efficient response to the decentralization of the city.

I have devoted much time to discussing urban decentralization, but now I must speculate about the shape and function of the core region of our center city. Jobs demanding face-to-face communication most naturally will tend to locate where there is a dense aggregation of people—center city. This can result in a growing and thriving business and commercial community in the region. The core region can serve as a center for sports, culture, and amusements.

Following along in the same vein of thought, I can envision the property tax coordinated with zoning as a vital means of city planning. For example, the central city core region can be designated for commerce, business, amusements, sports, culture, and apartment houses through zoning laws and a high "site" property tax. Tax policy can affect land usage by assigning high assessments for good locations. Also the site tax—or land tax as it is often called—can be used to deter slum formation and land speculation. Finally, zoning regulations might be used to actually help expedite industry's

natural trend to decentralize from the center city area to peripheral areas of the city and the surrounding country area.

These last comments have emerged from my own personal speculation in light of the data I have observed. As we now move ahead, many of the local programs have to be viewed as experiments. Each city becomes a laboratory for the political scientist and the practicing politician. In fact, this leads us to an area where a Federal agency can be useful. A national bureau for compiling data and providing information on the various "urban experiments" would increase the possibilities of success for programs initiated by local governments.

VARIATIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND SUPPLEMENTARY FISCAL TOOLS

There are useful variations and modifications of the property tax which I have not discussed. One of the most common is the neighborhood assessment. Levying a neighborhood assessment for the first cost of a new service or facility adheres to the principle of "having the user pay." During my discussion of property tax assessments and city planning, I cited the new subway in Melbourne, Australia, an imaginative application of the neighborhood assessment concept.

A tax device similar to the neighborhood assessment is the land value increment tax. In this case, tax payment is made only when land values actually rise in response to the improvement.

Also the various formulas for emphasizing the "land" portion of the property tax deserve consideration. One plan already having legal status is the so-called Pittsburgh plan which taxes land at twice the rate of improvements. Earlier in this paper, I elaborated on the necessity of assessing land at a higher rate than the improvements. An extreme response to this need is the policy of shifting the entire burden to the site value alone. This procedure has been successfully executed for as many as 70 years in Australia. New Zealand, Denmark, and a number of cities of South Africa have also successfully conducted this tax program. In this country the actual determination of these property tax formulas—with any new emphasis in the direction of land taxation which might occur—should reside with the State and local governments. In the long run, statewide and countrywide coordination is necessary to achieve fair tax equalization.

Some local efforts at metropolitan consolidation and regional fiscal coordination can be viewed as partial remedies for the problems of tax equalization. Before looking at two specific cases, I again want to emphasize my belief that local policies and programs should, whenever possible, be studied as experiments which might provide information for other cities facing similar problems.

In 1949 a city-parish government was instituted in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Parishes correspond to counties in most States. As a county coordinating body the government has jurisdiction over the following: the construction and repair of streets and highways, the power to zone for the entire area, the power to prohibit the incorporation of addl tional municipalities; and finally, a countywide property tax.

The major fiscal tool of the Baton Rouge city-parish government is a two-level property tax, with a lower rate applying outside the central city. In 1962, for example, the city property tax rate was $12 per $1,000 assessed valuation compared with $4 per $1,000 assessed valuation elsewhere in the parish. The city-parish council did vote a 1-percent sales tax which applies uniformly through the parish. Essentially, the two-level property tax is of special significance because it does enable the core city to draw revenues from the surrounding suburbs while at the same time this fiscal device is made palatable to the suburbs through the lower assessment on suburban property.

The Metropolitan Toronto Corp. also deserves mention. In total, its function includes provision of water supply, sewage disposal, arterial highways, parks, schools, financing, certain welfare services, coordinated planning, policing, business licensing, and air-pollution control. Although the corporation has no power to tax directly, it does play a major role in the area of tax equalization. To insure uniformity, the corporation assesses all property in the region. The corporation gets its funds through assessments on each municipality—13 independent municipalities including Toronto—based on the ratio their property assessments bear to the area's total.

Some solid progress has been made in the direction of consolidation. Many organizations, such as the Committee for Economic Development have begun to panic over "the balkanization" of our metropolitan regions, but I must reply that their panic is uncalled for. Positive steps have been taken.

A study of the local school districts in the United States reveals that consolidation is making an impressive advance. As of January 1, 1967, there were only 23,461 local districts as compared to 55,000 local school districts in 1956. The 1967 figure represents a 60-percent decline over the preceding decade. To bring the decline into sharper focus, we see that as of January 1, 1967, there were 3,541 fewer local school districts than on January 1, 1966. In fact, over the last two decades there has been a 75-percent decrease in the local school districts. In 1946 there were 101,000; 20 years later there are less than one-fourth as many local school districts.

It also should be noted that in some cases consolidation is advancing with a dramatic suddenness. Kansas, for example, had 1,500 local school districts in 1965. By the end of the following year there were only 349 local school districts in the entire State of Kansas.

The property tax should be the major fiscal tool of the local governments, but here is room for the implementation of other useful fiscal measures. Among the most promising fiscal techniques in terms of revenue potential and also tax equilization are the local payroll tax and the local income tax.

Local income and payroll taxes assume a great measure of desirability, first of all, because they allow a shift in fiscal emphasis from the Federal Government to the local governments. By lessening Federal payroll and income taxes in favor of local payroll and income taxes, we speed our revenue directly from those people paying the taxes to those spending the tax revenues. This shortening of the distance traveled by the revenue dollar will result in a cutting of administrative costs. Secondly, greater local spending of increased local revenues means more of our spending will be subjected to the "discipline of closeness"—the discipline which emerges when people spending the dollars must also directly raise the tax revenue. Toward this end, I would develop the urban payroll and income taxes and provide that the urban income and payroll taxes levied be deductible from Federal tax obligations.

The question of whether to use urban payroll taxes, urban income taxes, or a combination of the two is integrally tied to the issues of tax equalization. The basic relevance of the urban payroll tax and the urban income tax to tax equalization can be elucidated through a translation of these two taxes into the issue of the origin of income versus the residence of the income earner.

A primary motivation lying behind the levy of a city payroll tax is that revenue is drawn from people who work in the city, use many of the city's services, and then flee home to the suburbs—free from the city's tax grasp. Furthermore, these same suburbanites are people who previously had lived in the city and then moved outward. It has largely been the case that the people moving outward have higher incomes than those people left in the city. A payroll tax consequently helps equalize the difference.

There is, however, a problem raised if the suburbs institute an income tax. A suburban income tax would tax the same people who pay the urban payroll tax. Some States remedy this problem by giving precedence to the tax levied by one's place of residence.

I have found two possible formulas for balancing income and payroll taxes. A plan adopted by the State of Michigan enacts a broad-based income tax and gives residents a credit for taxes paid to any other local government. Under this plan wages, salaries, and profits would be allocated to jurisdictions of origin and interest and dividends to jurisdictions of residence. Since business property yields a larger share of total metropolitan tax receipts than does residential property, the Michigan plan probably favors the jurisdiction over origin.

An alternative plan balances origin and residence taxes equally by giving taxpayers in one jurisdiction (i.e., of residence or origin) a 50 percent credit for taxes owed to the other jurisdiction. Finally by manipulating State and local tax formulas such as the ones just discussed, the States and localities of this country can, I believe, continue their progress toward greater tax equalization.

There are ways of conducting State and local income tax programs which minimize administrative costs. By authorizing only municipal taxes that use the State income tax base and were collected by the States for subsequent return to jurisdictions of origin, the local and State governments can greatly lessen administrative costs. Consideration should also be given to having State taxes use the Federal base in an effort to provide additional efficiency.

Another fiscal tool which has served our urban areas quite effectively is the multi-State agency. Article I, section 10, clause 3 of the Constitution explicitly allows States, with the consent of Congress to enter into agreements or compacts with other States. With this congressional authorization, different States containing the same metropolitan region can join together in tackling common regional problems. The Port of New York Authority, for example, represents one such interstate compact.

Interstate cooperation is most common in solving transportation problems; e.g., major bridges and river authorities. Furthermore, this kind of interstate service is able to capture substantial revenues through direct user fees, namely tolls.

Transportation is not the only important area for interstate cooperation. For example, water shortage problems in urban regions also calls for interstate agreements. In response to a critical water problem in the Philadelphia metropolitan region; New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware have joined in the Delaware River Compact.

In beginning my discussion of the city, I said that it was first necessary to understand the underlying dynamics of urban development. From this orientation, I have guided my analysis by the economic and historical trends of the city. These trends, I strongly believe, should also be acknowledged when delving into the problems of the urban Negro.

THE URBAN NEGRO

In light of economic trends, the Negro problem represents an acute case of immobility. By taking the broad view of the Negro problem, we quite naturally recognize that the racial and social issues deserve consideration but there is also a pressing economic issue which is most deserving of our attention.

The basic problem of Negro immobility can be interpreted in terms of job training and economic skills. This factor of job competence, however, can be further reduced to

the dimensions of an urban-rural continuance of backgrounds for the Negroes in our cities.

It is important to realize that the Negro problem today is part of an age-old problem that has little to do with race or color. It has to do with the basic economics involved in any society which is industrializing. An industrializing society has marked migrations of sizable populations from rural living to urban living. The more rapid this movement the more aggravated the problems of social and economic adjustment become. The increased incident of crime among former rural people now living under urban conditions has long been observed. The closer people live with each other, of course, the more their daily actions affect each other. The more contact the more opportunity there is for friction, for more breaches of the codes both social and legal which govern the relationships of people living close to each other. Indeed, the codes of urban living are not only different from the codes of rural living, but perforce they are more comprehensive and complicated and hence lend themselves to more violations.

Part of the problem of adjustment comes from shifting from an economy which has much of barter about it to an economy which is almost entirely a money economy. Where the money economy cuts off in urban areas a State-organized welfare economy takes over in place of an informal community welfare economy.

Part of the problem of adjustment comes from the traditionally lower, as well as different, educational standards and standards of skills in the rural communities from those of the urban communities.

We must not identify these economic and social adjustment problems as racial problems if we are to solve them. The predominance of the Negro in the group shifting from rural to urban living beginning with World War II and continuing up to the present time has tended to confuse the problem. So, too, hasty analysis has led some to identify civil rights problems as racial problems. Again it is the confusion arising from the predominance of the Negro in issues involving civil rights that lies at the root of their obfuscation.

It must be constantly borne in mind that in the past decade—and the decade immediately ahead of us seems to be following the pattern—automation, or rapid technological change, has accelerated its pace and so aggravated the social and economic problems stemming from this massive migration.

In our Federal income tax laws we have always given a deduction for donations to charitable and educational institutions. These new tax theorists say thereby the Government subsidizes these institutions. I say we give the deductions not to subsidize but rather on the theory that we did not wish to tax this area of endeavor. We as a matter of policy prefer to obtain the money to run the Government from other areas of endeavor. This is money being spent for social purposes which if it were not so spent probably would require the Government to spend it directly.

So the tax credit to those who spend money on education, which I advocate, is entirely consistent with American classical tax theory. If the private individuals do not spend the money for education then the people through their government would probably do so as a last resort—although I submit much more inefficiently.

Consistent with the theory of tax neutralism and classical American tax theory, I have introduced in the House, legislation which would give a tax credit for higher education. For elementary and secondary education, the taxpayer would have the option of claiming a $50 tax credit per elementary and secondary school child against his Federal income tax, up to a maximum of $200. This education bill is also desirable because it capitalizes on the advantages and benefits of a sound local property tax.

The tax credit can also be used to combat water and air pollution and to develop job training and retraining. I have also initiated legislation for an incentive tax credit to private business and industry to fight water and air pollution. I have also advocated what is called the Human Investment Act, which provides a tax credit to employers for part of the expenses of providing job training and retraining programs.

In conclusion, I would like to cite the following prediction by Henry Ford: "We shall solve the city problem by leaving the city."[7]

Today, it is our task to recognize the validity of Henry Ford's prediction and use his message as a prescription for our future action.

Our cities are decentralizing and we can only progress by harnessing the forces of dispersion and not by bucking these forces head on. To deal with the problems of an expanding urban America, we must place a new emphasis on local and State government. We also must show a new respect for the potential of an updated property tax; and finally, we must recognize the role of low-density living and increased homeownership in the future of Metropolitan America.

Dr. Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics at Columbia, in a recent article published in the New York Times Magazine of February 9, 1964, puts these problems into a positive context:

"In Chicago, for instance, 80 percent of the Negro families have a higher income than 50 percent of white families. In the West, the nonwhite income distribution is almost the exact counterpart of income distribution among the white population of the South."

The most important area of education and instruction for the urban Negro is that of job training and vocational education. When these people acquire job competence and needed skills they will have greatly enhanced their own opportunities for increased mobility. Furthermore, local services providing listings of job opportunities and coordination between the unemployed and job vacancies should further increase the opportunity for economic and social improvement.

At this point, I must emphasize that racial restrictions on Negro mobility exist in serious measure and, of course, it is important economically, socially, and from a humanitarian standpoint to eliminate this bias and discrimination. What I do want to emphasize, however, is that we must balance the economic and social aspects of the Negro problem and recognize the economic impact of job immobility on the racial problems of discrimination.

REFORM IN FEDERAL TAX LAW

Education, job training and retraining, air pollution and water pollution all pose problems confronted by our urban governments. At present many indirect and inefficient Federal programs address themselves to these problems through block grants and Federal subsidies. Much direct and effective aid, however, can easily be funneled into these problem areas by merely providing tax credits in Federal income taxes.

Let me state the case for this most needed reform in Federal tax law in my own semantics because it is usually presented even by some of its advocates in the semantics of those who oppose it. This reform is in accordance with American classic tax theory; namely, that we do not tax money which is being spent for a social purpose which if it were not so spent we would call upon the government to spend. Putting it another way, we know that when we extract money from the private sector to pay for the expenditures of governmental services we are going to have some impact on the economy. We seek to keep that impact as a minimum. We prefer not to tax industries on the wane, we prefer to tax industries on the rise. We prefer not to tax low income, we prefer to tax high incomes. We prefer to tax wealth, not the process of creating the wealth. We do not tax money spent for desirable social purposes.

This is the tax theory of the tax neutralists. This is the classical tax theory in America. There is a new school of tax writers who are not neutralists. Because the power of taxation to effect economic results and to render economic decisions is so great, and I might add, so subtle these theorists advocate an old system as if it were new, to mulct rather than to tax. They seek to write tax laws to deliberately produce economic decisions—their decisions—to channel expenditures into certain areas supplanting the private decisionmaking process with the political process.

[7] Mitchell Gordon, *Sick Cities* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 13.

Article by Representative Emanuel Celler on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce, I was deeply gratified to receive today a copy of a Law Review article by the learned and distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Representative EMANUEL CELLER. The article which appears in the March 1968 issue of the Fordham Law Review is both scholarly and statesmanlike in analyzing the political and economic ramifications of State taxes imposed on interstate commerce.

Chairman CELLER has indeed made a major contribution to the literature on this important subject. I commend his article to my colleagues and include it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD today.

The article follows:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM DEALING WITH STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

(By EMANUEL CELLER*)

I. BACKGROUND

Prominent on the list of great legacies which modern America received from the original framers of the Constitution is the principle of a national common market. It is this principle—the principle of the Commerce Clause—that has bound our states together in the economic union which is so essential to their political union. At the same time, this principle has also played a major role in the phenomenal development of our American economy. Yet, essential as the common market principle has been for both our political and economic development, the very nature of our federal system has precluded us from attaining a completely open market and necessitated that some proper balance be struck between the need for the free movement of

*United States Representative from Tenth District of New York; member of the New York Bar.

goods and persons across state lines and the need of the states for revenue.

From the enactment of the Constitution until 1959 the entire responsibility for reconciling conflicts between the tax policies of the states and the national interest in the free flow of commerce was shouldered by the courts. Congress itself enacted no statutes to give the courts guidance. As a result, a vast body of decisional law provided the only standards for determining whether any particular state or local levy was violative of the national principle of free trade among the states. However, most of the cases which arose were so diversified and of such peculiarly local significance that they did not generate strong political interest on a national level.

While Congress remained silent, significant trends developed which resulted in a balkanization of the economy. As each state reached farther and farther beyond its own borders to tax more and more companies the burdens on the courts became unmanageable, and it became clear that the judicial branch of the government was inadequate to balance state revenue requirements with the national need for an open market. Indeed, the Supreme Court itself came to recognize its own inadequacy in this area. Thus, in recent years several members of the Court with such diverse philosophies as Justices Jackson,[1] Rutledge,[2] Black,[3] Frankfurter,[4] Douglas,[5] and Clark[6] have all subscribed to this view and have either directly or implicitly called upon Congress to act.

Essentially, the inadequacy of the judicial process to accommodate both the competing demands of the states for revenues and the national need for a free flow of commerce is an inherent one. It arises from the fact that the Court can deal only with individual cases and is substantially handicapped by its inability to explore fully the national impact of a broad conglomeration of levies imposed on interstate companies by all fifty states and literally thousands of local governments. The late Justice Frankfurter has described these built-in limitations of the Court in the following terms:

"At best, this Court can only act negatively; it can determine whether a specific state tax is imposed in violation of the Commerce Clause. Such decisions must necessarily depend on the application of rough and ready legal concepts. We cannot make a detailed inquiry into the incidence of diverse economic burdens in order to determine the extent to which such burdens conflict with the necessities of national economic life. Neither can we devise appropriate standards for dividing up national revenue on the basis of more or less abstract principles of constitutional law, which cannot be responsive to the subleties of the interrelated economies of Nation and State.

"The problem calls for solution by devising a congressional policy. Congress alone can provide for a full and thorough canvassing of the multitudinous and intricate factors which compose the problem of the taxing freedom of the States and the needed limits on such state taxing power.[7]

Faced with its own inherent limitations, the Court generally maintained a permissive attitude toward state levies on interstate commerce[8]—often declining in the absence of federal legislation to invalidate state revenue measures.[9] Encouraged by the Court's permissive posture, the state tax administrators asserted broader and broader jurisdictional claims over interstate commerce, so that by 1959 it was clear that Congress would have to act if the rapidly growing trend toward a balkanized domestic economy were to be reversed. In that year, in two companion cases, *Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.* v. *Minnesota* and *Williams* v. *Stockham Valves & Fittings, Inc.*,[10] the Supreme Court decided that in the absence of federal legislation a company could be required to pay a state income tax, even though it was engaged *exclusively* in interstate commerce in the taxing state. Prior to this decision the view had been widely held by the business community that a company could not be taxed by a state unless it engaged at least to some extent in *intrastate* commerce within the taxing state.[11]

The reaction of the business community to the *Northwestern* decision was extremely sharp. Small and moderate-size businesses in particular became gravely concerned with the prospect of having to comply with diverse, complex and overlapping income tax laws which would be beyond their capacity to handle. Not only was the business community fearful of future liabilities, but it was also confronted with the specter of assessment for countless numbers of back years as well. Having failed to file tax returns in the past in the belief that no liability had existed, generally they could not rely on statutes of limitations to bar assessments. In the *Northwestern* case, for example, the taxpayer was held liable for back taxes covering a period of some sixteen years. Under all of these circumstances, the business community regarded it as imperative for Congress to act.[12]

The reaction by Congress to the *Northwestern* decision was swift. Within weeks after the decision, hearings were held by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.[13] Meanwhile, both the House Judiciary Committee[14] and the Senate Finance Committee[15] reported out bills designed to provide "stopgap" relief while Congress could develop a more comprehensive program based on more detailed information. The outgrowth of the bills was Public Law 86–272,[16] which became effective in September of 1959.

Public Law 86–272 had a two-fold significance. First, the statute precluded a state or subdivision from imposing an income tax in situations in which the company's only activities in the state were limited to the solicitations of orders by salesmen or the making of sales through independent contractors. Second, both the House and the Senate viewed the statute as a temporary measure designed to prevent a further expansion of the jurisdictional reach of the states, pending the completion of a thorough study of state income taxes—which was considered necessary to achieve a permanent solution.[17]

Although Public Law 86–272 was limited in scope so as to apply only to income taxes, it soon became clear to the Congress that other forms of taxes were likewise having a profound impact on interstate commerce. Several months after the enactment of Public Law 86–272, the Supreme Court held in *Scripto, Inc. v. Carson*[18] that an out-of-state seller could be required to collect a use tax on shipments to in-state purchasers even thought the seller maintained no facilities in the taxing state and its sales were made entirely through independent contractors. This decision raised apprehensions in the business communities similar to those which had been raised by the *Northwestern* decision concerning income taxes. Indeed, the ramifications of *Scripto* are so broad that even those who tend to support the views of the state tax collectors regard it as a "stunning extraterritorial extension of a State's reach."[19]

Following *Scripto*, bills were introduced in both the House and Senate which would have extended the jurisdictional protection of Public Law 86–272 into the sales and use tax area and would also have broadened the Congressional study so as to include sales and use taxes. Deeply concerned with the broad impact of *Scripto*, but reluctant to restrict state taxing powers without a thorough study, the 87th Congress enacted legislation which was limited to broadening the scope of the study called for by Public Law 86–272. However, out of an awareness of the interrelated effects of a variety of taxes, Congress expanded the study to include not only sales and use taxes but "all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce. . . ."[20]

II. THE CONGRESSIONAL STUDY AND THE DEFECTS IT DISCLOSED IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Pursuant to Public Law 86–272, as amended, a comprehensive study was initiated early in 1961 by a Special Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of Representative Edwin E. Willis of Louisiana. Since Congress had expressed its intention to act only on the basis of clearly documented facts, the primary objective of the study, as stated by Representative Willis, was "to develop a body of factual information, hitherto unavailable, as to the number and characteristics of interstate companies, the pattern of their activities across State lines, the cost of complying with State and local tax laws, the degree to which they were able to comply, and the effect on businesses and State revenues of various possible remedial proposals."[21]

The study conducted by the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce was one of the most exhaustive ever undertaken within the Congress, and occupies a total of four volumes published

---

[1] Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Minnesota, 322 U.S. 292, 306–07 (1944) (concurring opinion).

[2] International Harvester Co. v. Department of Treasury, 332 U.S. 340, 360 (1944) (concurring opinion; General Trading Co. v. State Tax Comm'n, 322 U.S. 335, 360 (1944) (concurring opinion); McLeod v. J. E. Dilworth Co., 322 U.S. 327, 360 (1944) (dissenting opinion).

[3] McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines, Inc., 309 U.S. 176, 188–89 (1940) (dissenting opinion); Gwin, White & Prince, Inc. v. Henneford, 305 U.S. 434, 448–55 (1939) (dissenting opinion); J. D. Adams Mfg. Co. v. Storen, 304 U.S. 307, 327 (1938) (dissenting opinion).

[4] Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota, 358 U.S. 450, 474–77 (1959) (dissenting opinion); Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Minnesota, 332 U.S. 292, 300 (1944); McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines, Inc., 309 U.S. 176, at 188–89 (1940) (dissenting opinion).

[5] McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines, Inc., 309 U.S. 176, 188–89 (1940) (dissenting opinion).

[6] Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota, 358 U.S. 450, 457–58 (1959).

[7] Id. at 476–77 (dissenting opinion) (footnote omitted).

[8] For discussion of the judicial approach see Federal Limitation on State Taxation of Interstate Business, 75 Harv. L. Rev. 953, 956–72 (1962).

[9] But see National Bellas Hess, Inc. v. Department of Revenue of Illinois, 386 U.S. 753 (1967).

[10] 358 U.S. 450 (1959).

[11] H.R. Rep. No. 1480, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1964).

[12] Id.

[13] Hearings on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce Before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959).

[14] H.R.J. Res. No. 936, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959), reporting H.J. Res. 450.

[15] S. Rep. No. 658, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959), reporting S. 2524.

[16] 15 U.S.C. §§ 381–84 (1959).

[17] See H.R.J. Res. 450, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959); CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 13, page 16354 (remarks of Senator Byrd).

[18] 362 U.S. 207 (1960).

[19] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 14 (1967) (separate views of Rep. Edward Hutchinson).

[20] 75 Stat. 41 (1961).

[21] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 4 (1967).

over a four and one half year period.[22] It has by now become the definitive work in its field and has provided a wealth of reliable data of value not only to the Congress but also to state legislators, lawyers, accountants and students of local and state fiscal problems.

Since the study was extremely comprehensive—covering major aspects of the tax structures of all fifty states and several hundred local governments—one cannot summarize it briefly without losing sight of the extraordinary complexity of the current levies on interstate commerce. Yet it is useful for purposes of this analysis to point out that the study revealed at least four major defects in the present system.

First, the study revealed that the system is characterized by widespread non-compliance and non-enforcement—with most companies simply not filing any form of tax return in any state in which they do not actually maintain a place of business.[23] For example, in the income tax area it was found that in 97.5 per cent of the cases in which liability existed in the absence of a place of business, no return was in fact filed.[24] In the sales tax area there was non-compliance in 93.5 per cent of the cases under similar circumstances.[25] At the same time, those companies which do in fact file tax returns were found not to be complying accurately with state and local rules. As a result, it is clear that the system creates gross inequities among similarly situated taxpayers and leaves the tax administrator free to exercise an extremely broad amount of discretion to determine just which taxpayers will be subject to rigorous enforcement. In addition, it is also clear that the business community does not have the capacity to comply without incurring grossly excessive compliance costs.

The second defect documented by the congressional study is the tendency of the present system to result in overtaxation in some cases and undertaxation in other cases.[26] In the income tax area, for example, it is possible for some companies to be taxable on more than 100 percent of their net earnings, while other similarly situated companies pay a tax on substantially less than 100 percent.[27]

A third defect of the current system results from the existence of some provisions in state laws which give to locally based companies benefits which are not made available to competitors who are based outside of the taxing state.[28] In the sales and use tax area, for example, some states discriminate against consumers who trade in automobiles that are purchased outside of the taxing state.[29] Still other states tax products which are produced outside of the state, while granting exemptions for identical products manufactured within the state.[30]

The fourth major defect of the present system is the attitude which it has generated among taxpayers, especially small and moderate-size companies. Faced with rules that are inherently unworkable and cannot possibly be enforced by the state tax administrators on a systematic basis, taxpayers generally have developed a widespread resistance to the assumption of responsibility. Rather than file return under circumstances in which the cost of preparing the return often exceeds the tax, it is understandable that the small company especially will simply disregard state and local requirements. Thus the system itself not only breeds a widespread disrespect for state and local tax laws, it also tends to foster disrespect for laws in general.[31]

III. THE PROPOSED INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT

Based on the study conducted by the Subcommittee, as well as on three months of extensive hearings held subsequent to the completion of the study,[32] the House Judiciary Committee reported out a proposed Interstate Taxation Act in the form of H.R. 16491 on September 7, 1966. Since the 89th Congress adjourned shortly thereafter, consideration by the House was not possible, and the proposal was reintroduced in the 90th Congress in the form of H.R. 2158. On March 7, 1967, the House Judiciary Committee again reported the measure favorably, together with several amendments which reflected a number of suggestions for improvements made largely by State tax administrators.[33] In July of 1967, H.R. 2158 was reported by the Committee on Rules. Although it was not scheduled for debate by the House of Representatives in the first session of the 90th Congress, its sponsors are hopeful that it will be considered during the second session.

The core of H.R. 2158 is found in Title 1 of the bill, which establishes uniform jurisdictional standards for each of the four types of taxes which were included in the congressional study: corporate income taxes, capital stock taxes, sales and use taxes, and gross receipts taxes. Under these standards a company would not be subject to the jurisdiction of any state in which it does not maintain a "business location," which is defined to include: the owning or leasing of real estate, the maintenance of a localized employee, or the regular maintenance of a stock of tangible personal property for sale in the ordinary course of business.

To the basic jurisdictional standard there are two significant exceptions. One exception occurs in the sales and use tax area in the form of a provision which makes an out-of-state seller liable for the collection of a tax if he regularly makes household deliveries in the state. The other exception to the basic "business location" standard occurs in the income and capital stock tax areas, and involves the exclusion from the jurisdictional rule of those corporations which have an annual net income in excess of one million dollars.

Title 2 of H.R. 2158 provides a supplement to the jurisdictional standard in the form of a limit on the percentage of income or capital which can be taxed in those cases in which a company does have a business location in more than one state. Under Title 2, the maximum percentage of income or capital which is taxable is determined by a two-factor formula based on property and wages.

Title 3 of the bill addresses itself to some specific problems in the sales and use tax area. It provides for, *inter alia*, the location of sales for tax purposes, the granting of credits for prior taxes, exemptions for the household goods of persons who establish new residences, the exclusion of interstate freight charges from the measure of the tax, and the relief from collection requirements in the case of sales to persons who are already registered under the sales tax program of the jurisdiction imposing the tax.

Title 4 provides for continued congressional scrutiny of the problems left unresolved by the bill. It affords the states an additional four years to make progress in resolving such problems before congressional committees are called to make specific proposals.

Title 5 contains definitional provisions. In addition, it prohibits states and localities from giving favored tax treatment to local companies or local products under sales and use taxes or gross receipts taxes. It also prohibits the states from charging a taxpayer with the cost of conducting an audit—a practice which is fairly common on the part of states such as Florida, which sends auditors throughout the entire United States and assesses the taxpayer with the travel and living expenses of the roving auditor.[34]

IV. THE JURISDICTIONAL BALANCE STRUCK BY H.R. 2158

Since the jurisdictional provisions in Title 1 provide the basic framework around which the entire proposal is structured, the balance struck by those provisions is of paramount significance to an understanding of the manner in which the bill would reconcile the taxing powers of the states with the national need for a common market.

In this regard it is especially important to keep in mind that the present jurisdictional assertions of the states cannot be complied with by small and moderate-size companies and in fact are beyond the enforcement capabilities of the states themselves. To understand the reason for this, one need scarcely look beyond the data collected by the Subcommittee with respect both to the types of companies engaged in interstate commerce and the numbers of state and local governments which assert jurisdiction over interstate commerce.

At the time the Subcommittee conducted its study, it ascertained that there were, at the very minimum, some 120,000 manufacturing and mercantile companies engaged in interstate commerce in the United States. Today, the number is obviously considerably larger. About half of these companies have fewer than twenty employees, a substantial number have fewer than ten employees, and a significant minority have fewer than five. Yet these companies typically sell their products in many states, and even among those companies which are so small that their annual gross proceeds are less than two hundred thousand dollars, a considerable number sell their products in a truly nationwide market.[35]

By 1965, the number of jurisdictions taxing interstate commerce was already staggering. There were in effect at the state level 38 sets of corporate income tax laws, 38 sales and use tax laws, 37 capital stock laws and 8 gross receipts tax laws of general applicability. In addition, to compound further the chaos and confusion, business taxes are rapidly proliferating on a local level—with sales taxes already imposed by over 2,300 localities, gross receipts taxes by over 1,000 and corporate income taxes by more than 100 local governments.[36]

In formulating jurisdictional standards, one alternative which was considered and rejected by the Judiciary Committee was a plan to give jurisdiction for sales and use tax purposes to each state into which an interstate company shipped its products. However, such a broad jurisdictional reach necessitated a substantial degree of centralized administration. In short, if each state and each locality were to impose it own tax on a nationwide scale, it was clear that the system could only be made to work under a uniform nationwide collection program. As a result, the proponents of the plan recommended that a cooperative system be established under which the states and their subdivisions, as well as the Treasury Department of the Federal Government, would cooperate to provide a single audit for those companies

[22] Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, Report on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce, H.R. Rep. No. 1480, 88th Cong., 2d Sess., vols. 1 and 2 (1964); H.R. Rep. No. 565, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., vol. 3 (1965); H.R. Rep. No. 952, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., vol. 4 (1965) (hereinafter referred to as Report).

[23] Report, vol. 4, at 1127.

[24] Report, vol. 1, at 303.

[25] Report, vol. 3, at 729.

[26] Report, vol. 4, at 1127.

[27] Report, vol. 1, at 408–11.

[28] Report, vol. 4, at 1127–28.

[29] Report, vol. 3, at 819–20.

[30] Id. at 820.

[31] Report, vol. 4, at 1128.

[32] Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14 (1966).

[33] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 5 (1967).

[34] Report, vol. 3, at 698–99.

[35] Report, vol. 1, at 90–91.

[36] Report, vol. 4, at 1121.

which market their goods in more than one state.[37]

Were the raising of state revenues the only consideration in the formulation of jurisdictional standards, then the effective enforcement of a broad jurisdictional reach that could be obtained through central administration would obviously be desirable. However, during the course of the lengthy hearings that were held prior to the formulation of H.R. 2158, state officials made it clear that one of their primary considerations was the preservation of the maximum possible amount of state and local autonomy.[38] As a result, the sponsors of H.R. 2158 concentrated their efforts on the formulation of jurisdictional rules which would not require central administration but which would have the least possible effect on state revenues and at the same time protect the small and moderate-size companies from being exposed to insurmountable compliance burdens.[39]

In fashioning jurisdictional standards, the results of the Subcommittee's earlier study provided workable criteria. The Subcommittee had found that, for all practical purposes, compliance and enforcement were both limited to circumstances in which the interstate company actually maintained some form of permanent establishment within the taxing state.[40] The Subcommittee's findings also made it clear that no state would stand to gain or lose a significant percentage of its total revenues if Congress were simply to lay down legal rules which were consistent with the present actual practice.[41] Thus, having rejected the possibility of centralized administration and having found that the states do not have the capacity to tax systematically out-of-state companies which do not have some form of permanent establishment within their borders, the sponsors of H.R. 2158 then sought a practical and workable jurisdictional rule embodying a permanent establishment concept.

Having evaluated a fairly broad series of "permanent establishment" rules, the Special Subcommittee proposed the "business location" definition which is embodied in H.R. 2158. Originally, the term "business location" was defined so as to include either the ownership or leasing of real property, or the maintenance of a local employee who does more than merely solicit orders. Subsequent to the introduction of H.R. 2158, this definition was subject to considerable criticism by state tax administrators who argued that the resulting jurisdictional rule would be too narrow as a result of its failure to give the states jurisdiction over companies which regularly maintain stocks of goods in the state, but which have no other jurisdictional contacts. In response to this criticism, H.R. 2158 was later amended by the Judiciary Committee so as to include the regular maintenance of a stock of goods as a basis for jurisdiction.[42]

Several additional features of the jurisdictional standard in Title 1 were also incorporated as a means of further reconciling the views of the state tax administrators with the need for a free flow of commerce. In this regard, perhaps one of the most controversial features of H.R. 2158 is the exclusion from jurisdictional protection in the income and capital stock tax area of corporations which earn more than one million dollars annually. The basis for such an exclusion was suggested by one of the foremost state tax administrators in the United States, Mr. Fred Cox of the Georgia Department of Revenue. Based on a careful evaluation of both federal and state income tax returns, Mr. Cox concluded that, as a practical matter, there would be no significant loss of revenue so long as the states were left free to impose pose their current jurisdictional rules and their own types of apportionment formulas on the larger corporations. At the same time, the adoption by Congress of jurisdictional rules and a consistent two-factor formula for the smaller companies would substantially eliminate the compliance problems of the smaller companies and contribute to increased efficiency of state tax administration.[43]

Since Mr. Cox's proposal was consistent with the data and findings of the Subcommittee, it offered the possibility of a highly workable compromise that would be acceptable to the state administrators as well as to the small business community. In addition, Mr. Cox's proposal was also consistent with a widely held view on the part of the state tax administrators that the states themselves ought to be given four more years to resolve the major problems through state legislative action, rather than to be required to conform immediately to federally imposed standards.[44] Thus, by limiting the scope of the income tax and capital stock tax provisions to the smaller corporations, H.R. 2158 was able to afford the states such an opportunity in those areas where significant amounts of revenue were involved.

Still another feature of the jurisdictional standard in Title 1 which is consistent with the views of the state tax administrators is the provision in the sales and use tax area which gives the states jurisdiction over out-of-state sellers who regularly make household deliveries in the state, regardless of whether the seller has a business location in the state. During the course of the various hearings held on interstate taxation problems, state tax administrators generally emphasized the need to protect local retailers from the tax-free competition of out-of-state sellers. In its investigation the Subcommittee had found that this was a matter of considerable significance to retailers who are located close to the borders of a state.[45] Although the United States Supreme Court has generally maintained a permissive attitude toward state taxes, one of the few cases in which the Court struck down a state tax on interstate commerce involved an out-of-state company which regularly delivered goods from Delaware to household consumers in Maryland.[46] As a result of this case, border retailers are currently exposed to a significant amount of tax-free competition.

In its evaluation of this problem the Subcommittee observed that if a seller in this type of a case were required to collect the tax, he would generally not be subject to a multiplicity of laws since the radius of his delivery routes, is, of necessity, limited. As a result, the Subcommittee recommended that the Supreme Court's decision be reversed and the jurisdictional reach of the states be expanded in this area.[47]

In its entirety, Title 1 of H.R. 2158 may thus be viewed as embodying a series of compromises. First, it permits the states to continue to assert taxing jurisdiction on a level that is consistent with the level of actual compliance and enforcement under the present system, while protecting the many small companies engaged in interstate commerce from having to cope with a plethora of taxes imposed by states and localities which are now asserting jurisdiction even though the companies do not maintain an actual place of business within their borders. Second, it obviates the need for centralized administration and for a direct involvement of the federal government in state and local tax matters and thereby strengthens the autonomy of state and local governments, while assuring that the national market will remain accessible to the small business community. Third, in the income and capital stock tax area, it provides immediate relief for those companies which have the most serious compliance problems, while affording the states an opportunity to work out their own solutions to the interstate tax problems of those companies which are a major source of state and local revenues. Fourth, in the sales and use tax area, since the jurisdictional rule coincides with effective limits of the current systems, it permits the states to retain jurisdiction over all but a very few of their presently registered seller-collectors, while extending the jurisdictional reach of the states in the border retailer situation where tax-free competition is currently the most troublesome.

V. SOME POLITICAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THE JURISDICTIONAL BALANCE

It is testimony to the objectivity of H.R. 2158 that it has not raised political issues of a partisan nature on either a national or a regional level. In short, neither a Republican nor a Democratic policy position has emerged. At the same time, neither support nor opposition for the bill is more concentrated in one area of the country than another—or concentrated in accordance with either the size or degree of industrialization of particular states. Instead, H.R. 2158 has received broad general support from the business community as well as from segments of labor, with the major opposition coming from state officials.

The groups which strongly support the establishment by Congress of jurisdictional standards include such diverse organizations as the National Association of Wholesalers, National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and a large number of associations representing specialized industries, such as the American Association of Nurserymen, the Magazine Publishers Association, the National Food Brokers Association, the Advertising Federation of America, etc. On the other hand, the organizations which oppose the measure include the National Association of Tax Administrators, the Council of State Governments and the National Association of Attorneys General.

The very nature of the types of groups which support and oppose H.R. 2158 makes it clear that the major political issue raised by the measure is whether the imposition by Congress of jurisdictional limitations on state taxing powers is inimical to the political interest of state and local governments. Expressed in other terms, the issue before the Congress is whether the political power which would be denied to the states and their subdivisions by H.R. 2158 is such that it ought properly to be exercised by state and local governments. As a result, careful consideration ought to be given by the Congress to two fundamental aspects of the type of power in dispute.

First, the question arises as to the actual capacity of state and local governments to exercise this power in an equitable manner. Obviously, jurisdictional claims which cannot be equitably and systematically enforced by the states and their subdivisions and which cannot be complied with by the great majority of taxpayers, ought not to be asserted. In this regard, the evidence accumulated by the Congress indicates that the states simply do not have—and with-

[37] Report, vol. 4, at 1181–82.

[38] See Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14, vol. 1, 76–111 (1966).

[39] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 18, page 24744 (remarks of Rep. Edwin E. Willis).

[40] Report, vol. 4, at 1124–25.

[41] Report, vol. 4, at 1209–11.

[42] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1967).

[43] Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14, vol. 2, 854–56 (1966).

[44] Id. vol. 1, at 82.

[45] Report, vol. 3, at 767–70.

[46] Miller Bros. Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954).

[47] Report, vol. 4, at 1180.

out federal assistance are unlikely to acquire—sufficient administrative capacity to eliminate the widespread non-enforcement and non-compliance that currently exists with respect to out-of-state companies which do not maintain business locations within their borders.[48] Thus, in effect, the power denied to a state or local tax collector by H.R. 2158 is not the power to impose an effective tax program which is capable of raising significant amounts of revenue, but is, instead, simply the broad administrative power to select out of a wide range of non-resident businesses only a limited number as targets for enforcement. To deny the tax collector such power—the power to administer an unwieldly and unworkable system—can scarcely be considered to have a deleterious effect on state and local governments.

Second, even if it were assumed that the states and their subdivisions could acquire the administrative capacity to enforce their present jurisdictional claims equitably and systematically and that the many small companies in interstate commerce could afford to acquire the record-keeping facilities necessary to comply, an even more fundamental political question arises: would it be to the long-range benefit of the states and of the federal government if each state imposed its own tax on a nationwide scale, effectively reaching all of the companies which market goods in the state but do not have a business location there? Admittedly, such a system would have strong political appeal if viewed solely in local terms. As one distinguished writer has observed:

"Interstate commerce is a rich tax base. It has, moreover, special political fascination. A state or local tax levied upon it falls largely upon people in other states. Here is a legislator's dream: a lush source of tax revenue, the burden of which falls largely on those who cannot vote him out of office. It is the old problem of taxation without representation." [49]

It is indeed this appeal of the present system which accounts to a large extent for the opposition to H.R. 2158 on the part of a number of state and local officials. Obviously, any federal proposal to limit the power of the local tax collector vis-a-vis out-of-state companies would tend to be rejected summarily by governors, state legislators and state tax administrators, who are continuously plagued with the arduous task of extracting revenues from their constituents. Yet the policy of seeking continually to expand each state's jurisdictional reach beyond its own limits of effective enforcement has broad ramifications, not only because of its effect on the national economy but also because it undermines the political vitality of the states themselves. The more each state is successful in shifting its tax burden onto persons who are without political representation in the state government, the more those persons will exert political pressures on the federal government to play a primary role in state and local affairs. Thus, strong as the political appeal of programs to tax out-of-state citizens may be, the results of such programs lead to greater and greater political responsibility for the federal government.

Finally, there is still another aspect of state programs designed to shift tax burdens onto out-of-state companies which is too often ignored by state officials. The development of such a program on the part of one state and its subdivisions obviously acts as a stimulus to other states and subdivisions to develop similar programs. For example, California currently asserts jurisdiction over companies all over the United States, which do not have business locations in California. As part of its program, it currently maintains field offices in other states, including a staff of some 80 full-time auditors in New York City and a similar staff in Chicago. A number of other states have likewise begun to operate out-of-state offices of their own. Under the circumstances, there is certainly implicit in California's policy an open invitation to all of the other states and their subdivisions to assert jurisdiction over California companies which do not have business locations outside of California.

At first blush, one might expect that some sort of "golden rule" of state taxation would emerge from this situation so that each state would voluntarily limit its own jurisdictional assertions as a means of assuring its own local companies continued access to the national market. Yet the very nature of our federal system relieves state officials of political responsibility in this area. On the one hand, if a local businessman feels aggrieved by having to comply with the tax laws of a state in which he has no business location, he rarely calls his grievance to the attention of public officials in his "home state." Instead, he regards his predicament as raising a federal issue and is inclined, therefore, to make his grievance known to his representative in Congress. On the other hand, if the local businessman does call his grievance to the attention of the officials of his "home state," these officials will, in fact, be powerless to act.[50] Thus, if there is to be a "golden rule" for the taxation of interstate commerce, it is unlikely that such a rule will be promulgated by any political body other than the Congress.

VI. SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MULTISTATE TAX COMPACT WHICH HAS BEEN SUGGESTED AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO H.R. 2158

As part of their official program of opposition to H.R. 2158, both the National Association of Tax Administrators and the Council of State Governments have taken the position that Congress ought to discontinue further consideration of federal legislation in this area and ought instead to authorize the negotiation of an interstate tax compact. Thirteen states [51] have already enacted such a compact and several bills [52] have been introduced into Congress which would give congressional approval.

The compact provides *inter alia* for: the creation of a multistate tax commission composed of tax officials from each party state, the arbitration of multistate disputes, a three-factor formula for apportioning income which could be elected at the option of the taxpayer, and a system of credits in the sales and use tax area. Although a detailed discussion of similarities and differences between the compact and H.R. 2158 is beyond the scope of this analysis, there are two major features of the compact which are highly significant in the light of the foregoing discussion.

First, the compact does not address itself to the jurisdictional problem. Since it establishes no jurisdictional standards it leaves even the smallest interstate companies vulnerable to the claims not only of many states but of thousands of localities as well. Thus, it would not reaffirm the principle of a common market—as would H.R. 2158—but would instead encourage the states to persist in their efforts to shift tax burdens onto out-of-state businesses.

Second, by granting broad administrative powers to a multistate tax commission, the compact would tend to lessen the direct control of each individual state legislature over its own state's tax policies. At the same time, since the powers which would be granted to the Commission, as well as to individual tax administrators, are largely discretionary, it is unlikely that the compact would bring about an improvement in the attitudes of taxpayers towards the present system. In short, it is largely because the present system is lacking in precise standards and is so heavily dependent on the exercise of administrative discretion that taxpayers have developed a widespread resistance. If businessmen are to be called on to pay taxes in jurisdictions in which they have little or no political representation, a decrease rather than an increase in discretionary administrative powers would appear to be necessary.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During the eight years that have passed since the Supreme Court's decision in the *Northwestern* case it has become abundantly apparent that the present system for taxing interstate commerce works badly both for business and for the states. The study conducted by the Special Subcommittee makes it clear that as the states reach farther and farther to impose smaller and smaller liabilities on more and more out-of-state companies, tax administrators are called on more and more to enforce the unenforceable and businessmen to comply with the impossible. Since the system has grown unworkable, it is essential that a national policy be formulated which will preserve the taxing autonomy of our states and at the same time reaffirm the basic principles of our American common market.

H.R. 2158, which is now pending before the 90th Congress, would limit the jurisdictional reach of the states to the present levels of effective enforcement and compliance, and in so doing would provide a system which is not dependent for its efficacy on centralized administration. Although the measure has widespread support from the private sector of our economy, opposition to the measure on the part of state tax officials is formidable, and the states generally are reluctant to accept any statutory limitations on their jurisidictional reach over out-of-state businesses. As a result, the major political issue raised by H.R. 2158 is whether the establishment of jurisdictional limitations would in fact be inimical to the interests of state and local governments.

Whether the common market principles embodied in H.R. 2158 will eventually prevail depends ultimately, of course, on the collective judgment of the Congress. The facts have been found, the issues framed, and the alternatives in terms of national policy made clear. Reduced to its essence, the question for the Congress now to determine is whether the principles of free trade among the states ought to be compromised so as to permit each state to continue to make broad jurisdictional claims on a nationwide scale.

If the program contained in H.R. 2158 is approved by the Congress, then the present trend toward a balkanized domestic economy will be reversed and the small business community assured continued access to the national market. If on the other hand, H.R. 2158 is rejected, the states will be encouraged to increase their efforts to extract revenues from non-resident businesses. As a result the need to provide relief for small companies plagued by a plethora of compliance problems will continue to grow and correspondingly increase the need for centrally

[48] See, e.g., Report, vol. 1, at 515–16.

[49] Mendelson, Epilogue to F. Frankfurter, The Commerce Clause 118 (Quadrangle Paperback ed. 1964).

[50] See, e.g., Statement of Willard W. Livingston, Chief Counsel, Alabama Dep't of Revenue, Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14, 1301–03 (1966).

[51] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, and Washington. In addition, the Wyoming Legislature has authorized the Governor to negotiate a compact subject to the subsequent approval of both the Legislature and the United States Congress.

[52] H.R. 9476, H.R. 13682, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967).

administered programs capable of systematic enforcement. In either event, it is clear that the vexing problem of state taxation of interstate commerce has broad national ramifications and that ultimately a national program must of necessity emerge to remedy the present chaotic and unworkable system.

After Open Housing What?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, after each leader is made a martyr for political blackmail—the mob enters into a new phase for destruction of individual rights camouflaged as being under the law.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act to grant equal freedom was passed as a tribute to the late John F. Kennedy, the next civil rights action forced through in memoriam of the peculiar shooting of James Meredith, and now Congress is to be asked to take away property rights as a seeming vengeance against all white people for the execution of M. L. King.

Must legislation now be passed only by bullets? Not after serious consideration, but only after a stampede of fright and artificially created emotion.

Twenty thousand American boys have been murdered in Vietnam—are they not martyrs to Communist tyranny? Behind the Iron Curtain thousands of Christian and Jewish leaders are persecuted, some tortured to death—are they not martyrs to their faith? But what action have they demanded? Or have we given? Not even a law to forbid trade with the atheistic barbarian enemy of all free people.

If we in Congress are to give our people something, let us give them leadership—leadership to stand up and let our people alone.

I include "America Blackmailed" from Babson's Washington Forecast Letter following my remarks:

AMERICA BLACKMAILED

HEADLINE 1972

The following news story may hit the headlines some summer day in 1972:

"The President late yesterday afternoon signed into law the so-called Equal Property Act (H.R. 2216), following the capitulation of both House and Senate before the threats of an angry mob of proponents, estimated by District police officials at upwards of 600,000 persons, which had besieged the Capitol for over 3 days, holding Congress virtually hostage . . . pending a vote on the bill.

"As word of the 'surrender' by Congress was passed thru the crowd, its leaders called for a march on the White House. Within twenty minutes, the partisans began gathering before the Executive Mansion and, shortly before 4 p.m., leveled the iron fence and were milling around the lawn of the President's residence and office. The throng became increasingly unruly as no word of presidential action on the legislation was forthcoming from Administration aides, and, at about 4:45 p.m. militant leaders shouted instructions to burn the White House. Within minutes after these orders were issued—and as torches were being carried toward the East Wing of the White House—Presidential Press Secretary Elbert Williams appeared at the main entrance to the Executive Offices and announced that the President had signed the bill into law.

"A tremendous roar of approval arose, and a partisan band struck up the triumphant People's Power theme song, 'March of the Masses.' Following the signing of the bill, the mob separated into apparently planned 'recrimination squads' and systematically sacked, burned, and looted a 12-block area of downtown Washington as District police and a scattering of military units looked on helplessly. Late last night, Metropolitan Police Chief Tweedy estimated total damage at over $300 million.

"The Equal Property Act completely discards the constitutional concept of private property and sets up a system for the transfer of all private property to all Americans on a so-called equal-share basis. Authority to administer the Act is vested in a Commission in which majority control is to be held by representatives of the poor, the underprivileged, the unemployed, and minority groups which have suffered past discrimination.

"Washington officials see little chance of the Act's being overturned by the Supreme Court in view of threats by People's Power leaders to paralyze all major cities in event of an adverse ruling. The high court is expected to be further guided by the fact that overwhelming People's Power forces earlier this month succeeded in dissolving both the Democratic and Republican national conventions . . . leaving the Power candidate, Arthur Danrig, as the only name on the ballot in November's national election."

The road we travel—Sounds preposterous? We'd like to think so.

But . . . as a matter of cold, hard fact, this nation—the land of the free—is moving relentlessly toward such a fate . . . as government by law gradually submits to the blackmailers of America.

Today's blackmailers operate under the phony slogan of the "right to dissent." They have distorted and magnified the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and right of peaceable assembly into a license for intimidation, sedition, riot, and anarchy.

Under this false banner, they have blocked the traffic and commerce of American cities, shut down the operation of government offices, destroyed private and public property, disrupted our educational procedures, interfered with our selective service system, obstructed inductions into our armed forces, provided aid and comfort to the enemy, desecrated our country's flag, and vandalized hundreds of communities thruout the nation.

Our government of laws, our government of constitutional processes, has begun to crumble before a tide of lawlessness which has not only been condoned but even encouraged by many government leaders.

Instead of firmly supporting the enforcement of law and order on the local level, federal officials and other national leaders gave aid and encouragement to the law breakers . . . on the basis that civil disobedience is justified when the violators are acting in a *"good"* cause.

BREAK IN THE DIKE

This was the great breakthru in the dike of law and order.

For almost two centuries, we had been taught—and we believed fervently—that the law must be respected, whether we felt it to be a good or a bad law.

All of us know the nagging discomfort of living under laws that are inequitable. In such cases, we may exercise our constitutional rights to bring about a change . . . but we do it by lawful process.

Under provisions of the Constitution, the full power of the United States government should have ben placed squarely behind local authorities in the breaking up of the very first sit-in in America.

True, it was peaceable assembly . . . but it clearly interfered with the rights of others to carry on their normal activities under the protection of the law.

But . . . prominent national politicians, blinded to legal justice by the possibility of making political hay, placed themselves on the side of anarchy.

We all remember the statement of the late Adlai Stevenson . . . that he would consider it an honor to go to jail for such civil disobedience. His remarks were echoed by hundreds of others . . . and mob power in America was born.

AS YE SOW

The Watts riots in California served as Lesson No. 1 in large-scale blackmail. This outbreak of mass crime was not punished. It was rewarded with countless millions of federal dollars poured into the area in hope that the rioters would "cool it."

After that demonstration of largess, can you blame the Negroes of Detroit, Newark, Milwaukee, Chicago, and scores of other American cities for wanting to get in on the action?

The amazing thing is this: Not only have government officials condoned such lawlessness . . . government employes have played a major role in fomenting many of the disorders . . . under the guise of helping the oppressed. Anti-poverty employes in Newark organized and publicized the police-brutality mass rally which led to the catastrophic riot in that city. A Newark anti-poverty official, Willie Wright, urged Negroes to arm themselves against "honkie cops." The agency's accountant, Charles McCray, was arrested for taking part in the shooting during the riot . . . but officials refused even to suspend him from his job.

The situation has been the same in countless communities all over the nation. Sargent Shriver's anti-poverty agency admits that there are convicted criminals on the agency's payroll . . . and that many of them have been given jobs counseling youngsters.

Many of the black-power movement's most militant activists—including riot-inciter H. Rap Brown—have been on the government's payroll . . . often as $50-per-day consultants.

It's widely said that the government is motivated by a desire to placate the troublemakers.

Actually, the reverse situation prevails. The trouble makers are blackmailing our government . . . successfully and repeatedly. They seek money . . . and power. They're getting both.

BLUEPRINT FOR CHAOS

Communists are prominent in nearly all the organizations which are fomenting this anarchy in the U.S. They have been welcomed with open arms into the National Conference For New Politics, a group whose Chicago convention was keynoted by Martin Luther King. One of the leaders of the conference happily commented that Communists would provide leadership for the group.

Bettina Aptheker, an admitted Communist, continues to hold a top position in the peace and draft-resistance movements.

Stokely Carmichael has returned from his Red tour to lead his followers toward "the destruction of the American government."

And dozens of others—with countless citations for Communist connections—hold prominent positions in scores of violent "dissent" organizations in this country.

One of these is the Revolutionary Action Movement which has documented its plans for the revolutionary end of the American way of life. RAM says its followers will "strike by night and spare none" . . . that it will foment "mass riots, blocking of traffic, burning of buildings . . . street fighting."

The planners call for "sabotage in the cities—knocking out electric power first, then transportation—and guerrilla warfare . . ."

The blueprint for chaos goes on and on—in great detail—reminding one of Adolf Hitler's brazen revelations in Mein Kampf.

In this atmosphere in which lawlessness and intimidation are tolerated—even re-

warded—it is understandable that the crime rate has soared.

THE HARVEST

The FBI reports that the incidence of major crime in the United States is rising at an annual rate of 16% . . . far above the rate of growth in our population.

If the uptrend which has persisted thru 1967 is projected to include 1968, more than 4⅓ million major crimes will be committed this year. Based on our population of a little over 200 million, this means that you will have one chance in 47 of being murdered, maimed, or robbed in the next 12 months!

More and more, criminals are being coddled by our courts . . . and treated as the unfortunate victims of poor social environment. Punishment is out; gentle rehabilitation is in. Yet, a recent FBI study showed that 57% of offenders released on parole in 1963 were rearrested within 2½ years . . . and that 83% of those acquitted or dismissed in 1963 were rearrested within the same 30-month period!

POLICE HANDCUFFED

The Supreme Court has seriously impaired the efficiency of law enforcement agencies by restrictions on investigative procedures and techniques . . . and has so hogtied the police in searches and interrogations that thousands of hardened criminals are yearly set free to prey again on the public.

The sharp uptrend in acquittals, suspended sentences, and refusals to prosecute—particularly in juvenile and minority-group cases—has influenced police officers in hundreds of communities to blind their eyes to gross law violations. Because of this frustration, police morale today is at an all-time low.

The problem was well summed up by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who wrote in the April 1967 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin: "Morality, integrity, law and order, and other cherished principles of our great heritage are battling for survival in many communities today. They are under constant attack from degrading and corrupting influences which, if not halted, will sweep away every vestige of decency and order remaining in our society."

WHOM WE INDICT

Whom are we to indict for sparking this chaos in America? Are the prime defendants the Stokely Carmichaels, the H. Rap Browns, the hippies, the draft-card burners, the peaceniks, the juvenile delinquents, the rabble rousers, the Commies who have gained respectability as "honest dissenters"? Certainly, most of these could be brought before the bar of justice to answer charges of law violations . . . and they should be.

However, there is a stronger, truer bill of indictment which may be drawn against those who have invited the bloody blackmail of America by permitting, even encouraging, mounting civil disobedience. We speak of men such as the late Adlai Stevenson, Bobby Kennedy, Nicholas Katzenbach, Earl Warren . . . Senators Ribicoff, Javits, Clark, and Case . . . and yes, even Hubert Humphrey and Lyndon Johnson. These men of power, prestige, and great influence in the political structure of America have permitted the concept of "freedom of speech" to be expanded to include subversion, intimidation, and incitement to riot; they have condoned the distortion of "academic freedom" to encompass the adulteration of young minds with Communist doctrine and the disintegration of a well-disciplined educational system; they have allowed "freedom of assembly" to mushroom into disruption of peaceful activity, mob rule, riot, and insurrection.

Unless those in authority in the United States can be influenced to abandon the suicidal course on which they have embarked—or unless they can be replaced by men who will—we cannot hope to restore in our nation the kind of domestic peace and order which has made our many generations proud to be Americans . . . living in a land of freedom, security, opportunity, and justice under law.

The crisis we now face is the most serious, the most dangerous, in the history of our country. Each of us must diligently employ our influence and our effort—in speech, letters, and at the ballot box—to help set straight the way.

Is the Supreme Court Really Supreme?

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, an important and thought-provoking article, published by the Reader's Digest in July 1967, has only recently come to my attention, which I believe should be made available to Members of Congress and to the general public. The article, written by Eugene H. Methvin, points out some of the more glaring excesses of the U.S. Supreme Court and calls on the Congress to act to curb the growing power of the Federal courts. A brief survey of the following article, which I submit for the RECORD, will reveal the reason many of us are calling for Congress to define specifically through statute and constitutional amendment the role of the U.S. Supreme Court and the various Federal courts:

IS THE SUPREME COURT REALLY SUPREME?

Recent controversial rulings by the High Bench raise anew the troubling issue: Who is the ultimate arbiter of the Constitution? Our founding fathers provided a foresighted answer.

Fifty-two percent of the American people rate the Supreme Court's performance as "only fair" or "poor," according to a recent Louis Harris opinion poll. "The Justices are stretching the judicial process to try to translate their notion of an ideal society into reality," says Prof. Philip B. Kurland, editor of the University of Chicago Law School's *Supreme Court Review*. From legal scholars to the man in the street, from Congress to the Justices themselves, this most revered of our governmental institutions is today drawing stinging criticism.

Some of the most eloquent protests have come from within the Court itself. In 1962, when the Supreme Court invaded the political thicket of legislative reapportionment, the late Justice Felix Frankfurter denied that the Court had constitutional authority for its move. He accused his colleagues of "a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past."

In another case last year, Justice Byron R. White charged the Supreme Court with laying down specific rules that have "no significant support" in the history of the Constitution.

Justice John M. Harlan has despairingly proclaimed that recent Court decisions amount "to nothing less than an exercise of the amending power by this Court."

Direction by Decision. Repeatedly in recent years the Court has claimed vast new powers to change by judicial decree the shape of our constitutional system. A narrow majority of "activist" Justices, spearheaded by Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice William O. Douglas, has increasingly taken away from juries and legislatures—the two authentic voices of the people—crucial decisions affecting the order and direction of American life.

Consider the Court's decisions in three vital areas:

School Prayer. The Court has declared that reading the Bible or saying the Lord's Prayer (or even a non-sectarian prayer) in voluntary classroom religious exercises is unconstitutional. It has relied on the theory that the First Amendment ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof") somehow requires the Court to impose a wall of separation between religion and any sort of governmental activity.

This notion is "sheer invention," say many distinguished law scholars, among them Dean Erwin Griswold of Harvard Law School. We have, Griswold says, "a spiritual and cultural tradition of which we ought not to be deprived by judges carrying into effect the logical implications of absolutist notions not expressed in the Constitution, and surely never contemplated by those who put the constitutional provisions into effect."

REAPPORTIONMENT

In one stroke, in June 1964, the Court rendered "unconstitutional" the legislatures of most of the 50 states. The action boldly asserted a judicial power never before claimed. It was based on the 14th Amendment. The dictum that "no state shall deny to any person the equal protection of the laws" means, said Chief Justice Warren, that states cannot adopt "Little Federal" plans, in which one house of the legislature is apportioned like the U.S. Senate, to accommodate other factors (historic, economic or geographic) than population. The states must, instead, elect *both* houses on a "one man, one vote" basis.

Justices Potter Stewart and Tom Clark objected sharply. They called the Court's action "the fabrication of a constitutional mandate," and said, "The Draconian pronouncement finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

The quarrel arose because many state legislatures had failed to reapportion their districts as people moved from country to city and from city to suburbs. Other states, however, had reapportioned conscientiously—Colorado, for one. In 1962, Coloradans went to the polls to choose between two reapportionment plans, and voted 305,700 to 172,725 in favor of a "Little Federal" plan which gave Colorado's lightly populated western mountains and eastern wheatlands a few more members in the state senate than their population warranted. A majority in every county, including urban Denver, supported this plan.

Justices Clark and Stewart pleaded with the Court to avoid destroying such local initiative and decision. Under the "equal protection" clause, they said, federal courts might properly void any systems which prevent ultimate majority rule. "Beyond this there is nothing in the federal Constitution to prevent a state from choosing any electoral legislative structure it thinks best suited." Colorado simply "sought to provide that no identifiable minority shall be completely silenced or engulfed," an aim that "fully comports with the letter and spirit of our constitutional traditions." The Justices pleaded in vain.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURES

Historically, the administration of criminal justice has been left to the states. The Constitution originally gave the federal government no authority whatever to intervene in ordinary criminal matters. However, the 14th Amendment forbids states to deny a person "due process of law," and the Court has now been using this language as reason to impose a new set of detailed, and controversial, rules of its own making on state law enforcement.

In 1961, for example, five Justices asserted that "due process" requires a state judge to

keep physical evidence from the jury if he finds any legal fault with the police search that obtained it. That overruled long-standing Supreme Court decisions and nullified contrary rules in 26 states. Then, in 1964, five Justices prohibited the century-old practice in 15 states of letting the jury decide whether a confession has been coerced. Justice Clark protested: "Dependence on jury trials is the keystone of our system of criminal justice, and I regret that the Court lends its weight to the destruction of this great safeguard to our liberties."

In June 1966, Chief Justice Warren and four fellow Justices imposed on all states a new rule, never before followed in any state: Judges must also keep a confession from the jury unless police can prove beyond doubt that they warned the suspect of his rights, and even furnished him a lawyer throughout interrogation if he wished.

There is mounting evidence that the Court's massive federalization of criminal justice has grievously crippled law enforcement. FBI statistics show that, since the 1961 ruling, the rate at which police are solving reported crimes—a rate which had held steady for years—has dropped by almost ten percent. In New York City, after last year's ruling on interrogations, the proportion of unsolved murders increased by 40 percent. Indeed, the Supreme Court's rulings have compelled the freeing of many apprehended and confessed criminals.

Last September, for example, a woman stood before Brooklyn Judge Michael Kern. She had confessed to taping her four-year-old son's mouth and hands and beating him to death with a broomstick and a rubber hose. Nevertheless, because of the new Supreme Court ruling, her signed confession, the state's only evidence, had to be thrown out.

"Thank you, your honor," the woman said.

"Don't thank me," the judge replied icily. "Thank the United States Supreme Court. You killed the child and you ought to go to jail."

CONFLICTING PHILOSOPHIES

These highly controversial decisions reflect a titanic clash of judicial philosophies in today's Supreme Court. Justices Harlan, White and Stewart are currently the chief representatives of the philosophy of judicial restraint propounded by the great jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes: In a democratic society, judges who never face the discipline of the ballot box must defer to elected legislators in policy choices—and leave it to the voters to discipline the legislators at the polls if the legislators' decisions are bad. A judge should declare a legislative act unconstitutional only when he is certain that reasonable men could not disagree. Otherwise, said Holmes, even though the legislators have decided unwisely, a judge is obligated to say, "Damn 'em, let 'em do it!"

On the other side in today's Court, Chief Justice Warren, Justice Douglas and usually Justice Hugo L. Black represent the activist philosophy, or what is sometimes called "political jurisprudence." This school holds that constitutional claims coming to the Supreme Court involve, primarily, conflicting values and interests. There may be no express law relevant to today's conditions. So, in weighing conflicting interests, the Justices must impose their own "social preferences." This philosophy sees the Justices as the modern interpreters of the values expressed in "our living Constitution."

Last year, for example, the Court outlawed Virginia's poll tax—even though it had unanimously upheld a similar tax 29 years before. Even Justice Black denounced this change by judicial decree as "an attack on the concept of a written constitution which is to survive unless changed through the amendment process."

But do we want the Court to be such a lawgiving body? Carried very far, this philosophy would mean in effect abandoning our written Constitution. The High Bench would become not a court of law but a Grand Policy Council, a "Big Brother Clubs" as one law professor irreverently dubbed the activists.

From the first, men like Thomas Jefferson feared the federal judiciary as a dangerous, fundamentally anti-democratic power. Their fears have proved valid. For half a century (between 1890 and 1937), reactionary "activists" on the Court virtually destroyed the nation's legislative ability to cope with the industrial revolution to regulate wages and working conditions, child labor, utilities, railroads, labor-management wars. They nullified 52 acts of Congress and 228 state laws. Ultimately, in the "limited constitutional revolution" of 1937, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Congress and public pressure persuaded three activist Justices to retire or switch, thus allowing needed social legislation to stand.

Today, the Court is again exhibiting judicial "activism"—only this time designed to impose radical change instead of a freeze. "When in the name of interpretation, the Court *adds* something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it," warns Justice Harlan, "the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

TO GUARD THE GUARDIANS

Who *is* the ultimate arbiter of our Constitution? *Does* the Constitution limit the Justices as well as the legislators and the President?

The founding fathers, understanding the tendency of all men to grasp ever more power, labored to subject every branch of government to checks and balances. They specifically included the Supreme Court. To the ancient question, "Who will guard these guardians?" they answered emphatically, *"The people—through their elected representatives."* And, historically, we have asserted that authority on many occasions.

For example, one powerful check on the Court is the President's power of appointment. In 1870, President Ulysses S. Grant filled two vacancies. The votes of these new Justices made it possible to reverse a recent crucial decision, which declared that Congress had no power to issue paper money. Last June's crucial five-four decision on criminal confessions could not have been made had not President Johnson's first appointee, Justice Abe Fortas, promptly lined up with the activists. Since Justice Clark, a moderate, has recently retired, and since several Justices are over 65, Presidential appointments may completely reshape the Court in the next few years.

The Constitution also plainly specifies two major ways in which Congress can check the Court:

The 14th Amendment—under which the Supreme Court has dictated state legislative apportionments and criminal procedures—specifically names Congress as the protector of the rights it creates. While Congress cannot reverse a Supreme Court decision in a specific case, it *can* write new remedies which the Court is then obligated to apply in resolving such cases in the future. Last year, for example, Chief Justice Warren specifically acknowledged that Congress may, by simple statute, write rules different from those that the Court handed down for police interrogations.

Article III empowers Congress to make "exceptions and regulations" to the Court's appellate jurisdiction. Thus the Constitution explicitly makes *our elected legislators* the supreme judges—by simple majority vote—of what types of cases the Court may decide. Says Herbert Wechsler, Columbia Law School professor and director of the American Law Institute, "The plan of the Constitution was quite simply that Congress would decide from time to time how far the federal judicial institution should be used. Congress has the power, by enactment of a statute, to strike at what it deems judicial excess."

Thus the judges are *not* the sole arbiters of the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution laid on Congress a duty to define the rights it provided, and to act as a counterweight to the Court.

"BEYOND THE BOUNDS"

Though it has acted at other times—for example, in 1868, when it stripped the Court of power to hear appeals in habeas corpus cases—*Congress has failed so far to rein in the present Court.* In 1964, the House did vote 218–175 to forbid the Court to interfere in state legislative apportionments. This simple majority vote was, under Article III, sufficient. But in the Senate, an attempt was made to seek passage of the measure as a constitutional amendment, and it missed—by seven votes—the required two-thirds majority. An amendment to permit voluntary school prayer also failed by a narrow margin. Both goals might well have been accomplished, by a simple majority vote, under Article III and the 14th Amendment.

Some scholars are convinced that the present Supreme Court would have declared any such effort unconstitutional. Others argue, however, that if the Court had gone to that extreme Congress could then have retaliated by restricting the Court's future jurisdiction in cases of the kind under Article III.

In the absence of such an effort to check the Court, five Supreme Court Justices, in alliance with one-third of either House or Senate, are—by "interpretation"—radically amending our Constitution. Yet amendment is supposed to require a two-thirds vote of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures.

The great liberal Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo wrote: "Judges have, of course, the power, though not the right, to travel beyond the bounds set to judicial innovation by precedent and custom. Nonetheless, by that abuse of power, they violate the law."

The founding fathers named Congress as the referee to guard the bounds beyond which the Justices should not go. The time has come for our elected representatives to blow the whistle.

Congressman Shriver's Eighth Annual Kansas Fourth District Opinion Poll

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to invite citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas to participate in my annual opinion poll. Once again I am submittting a questionnaire to each householder in my congressional district on some of the major foreign and domestic issues facing the Congress and our Nation.

It is very helpful to me in representing my constituents to have their opinions on these matters. At the same time, I hope these questionnaires stimulate discussions at home regarding legislation before the Congress with the objective of encouraging broader citizen participation in representative government.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the eighth annual Fourth District Opinion Poll which will be mailed soon, under congressional mailing regulations, to each householder in the seven-county district. The questionnaire follows:

CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER'S ANNUAL 4TH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Which 4 of the following would receive your highest priority for spending reductions?			
____Defense ____Health ____Supersonic transport			
____Foreign aid ____Highways ____Space			
____Agriculture ____Poverty program ____Anticrime programs			
____Public works ____Aid to cities ____Air and water pollution			
____Education ____Beautification			
2. Do you favor the President's request for a 10-percent surcharge on Federal income taxes?			
3. Should the Nation be working to eliminate a compulsory draft?			
4. Do you favor establishment of a strategic reserve of agricultural commodities by the Government with specific restraints against the arbitrary sale of these stocks into the market?			
5. Congress in 1967 appropriated $1,700,000,000 for the antipoverty program.			
(a) Should the program be expanded?			
(b) Should the program be reduced?			
(c) Should the program be eliminated?			
(d) Should the program be maintained as is?			
6. In order to help resolve problems of hard-core unemployment which do you favor:			
(a) The Human Investment Act providing a tax credit incentive to employers for part of the cost of training workers on the job?			
(b) The President's proposal for the Government to subsidize any added costs of training above those a company would spend on normal employees?			
(c) Federal Government guaranteeing public employment as a last resort for people to find jobs in the private economy?			
7. Do you favor Federal assistance to the States to improve and enlarge State and local police forces as determined by local and State governments?			
8. Do you favor the return of U.S. military forces from Western Europe as a means of improving our balance-of-payments situation?			
9. Vietnam. The major international problem on the minds of Americans at this time is U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Which of the following courses is in line with your present thinking:			
(a) If it would stop the war, we should increase our military effort, including intensified nonnuclear bombing and hot pursuit into Cambodia and other neutral sanctuaries to bring North Vietnam to the conference table			
(b) If it would stop the war, we should help form a coalition government in Saigon that would include the Vietcong?			
(c) If it would stop the war, we should pull our troops out of Vietnam and let the South Vietnamese take care of themselves			
(d) If it would stop the war, we should stop bombing North Vietnam			
(e) Other (your alternative to stop the war):			

Popular Support for Monday Holiday Legislation

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 the House Judiciary Committee, on which I have the privilege of serving, took favorable action on H.R. 15951, the Monday holiday bill. The bill reported by the committee calls for the observance of three of our national holidays on Mondays: Washington's Birthday—third Monday in February—Memorial Day—last Monday in May—and Veterans Day—fourth Monday in October. In addition, H.R. 15951 provides for the observance of a new national holiday, Columbus Day, on the second Monday in October.

The public response to the committee's action was immediate, enthusiastic, and most gratifying to the supporters of Monday holiday legislation. I need not recount the many benefits to be derived from scheduling certain of our national holidays on Mondays, nor the overwhelming endorsement which this legislation has received from the many segments of American society. However, I do wish to commend to the attention of the Members the following editorials and news articles attesting to the popularity and significance of the recently reported Monday holiday bill:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 27, 1968]

HOPE FOR MONDAY HOLIDAYS

A uniform-Monday-holiday proposal sponsored by Rep. Robert McClory (R-Ill.) swept through the House Judiciary Committee by a surprisingly heavy 15-to-2 vote. We hope that the House, which has a tradition of granting itself an abundance of three-day weekends, will move McClory's bill along to passage.

The measure would establish Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day and Veterans Day as Monday holidays, and make Columbus Day a new federal holiday which also would fall on Monday. Since Labor Day already is celebrated on Monday, the bill would give Americans five long weekends a year—a pleasant prospect.

Both industry and labor long have backed Monday-holiday legislation—because it would cut down on midweek absenteeism and resultant higher production costs while giving workers a better chance to take advantage of a day off. Holiday proposals have bogged down in the House and Senate, however, because of pressure from patriotic and church groups. McClory's bill surmounts most of the objections by leaving Thanksgiving Day and Independence Day untouched.

Establishment of long weekends may not be the most important issue in the country today, but it is a worthwhile issue. And legislation such as that proposed by McClory has one unique feature—it would please a lot of people without costing anyone a dime.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 27, 1968]

MONDAY-HOLIDAY BILL TAKES FLIGHT AGAIN AFTER BEING STALLED: HOUSE PANEL VOTES TO OBSERVE FOUR HOLIDAYS ON MONDAY, MAKE COLUMBUS DAY A FEDERAL ONE

WASHINGTON.—Long-stalled legislation to create more Monday holidays has suddenly started moving again in Congress.

The House Judiciary Committee voted 15-to-2 approval of a measure switching three existing Federal holidays to Monday observance, and making Columbus Day a new Federal holiday. The result would be creation of four new official three-day weekends similar to the existing Labor Day weekend ending on the first Monday in September.

The bill, sponsored by Rep. McClory (R., Ill.), sets up this holiday schedule:

—Washington's Birthday would switch from Feb. 22 to the third Monday in February.

—Memorial Day would move from May 30 to the last Monday in May.

—Veterans Day would move from Nov. 11 to the fourth Monday in October.

—Columbus Day would be observed on the second Monday in October instead of the Oct. 12 date already established as a holiday by most states.

Unlike some earlier versions of the Monday holiday bill. Rep. McClory's measure would leave July 4 untouched as Independence Day, and Thanksgiving would continue to fall on the fourth Thursday in November. Patriotic groups have been especially hostile to tampering with the Fourth of July, and some merchants were worried that Monday Thanksgivings would disrupt existing retailing patterns.

Congress has power to establish legal holidays only for the District of Columbia and for Federal employes, but state legislatures traditionally follow the Federal lead. Mr. McClory's bill wouldn't become effective until 1971, to accommodate calendar manufacturers and give state legislatures time to adopt the new Federal schedule.

The idea of more official three-day weekends has been vigorously pushed by such business groups as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The chamber contends uniform Monday holidays would cut down absenteeism and stop-start production costs that occur when a holiday falls in the middle of a week. Monday holidays also are backed strongly by travel organizations.

But apathy and some outright resistance has kept Monday-holiday legislation buried in committee in both the House and Senate. To win more support, first Mr. McClory and his allies dropped the earlier goal at naming Washington's birthday President's Day; this mollified some Virginia lawmakers. He also agreed to sweeten the package by including Columbus Day as a Federal holiday, a goal fervently sought for years by Italian-American groups.

While Congress stalled on Monday holidays, some states moved ahead on their own. The Massachusetts legislature recently adopted a bill providing for observance of Washington's Birthday, Patriots Day and Memorial Day on Mondays, and comparable bills are pending in eight other legislatures. This gives backers of Federal legislation the new argument that Congress should take charge, to avoid national confusion.

A Monday holiday bill sponsored by Sen. Smathers (D., Fla.) has languished for months in the Senate Judiciary Committee, despite backing by Minority Leader Dirksen (R., Ill.). The judiciary panel has been tied up with higher-priority civil rights, crime and gun legislation, but Senate sources said the holiday bill seems sure to be approved once it's put to a committee vote.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, March 28, 1969]

THREE-DAY HOLIDAY GAIN

The impasse over the creation of more three-day holiday weekends has finally been broken by the House Judiciary Committee. It approved a compromise bill, whose chief sponsor is Rep. ROBERT MCCLORY (R.-Ill.), shifting four holidays to Mondays. Affected are Washington's Birthday and Memorial, Columbus and Veterans days.

This is an encouraging start on a worthwhile cause that had all but been given up for lost, and a tribute to MCCLORY's persistence. Enough counterpressure was mustered to prevent a shift in the observance of Independence and Thanksgiving days in the compromise version of the original measure.

But a full airing of the issues in House and Senate debate should convince even the traditionalists that no sound historical reason exists for exempting those particular holidays. Their addition to the approved list—

along with the usual Monday observance of Labor Day—would give the nation seven three-day holidays every year (and two more when Christmas and New Year's Day fall on a Friday or Monday).

The vast majority of Americans would welcome it.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun, Apr. 2, 1968]

MORE 3-DAY WEEKENDS IN SIGHT

The prospect for more three-day holiday weekends is beginning to look very good indeed after a proposal sponsored by Rep. ROBERT MCCLORY, R–Lake Bluff, received a favorable 15–2 vote in the House Judiciary Committee last week.

If the bill moves as well in the House and Senate, the American public will be guaranteed five long weekends each year. The bill will establish Monday observances for Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day and Veterans Day and will make Columbus Day a new national holiday, to be celebrated on Monday. Labor Day is already observed on a Monday, so that brings the total to five three-day weekends for more travel, golf, or doing the work around the house that the wife has been nagging about.

Major support for the proposal is coming from both management and labor—management because the measure would cut down on mid-week absenteeism near the holidays as they now fall, and labor because workers always like longer holidays. We agree with both of them and support MCCLORY'S bill.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 8, 1968]

HAPPY HOLIDAY BILL

A long-pending bill fixing four additional Federal holidays on Monday is now considered certain of Congressional passage this month.

The measure, introduced several years ago by Illinois Rep. Robert McClory, sets Washington's Birthday the third Monday in February; Memorial Day the last Monday in May; Columbus Day the second Monday in October, and Veterans Day the fourth Monday in October.

While the bill would apply to only to the District of Columbia and to Federal employees, it should spur many states to follow suit.

Massachusetts already has passed such a law and similar bills are pending in eight other states.

The idea of four more three-day holiday weekends (Labor Day is now the only one) has been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other business groups.

They point out that it will not only eliminate costly midweek factory shutdowns, but will aid the resort and travel businesses.

Teachers in Politics

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the National Education Association marked its first teachers-in-politics program across the country. I heartily approve of this program and I commend the National Education Association for its leadership in this most important area of citizenship.

In Kansas, the Kansas State Teachers' Association sponsored six regional political clinics under the leadership of Mr. Jim Yonary, president of the Kansas PACE group.

The many complex problems facing communities, the States and our Nation require the interest and participation of informed citizens. Although I am sure teachers would be the first to agree that partisan politics have no place in the classroom, our great country needs a strong two-party system to continue to prosper and move forward. The teacher stands in a unique position to develop student interest in politics.

At the same time, teachers also are in a position to bring the message of educational needs and requirements to the public through their involvement in the political process.

Mary Brooks, Republican National Committee assistant chairman, has stated:

The increasing influence of government and politics on all areas of living today makes political participation a necessary fact of life for concerned citizens.

The National Education Association, and its affiliated State organizations, are performing an important public service through this project.

Dr. King and the President's Civil Rights Act of 1968

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King is a profound tragedy for all Americans of good will—for he died a victim of the hatred all good men have fought to erase.

But in the sadness of his death we can create a living memorial to his memory—President Johnson's civil rights bill of 1968 passed by the Senate and now before the House of Representatives. An act which was once vital is now imperative.

The civil rights bill of 1968 presents Congress—and the Nation—the first opportunity to reaffirm the efficacy of our democratic system to Negro Americans—to demonstrate that they need not go outside the system to secure full equality.

We must show now—as never before—that the conscience of our country is aroused to action. If we cannot show we care—we cannot expect Negro Americans to care about the future of their country.

America must not be rent in two—divided by an arbitrary color line into opposing camps. We must now be prepared to prevent injustice from splitting it apart.

If we in Congress can bring the Negro closer to the full citizenship guaranteed by the Constitution; if we in America can assure Negroes that their color can be a badge of pride in America, not a symbol of inferiority; if Americans joined in united purpose can rid the last vestiges of hate and bigotry from our land—then Martin Luther King will not have lived and died in vain.

Martin Luther King has stimulated us to action—and great progress—in the past. Under President Johnson we have banned discrimination in the use of public accommodations, prohibited industry from discriminating in employment on the basis of race, assured nondiscrimination in voting, banned the poll tax, and taken great strides to abolish the last vestiges of segregated schooling.

All of these are symbols of what men can do together—and of what Martin Luther King urged us to do. Let us now—in the lawful and nonviolent way Dr. King would have wanted—build on these monuments to freedom by creating a more just America. The first step is the civil rights bill of 1968.

Let us show the world we are true to our American heritage of brotherhood. Let us prove to ourselves that our promises are not empty rhetoric, but realistic hope for the future.

Let us turn this saddest of moments into the happiness of dreams fulfilled—of black and white together as brothers united for America.

To do less imperils the Nation.

Book Review: On Credibility Gap

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most talked-about books in Washington today is "Crisis in Credibility" by Bruce Ladd, the talented young special assistant to our colleague, DON RUMSFELD of Illinois. This book describes accurately the crisis in our Government's public information program. Bruce is to be commended for his diligent and objective research in compiling the material. Many of the examples of managed news he cites are frightful and disturbing.

Publisher's Auxiliary for March 9, 1968, reviewed his book and I include the text of the review by Ted Serrill at this point in my remarks:

BOOK REVIEW: ON CREDIBILITY GAP

"Crisis in Credibility," by Bruce Ladd, 274 pages with bibliography and index, $5.50. The New American Library, New York City.

(By Ted Serrill)

It took a six months' leave of absence as press secretary to Cong. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) to produce this fast-reading documentation of how and when Governmental Washington fails to tell the truth, evades the issue and puts up smoke screens to hide the facts when things are not going just right in the administrative areas.

The publishing company, better known for its pocket books, is an arm of the Los Angeles Times.

It pictures Bruce on the dust jacket as a young, sharp-eyed journalist. After a degree from Northern Illinois a decade ago he served six years as an editor with the Mt. Morris (Ill.) Index and the Paddock Publications and then took a leave to be press secretary to Charles H. Percy, now U.S. Senator.

Since then, he has been a fellow of the American Political Science Assn. in the Nation's Capital and, except for his leave to write his first book, has served Cong. Rumsfeld as a staff aide.

The author, who is personally known to this reviewer through SDX and the Moss Subcommittee, says his book is selling well, but

there are few copies available yet around Washington.

His discussion of the President's role in formulating and administering the Government's information policy and the impact of Congressional news management on Government's credibility is well documented.

Among his conclusions:

". . . the ever-growing authority of the executive branch of the Federal government will have to be checked, if the democratic dialogue is to be preserved.

"The news media can also contribute to the demise of the credibility problem if they will be more attentive to their independent watchdog role. . . ."

In the latter respect he calls for more press manpower in Washington, avoidance of not-for-attribution and background-only briefings, avoiding seduction by administration officials, more coverage of the minority party, and being less concerned with the status quo and more concerned with raising hell.

Teachers in Politics: A Responsibility Seriously Taken

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, April 5 to April 7 were the days set aside by the teachers of our Nation for national Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. The sentiment which inspired this observance is a fine one, characteristic of the spirit of public service which motivates our teachers. Their already notable civic contributions at all levels can only be enhanced by active participation in politics.

As a former President, James Madison once noted:

A well-instructed people alone can be permanently a free people.

Since the earliest days of our Nation, teachers have been instructing generations of young people in the ideas and ideals which have kept our democracy strong. Paramount among these has been active participation in the political process, and the example of teachers' responsible and intelligent participation at the polls and in the precincts must serve as a model to the youth they teach.

With the complex problems facing our cities, our communities, and our country as a whole today, it is incumbent on each and every citizen to take part in the difficult decisions which must be made. Making one's choice through the political process is the most sensible alternative available to us. President Johnson stressed the importance of teacher participation in politics when he said, in a personal message to the teachers of America:

Give your active participation and leadership to partisan politics—local, state and national. . . . Today the challenges facing our nation call for intelligent, committed, active leadership. That means getting into politics—the area in which so many crucial public decisions are made.

A further indication of the importance of teacher participation in the decision-making process of public affairs is the increasing importance of educational legislation brought before the Congress today. Funds expended are already in the billions and who knows better than our teachers the needs and priorities of the Nation's schools? Many of the decisions which must be made in advancing legislation are highly technical and demand a competence often attained only by experts; the advice and opinions of the teaching profession, obtained through their participation in the political process at all levels, can be invaluable in securing the most beneficial legislation possible.

It is heartening that, to a great extent, teachers are aware of the importance of informed and intelligent participation in political activity. A survey by the National Education Association indicates that 67 percent of all teachers today believe they should participate actively in politics. And, teachers as a group have a better participation record in national elections than does the general voting public. In the November 1964 national elections nine out of 10 teachers went to the polls while only seven out of 10 persons in the general population of voting age did so. The events of Teachers-in-Politics Weekend should encourage even more teachers to be active participants in politics; through political clinics teachers may learn more about the ways open to them for expressing their opinions.

I strongly support such intelligent preparation for taking part in the political process. Our Nation's teachers are setting a precedent which every informed citizen should follow. Through political awareness and responsible action at the polls, teachers can lead the way to a stronger, more responsive government for all.

Capt. Edward A. Boardman Killed in Action

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Edward A. Boardman, a fine soldier from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CAPTAIN BOARDMAN KILLED IN ACTION—PASADENA RESIDENT LEAVES WIFE AND SIX CHILDREN

An Army officer from Pasadena, Md., was killed in action in Vietnam April 1, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

He was identified as Capt. Edward A. Boardman, 44, husband of Mrs. June Cornell Boardman, of 3912 Alberta avenue.

Captain Boardman was killed during an enemy mortar attack on his base at Long Binh, the Department of Defense said in a telegram to Mrs. Boardman. He was the company commander of a company of the 3rd Ordnance Battalion.

A native of Nichols, N.Y., Captain Boardman was educated in the public schools there. He was inducted into the Army soon after completing his schooling and served until he received a discharge in 1945.

He reentered the Army in 1950 and had been on active duty since that time. Before being assigned to Vietnam last October, Captain Boardman was on the staff of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe.

He spent most of his Army career as an enlisted man. He received his officer's commission in September, 1966. Previously held the rank of sergeant major.

In addition to his wife, Captain Boardman is survived by four daughters, Mrs. Louis G. Rimbagh, of Rivera Beach, Md.; Mrs. William T. Bottoms, of Riverdale, Md.; and Miss Andrea Boardman and Miss Carol Boardman, both of the home; two sons, Allen Boardman and James Boardman, both of the home; his mother, Mrs. Clayton Hayden, of Waverly, N.Y.; and a half-brother, Donald Hayden, also of Waverly.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my fellow Americans, and with people of good will throughout the world, in mourning the tragic death of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

To his family, to his friends and to his associates, I offer my heartfelt sympathy. It is they who bear the brunt of the grief that is shared by so many millions of people.

Columnists and commentators have already pointed out the great irony of his death—that this good and sincere man, who preached love and nonviolence, should be struck down by an act of hatred and violence.

We must go beyond this to appreciate the full tragedy of the assassination. To people of good faith in both races, Dr. King had held out the hope of a peaceful end to the prejudice and intolerance which have shackled this Nation and kept us from achieving the American dream of true freedom for all.

The real tragedy of Dr. King's death will come if Americans of both races use his assassination as an excuse to continue the hatred and violence against which he fought and preached, and because of which he died.

Dr. King would be the first to plead for the better alternative—that his death should hasten the day when all Americans share in the dreams and visions that he saw from the mountain top.

The assassination of Abraham Lincoln brought a reaction of hatred that racked this Nation for a decade, and cursed the already anguished South with the agonizing period known to history as the Reconstruction.

The assassination of John F. Kennedy, by contrast, ushered in an era of hope. The legislation and social progress for which he fought and died became a reality in part because of his death.

This would be a more fitting memorial for Dr. Martin Luther King.

It is not important or significant that the assassin was a white man. This was an accident of fate. It is more significant that he was an evil man, whose mind had been warped by the very hatred that Dr. King sought to eliminate.

There are both white and black Americans who preach violence as the answer to our Nation's problems. In the first an-

gry reaction to Dr. King's death, these people had their way. Death and destruction, grief and ashes, stand today as eloquent testimony to this senseless venting of hate.

A counterreaction to this violence would only pile tragedy upon tragedy.

Dr. King's death will not have been completely in vain if we let this grievous week launch a new day of hope for the United States and for the world.

Let us pray that all Americans, black and white, will recognize the true wisdom and hope of Dr. King's philosophy. Let us strive together that his dreams may be realized, and that hatred based on the color of skin may be erased from our way of life.

How To Be a Good Board Member

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and pleased to be advised that Mr. Ian M. MacRitchie, a constituent, has been named secretary of the board of education in Oaklawn, Ill., and presented a paper, "How To Be a Good Board Member," at the convention of the National School Boards Association held a week ago in Detroit.

In view of the major interest that we all have in advancing education in the United States, I am pleased to insert Mr. MacRitchie's remarks in the RECORD where they will hopefully receive thoughtful reviews:

HOW TO BE A GOOD BOARD MEMBER

(Presented at NSBA Convention, Detroit, Mich., March 30, 1968, by Ian M. MacRitchie, secretary, board of education, Oak Lawn, Ill.)

Anyone can be a board member. It takes a little effort to be a good one. What I have to say this morning has been said by many in several ways but like the Ten Commandments, it bears repeating.

The board of education of which you are an active member is an American invention that has its roots in our Colonial heritage. With all members of boards of education throughout this nation, you represent a continuing commitment to local control and decision-making in the education of our youth. Have the vision and courage to discharge your duties and responsibilities so that you may continue to enjoy the privilege of self-determination.

You are now involved in the greatest growth industry of this last half of the 20th century. You are engaged in one of the largest enterprises in your community. You are a critical force in the creation of human and material wealth—through the most dynamic process known to man—the education of our youth.

Remember, however, that you are only one of the members of the board of education, but you are one. Neither dominate nor be dominated. Your vote counts, be it with the majority or against it. You will make your contribution to the future of your community, the state and the nation if you act as an informed, responsible citizen—and you will always have a clear conscience.

Study the issues and inform yourself before making up your mind. Your behavior as a board member will require a high degree of maturity to examine the facts, keeping in focus the objectives for which you were elected—the education of the young people entrusted in your care.

Maintain a good rapport with your administration and staff. A board sometimes prefers to make up its mind with little or no prior consultation with the staff and administration. Such a board may be able to make prompt decisions and thus appear to be efficient. It takes a little more time to give careful consideration to the ideas of those who have a legitimate right to be heard, and this includes the public, but ultimately board decisions are much more likely to be effective.

Make a special effort to understand the fiscal problems of your district. Boards authorize the expenditure of large sums of public monies and board members are accountable for decisions made. Take this role as a board member seriously—very seriously.

The real issues in education that matter are usually not cut and dried, and most positions taken are not clearly right or wrong. Vote with the majority if you believe they are right. However, if it is your considered judgment that you cannot support the others, have the courage to cast a minority vote. A board that sees eye to eye on almost every issue is probably not dealing with very many important educational issues. In situations such as this a one man board could operate equally as well. Do not be a rubber stamp.

You have only one vote, although you may influence others to vote with you or against the issue you favor. Once the majority has spoken, however, you have an obligation to support the majority board position.

In conclusion, I would like to summarize a list of do's and don'ts that will make up a credo that you can live with and which will help make you a better board member. These I have put in the first person because they should be considered in this vein by all school board members—new or experienced. As I recite them, assume that I am speaking as if I were you.

Things I should do as a board member:

1. Remember that outside a regular or adjourned meeting legally constituted I have no legal authority.

2. Familiarize myself with the School Code of my state. The Code establishes the "ground rules" as well as being the law with respect to the public school system.

3. Familiarize myself with the written policy established by the Board of Education providing the "ground rules" of the operation of my district. Board policy sets forth the responsibilities, duties and limitations of all Board members, the admnistration and all employees.

4. Remember that in all instances that I must exercise the trust and responsibilities of a board member that will result in and ensure for the children of my school district the best educational opportunities that the resources of the district can afford.

5. Study the agenda of the meeting and all pertinent data provided with the agenda prior to the meeting, marking any items that I do not fully understand so that they can be cleared up by questions before Board action is taken. (By Board policy in my district, the agenda and related material must be in the hands of each Board member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.)

6. Support the Board action even though I may have voted against it. I believe that this promotes Board harmony and team work.

7. At all times remember that it is my responsibility to represent the best interests of the total community, not that of a particular segment.

8. Listen to the discussions of the matter at hand and state my views briefly and clearly and when I disagree, do so without being disagreeable or cherishing grudges.

9. Make no promises nor attempt to settle complaints or suggestions made to me by any one but refer such complaints and suggestions through the proper channels.

10. Take part in or attend regional school board conferences and workshops. When the opportunity arises take part in or attend the National School Board Association Convention.

11. Remember that I am attending such meetings for the benefit of my district and report back to my board with as complete a review of the meeting as possible.

12. Recognize that an effective board gives as much attention to the educational program embodied in the school curriculum as it does in the business operation of the district. The sole reason for the business operation, i.e., school sites, school buildings, equipment, maintenance, transportation, and administration is to provide an adequate educational program.

13. Spend time reading books, articles, periodicals, superintendent's reports to provide background for informed discussions at board meetings and in public contacts.

14. I reiterate that the sole purpose of a Board of Education is to provide the facilities and staff for the best education possible for the children.

There are, conversely, things that I as a Board member should not do:

1. Commit myself or my board to any course of action outside of a legally constituted meeting of the Board.

2. Seek to use my position as a Board member as a stepping stone to other public office.

3. Forget, at any time, that I have a moral and ethical responsibility to discharge my functions courageously and impartially in the interest of the greatest good to the greatest number at all times.

4. Never allow pressure groups to influence my thinking and judgment of any issue relative to the operation of my district and the education of the children. In this vein I cite William Shakespeare: "Take each man's censure but reserve thy judgment."

5. Never "play politics" in either the traditional manner or in any petty sense.

6. Overlook, at any time, that although I am a member of a local board I am a State Official and that I have a responsibility to seek improvement of education throughout the state.—In this regard active membership in the State School Board Association is of prime importance.

7. Never make promises as to how I will vote on any matter, properly the prerequisite of the entire board, to the public or to any other Board member.

8. Never attend or attempt to institute meetings in "secret" or "star chamber" meetings which are not official and at which all board members do not have an opportunity to attend.

There are other "dos and don'ts" for Board members many of which, I am sure, you all are aware. These that I have mentioned here will make up a credo that all Board members can follow. I hope that they will be of help to all of you.

President Sets His Own Standard for the Level of Statesmanship

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, a President sets his own standard for the level of statesmanship at which he will operate. Mr. Johnson has set that standard very high indeed.

I take his momentous decision to mean this: The present moment requires a sense of national unity to resolve the great problems of Vietnam, of the cities, and of keeping the economy in balance.

To get this unity the President must be above partisan politics or the suspicion of self-seeking, particularly in foreign policy. Here the highest degree of resolve and sincerity must accompany the unilateral deescalation order he announced in his momentous speech if it is to start a series of reciprocal withdrawals which could end the war.

Before the President's historic action it looked like the timing of the election was against us. At very least, there would be a long, bloody interim between now and the election, during which America's direction would be in doubt.

Now the situation has changed. The time for a response from North Vietnam and all Vietnamese is now if peace is sought. And a response came. We have yet to gage its sincerity and importance.

The President's action eliminated a dangerous 6 months of doldrums in the process of seeking peace.

On the domestic front, there must be a massive attack on the ills of the cities. How dramatically this was demonstrated last week. The economy must be bolstered to stem inflation and reduce high interest to keep the dollar strong and stable at home and abroad.

A high level of statesmanship in this situation demands support of the surtax. And such an austere demand for taxes and for the application of our resources to our major ills can only be attained by a unified Democratic Party.

The President obviously thinks—from what he clearly said—that such a unified party cannot be led by an incumbent who is a contender for the presidential nomination.

I think what he is doing is in the highest tradition of the great office of the Presidency.

Equal Opportunity for All Americans

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, time and again we have heard, in this Chamber, complaints from opponents of civil rights legislation that they have been forced to legislate under the duress of domestic violence. No doubt Members of this body will this week again hear those same complaints.

I would remind the Members of the House that we have had ample opportunity to legislate without the pressure of domestic violence in past months. Instead of doing what must be done to end the strife and discord in this country, we repeatedly have tolerated delay and compromise.

Finally, on March 11, the Senate acted on H.R. 2516. Now this legislation awaits action in this House.

We must recognize that the current civil rights bill is only a modest step in the direction of the equal opportunity for which the Nation purports to stand. Before a Negro father can buy that house in the suburbs, he needs more than a fair housing law. He needs a decent job. That means he needs equal job opportunity—equal education; a decent chance to realize the hopes and dreams white America takes for granted.

But H.R. 2516 is a start, and I hope the House recognizes its importance—not only in its substance—but as a signal to the citizens of the Nation that Congress is committed to the dream of equality of opportunity.

Are we going to answer the cry for help that screams for recognition in this Nation—or shall we sit quietly while the remains of the American dream are buried in Atlanta along with the body of Dr. Martin Luther King?

Mr. Speaker, it is a time for action. Action on civil rights, on education, on programs against poverty. America has lost a leader. Let us try to fill the leadership void right here, in the Halls of Congress, by taking the action we all know is necessary for the preservation and advancement of this Nation.

Passover, 1968

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 1968 observance of Passover, I extend to my Jewish friends and constituents my sincere best wishes. Passover is truly a time for joy and gladness, when the Jewish people may remind themselves and the world of their historic and successful struggle to preserve their national identity, to uphold the ideal of religious freedom, and to remember that oppression and tyranny cannot forever withstand the opposition of a righteous and determined people.

Passover, of course, is a festival which signifies Jewish identity. It is a festival which acts as a symbol, as it were, of the will of the Jewish people, expressed early in their history, to preserve their religious customs and national integrity although outnumbered and surrounded by hostile adversaries.

Although the Passover is unalterably identified with the exodus, it is not unlikely that this ancient festival has its origins much deeper in history, or prehistory, as the case may be. It is possible that Passover was at first a synthesis of two primeval rites—the springtime festival of a nomadic people who sacrificed a lamb to insure the welfare of their flocks; and a feast of unleavened bread, which was celebrated also in the spring, by a predominately agricultural people. The Hebrews, who had been a nomadic people before they came to Palestine, and who became an agricultural people after they settled in the area, would have found both festivals compatible with their customs and way of life. It is, therefore, possible, that the Passover derives from these ancient rituals, given cultural and historic significance by the important event of the exodus, which assured the preservation of the Jews as a people possessing a unique religion and culture. In "passing over" the blood-stained houses of the Israelites living in Egypt, the Lord's avenging angel assured the survival of a people destined to have incalculable influence over the future history of the world.

Today, in 20th-century America, the Passover is significant not only for Jewish people, but for all Americans—for those who love liberty and the right of self-determination for all men. In an age when all men are demanding, as never before, their right to justice and equality, it is appropriate that we remember the example set 3,000 years ago by a then small and insignificant people—an example unparalleled in the history of the world as a model of courage, sacrifice, and endurance.

During this Passover I offer to everyone participating in its observance my own hopes for the future of the Jewish community and the American Nation. In the hurry and confusion of a restless and anxious world, may the wonder of Passover be never forgotten:

> The Lord is my strength and song, and he is become my salvation: he is my God, and I will prepare him an habitation; my father's God, and I will exalt him. . . . Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed: thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation.—Exodus, 15: 2, 13.

Senator Kennedy Frightening, Writer Says

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very observant and keen reporter of the Washington scene is Dumitru Danielopol, columnist of the Copley Press, who possesses a special background in foreign affairs which serves him well in analyzing current developments. Therefore, his commentary on recent current as well as international events, I believe, merit attention, and I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the April 3 edition of the Joliet Herald News, Joliet, Ill., as follows:

SENATOR KENNEDY FRIGHTENING, WRITER SAYS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Robert Kennedy's entry into the presidential race is more than welcome.

With Sen. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., and former Gov. George Wallace of Alabama competing, his bid assures Democrats of a broad choice of presidential nominees.

For people like me who did not support Mr. Johnson in 1964, this competition is a sort of vindication. Even Democrats now concede they made the wrong choice.

If their campaign is rough, tough and outspoken so much the better. It's time that the American people take a look at four decades of virtually uninterrupted Democratic rule.

Sen. Kennedy says that the President's policies are "catastrophic."

They are.

After four years of fumbling in Vietnam, the President himself realizes he's getting nowhere. He now calls for a total effort and for victory at home and abroad. That's the policy Republicans have been advocating for years.

After years of appeasement of the Reds in Europe with "peaceful engagement," "de-

tente" and economic help there is no real sign the Communists have changed their spots. They are still providing the major help to Hanoi.

For years the Republicans have called for a reduction in the lavish "Great Society" and antipoverty programs, for reductions in the huge budget deficits that imperil our economy and place the dollar in jeopardy.

Now President Johnson advocates restriction on travel, increased taxation and an "austerity" program.

But while Sen. Kennedy adds to the dialogue, there's no indication that he would improve on President Johnson's performance.

Quite the contrary. So far, Kennedy's program is even less acceptable than that of President Johnson in 1964.

It can be spelled out in three words:

"Anarchy, defeatism and appeasement." Coincidentally they are the initials of ADA.

In a country torn by dissent, rebellion and rioting Sen. Kennedy says: "The more riots that come on college campuses, the better world for tomorrow."

If that isn't anarchy, what is? It's a Kennedy style "cultural revolution."

The senator from New York has been a defeatist on Vietnam for years. He joined other liberals like Walter Lippmann, Sen. J. William Fulbright, Prof. George Kennen, etc., to declare that this a war we cannot win.

Consequently, Sen. Kennedy has advocated appeasement. He has called for admission of the Viet Cong in peace negotiations to assure them "a genuine place in the political life of Vietnam."

This implies the ultimate surrender of South Vietnam to the Reds.

Kennedy, of course, denies that we would sell out American interests but he fails to explain how he's going to prevent a Red takeover. Nor does he say how he is going to prevent wars of liberation in Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and other Asian countries?

Republicans warned the American people in 1964.

In a pre-election column in 1964 I said:

"The Democratic platform believes we can appease Communist dictators, we can pamper and feed them and eventually convert them to freedom, that we can coexist, that we can live and let live.

"President Johnson promises more disarmament, more accommodation, more trade and more help to the Communists.

"He frightens me."

Sen. Kennedy frightens me even more today.

Refer "Pueblo" Dispute to International Court of Justice for Adjudication

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I suggested that the question of whether the *Pueblo* violated North Korean territorial waters be submitted to independent third-party adjudication, preferably the International Court of Justice at the Hague.

It has come to my attention that Mr. William K. Ailshie, a retired former U.S. consul general, has written a letter to the San Diego Union on February 27, 1968, expressing much the same viewpoint and adding some very persuasive arguments of his own. I include his letter in my remarks at this point:

EDITOR, THE UNION: Since our government has made the seizure of the USS Pueblo by North Korea a legal question by stating that the Pueblo was in international waters when seized, I suggest that the case be submitted to the World Court.

I cannot see what we could possibly stand to lose by submitting it to an impartial international court—at least a majority being impartial.

Nothing would raise the prestige of the United States so much as submission of the Pueblo incident to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, and nothing would lower the prestige of the Communist bloc so much as a refusal to submit this case to the World Court.

As presently constituted the court is made up of 15 judges from 15 different countries elected by the General Assembly and Security Council voting independently.

Even if the court should render a purely political verdict, we have no reason to fear its impartiality or lack of it. There are only two hardcore Communist members at present, Russia and Poland. On our side are the United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, the Philippines, France, Mexico, Peru, Italy and Japan. Dubious countries are Lebanon, Nigeria, Senegal and Pakistan. All questions are decided by a majority vote. A quorum of nine judges is sufficient to constitute the court.

Every judge is an eminent international lawyer whose professional pride likely would cause him to hesitate to put his name on an opinion which would damage his standing among fellow jurists. The decision of the court would be a precedent and would be binding on the entire international community, including the Communist nations.

We have nothing to lose and much to gain by submitting the Pueblo incident to the World Court at The Hague.

WILLIAM K. AILSHIE,
U.S. Consul General, Retired.
LA JOLLA, CALIF.

A Tribute to Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, there is tragic irony in the circumstances that at the very moment when America gloried in its brightest hopes for peace in Vietnam, it was plunged into the depths of despair by alarms of civil disorder.

The insensate violence, arson, and looting, which erupted across the Nation in the wake of the execrable assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, demonstrate the fragile character of the strands which knit the fabric of a peaceful social order. On the other hand, the death and destruction wrought by wanton riots in our National Capital, in Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and in other cities fall far short of justifying descriptions, by many public spokesmen, of America, as a "sick society."

The health of a society cannot be measured by the abberational conduct of those to whom the killing of Dr. King has been an excuse, rather than a cause, for lawlessness. Those who participated in the violence of arson and looting are those who have not been touched by the preaching and teaching of Dr. King. The target areas of these apostles of violence were liquor, clothing, and appliance stores, and the guiding impulse of these looters was burglary of products offered for sale in these establishments, not vengeance for the death of a beloved leader. On the contrary, the toll of death they have caused, the homeless refugees they have created, desecrates the memory of Dr. King and affront his philosophy.

Our social health should, in fact, be measured by the millions of people in America from all walks of life who responded to President Johnson's designation of Sunday as a day of prayer and dedication, by the thousands of black and white people who joined in prayer at the Central Park Mall, by the special services conducted in churches, synagogues, schools, and other institutions throughout the land, by the millions of countless and unsung ways that our people have demonstrated their profound grief and dismay. Indeed, the gentle threnody composed by our flags at half staff waving in the breeze more profoundly expresses the mood of our people than the raucous violence in the streets. In the critical days ahead, America will be guided by the simple message brought to his congregation by Dr. King's father:

Don't lose your way, and don't ever let it get so dark that you can't see a star.

Ideas that move men and nations have an organic quality that sustains them beyond the span of life of their creator, and Dr. King's ideal for progress through nonviolence will inspire those who survive him. His dream of a society of social justice, a society that knows no bigotry and prejudice, a society that knows no hunger, no poverty, no war, is the essence of the Judea-Christian ideal to which civilization has aspired for 2,000 years.

In the critical days ahead, we shall miss his inspiring leadership. Through the sheer force of his personality and dedication, he bridged the chasm between those who envision America as a united people and those who contend for racial separatism; between those who seek progress toward attainable goals through creative protest and those who proclaim violence, rather than liberty, throughout the land. As a student of the Bible, Dr. King spoke in simple, vivid Biblical imagery and through his words touched the finest instincts of people throughout the world.

Dr. Martin Luther King has now taken his place in the history of our Nation and in the history of civilization. There is perhaps no better way to express our loss than in the gentle, moving words of Shelley's elegy to Keats:

And thou, sad Hour, selected from all the years to mourn our loss, rouse thy obscure compeers and teach them thine own sorrow; say: "With me died Martin Luther King; till the Future dares forget the Past, his fate and his fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity."

In Step With Politics—Out of Step With the People

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Liberty Lobby open letter to Members of the House of Representatives is worthy of

consideration by every fair and open-minded colleague.

The letter and research report follow my remarks:

LIBERTY LOBBY,
Tuesday, April 9.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

All men of good will must regret the recent assassination of Martin Luther King, whatever their position on the issues with which he was involved.

If this is true, it is now even more incumbent on the Congress that it refrain from immediate consideration of the Civil Rights Bill now before the Rules Committee. Because, if regret—or any other emotion—dominates the thoughts of House Members, this is no time to make use of the awesome power of authority granted to Representatives by their constituents. This power is intended to be used only when guided by judicious reason . . . not when directed by emotion.

You will recall that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed as "a memorial to John F. Kennedy." The Civil Rights Act of 1965 was passed as a reaction to the death of Viola Liuzzo. There must be a better way to memorialize martyrs than through the passage of laws that affects the lives of 200 million Americans. Laws should not be enacted by bullets.

Further, Members of the House who react emotionally in the context of April, may regret their action in the cool atmosphere of November. Recall always that much can occur—indeed, much is certain to occur—between now and November, that will alter the attitudes of the voters to whom you must answer.

The death of Martin King has no doubt initiated a pang of remorse in the hearts of some of the tens of millions of Americans who hated everything—the hyprocrisy, the demoguery and the violence—that King represented. But . . . how long will this remorse last? In the heat of summer—in the crackle of gunfire and the crash of broken glass—the problems that King helped to create will remain. Then the remorse will melt away. The passion of regret will be replaced with the passion of anger.

If you question the existence of so-called White Blacklash, I think you will find the enclosed advance copy of the May *Liberty Lowdown* worth reading. More than for anyone else, it was written for you. If democracy in America is going to work, it demands recognition by elected representatives of the true feelings of those who elect him.

Incidentally, if you wish to receive the monthly *Liberty Lowdown,* which is otherwise restricted to our 10,000 Board of Policy members, we will be pleased to respond to your request.

Sincerely,

W. B. HICKS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

LIBERTY LOWDOWN

PRAGMATIC POLITICS, THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE POLLS

Back in 1964, the Republican Party found itself divided between those who advocated a pragmatic appeal to the "moderate" voters of the Nation, and others who said that the Party should stand for "principle" above politics.

The 1964 election appeared to justify the position of the party "pragmatists." At least, it strengthened the influence of such groups as David Rockefeller's Ripon Society, and it led to the publication of numerous costly research studies such as *Where the Votes Are,* an 84-page statistical polemic issued by the Senate Republican Policy Committee in July of 1966. The theme of *Where the Votes Are,* was typical of nearly all the research of 1965 and '66: The Party must turn leftward in the future, to remain in the mainstream of American politics.

The pragmatic conclusion of this cool, analytical study was couched in the words of Michigan Governor George Romney, already recognized as *the* vote-getter of the Republican Party:

"The Republican Party . . . Must work without respite, (and) dedicate itself with unalloyed devotion to the task of securing equal rights for all Americans."

Thus did the party pragmatists unfurl the banner of Civil Rights as the standard to which victory-seeking Republicans should rally in 1966, 1968 and beyond.

REPUBLICANS A THIRD PARTY?

Hard on the heels of the Senate Policy Committee study, the July 31, 1966 Gallup Poll revealed the alarming fact that for the first time, the number of voters who identified themselves as "Independents" equalled the number who called themselves Republicans. In effect, Republicans were on the verge of becoming the Third Party.

Pragmatic Republican politicians were thus given whatever justification they might require to take action—even radical action—to reshape the image of the Party to make it more appealing to the growing bloc of Independent voters.

Strangely, however, the pragmatists did no such thing. Instead of analyzing the motivations of the Independent voter, and formulating a Republican position that would attract his allegiance to the Republican Party, the researchers and policymakers of the party continued to turn out studies and reports on how the party could improve its appeal to the *Negro* voter, as if the Negro and the Independent were one and the same.

It did not require a Ph. D. to recognize the fallacy of this assumption. The polls as published in the newspapers clearly made the distinction. For one thing, the percentage of non-white voters who claim to be Independent is only about two-thirds as large as the percentage of white voters who so identify themselves. In September of 1967, for example, 31% of all voters said they were Independents; but of non-white voters, only 22% put themselves in this category. Thus, of the 35-million voting-age Independents as of September, 1967, *only 2.5 million—or 7%—are non-whites.*

In addition, were further proof of the fallacy needed, a glance at the findings of the July, 1966 Gallup Poll would have revealed that *"On Civil Rights, Independents are closer to Republicans than Democrats in their view that the Johnson Administration is pushing integration 'too fast.'"* It seems that even a cursory consideration of this statement would have alerted GOP researchers to the fact that the huge Independent vote would hardly respond to an appeal aimed at Negroes.

IDEOLOGIES IN PRAGMATIC CLOTHING

Nevertheless and willy-nilly, the supposedly pragmatic research staffs of the GOP persisted in their leftward drive to line up the Negro vote in 1966. They managed to deceive a majority of House Republicans into voting "pragmatically" for a "Fair Housing" Civil Rights bill in August of that year.

By allowing their emotions to overcome their common sense, these ideologies in pragmatic clothing might have ruined the Republican Party's chances for a comeback in 1966. Instead the GOP was saved from a harsh lesson by two big factors: One was that the Fair Housing bill of 1966 did not pass into law, thus precluding any impetus it might have added to the wave of anti-Civil Rights feeling that was sweeping the Country at the time; and the other factor was the publicity given to Ev Dirksen's opposition to the bill by the Nation's press, such as the *Washington Post* headline of September 9, "Dirksen Turns Back on Civil Rights Movement."

On the very eve of the 1966 elections, the Harris Survey summed up:

"The number of white people who now believe that Negroes have tried to move 'too fast' has risen to 85%, up from 49% a year ago and up from 34% in November 1964.

"White criticism of Negro demonstrations now has mounted to 88%, up from 81% in September (the previous month—ed.).

"By 56–44% the public is critical of the way the Johnson Administration has handled civil rights and racial problems.

"At the same time, by a thumping 69–31% margin, voters now believe the Republican Party would more likely slow down the pace of civil rights."

And—as the 1966 election returns rolled in—the fortunate Republican Party reaped its windfall: a gain of 47 seats in the House of Representatives.

Thanks to the voters' image of the Democratic Party as the champion of Civil Rights, the Democrats bore the brunt of the White Backlash in 1966. This is a conclusion that has been denied by most analysts of the election, but then, most of those analysts are pragmatists of the same ideological stripe as the research specialists who turned out *"Where the Votes Are,"* so they can be expected to deny the existence of White Backlash.

The facts seem clear:

(1) Even though no Republican was defeated in the November election who had voted or paired for Fair Housing in August; neither was any defeated who had voted or paired against Fair Housing, with the single exception of Alabama's Glenn Andrews, who succumbed to the vote-pulling power of Lurleen Wallace. This seeming lack of impact on Republicans is the indicator that most analysts point to as proof that White Backlash was not a factor in the election of 1966.

Please remember, however, the October Harris Survey, and the 69% of voters who felt that "the Republican Party would more likely slow down the pace of civil rights." Recall also, Dirksen's September stand against Fair Housing.

(2) Of the 189 Democrats who stood for election in November after voting or pairing for Fair Housing in August, *32—or nearly one out of six*—did not pass muster with the voters. Compare this one-out-of-six casualty ratio with what happened to the Democrats who had voted or paired against Fair Housing. Of these there were 101, up for election in November, only *eight* of whom—less than one out of twelve—were defeated!

It is even more rewarding to note that the eight Democrats who lost after voting against Fair Housing have one very important common characteristic: They were all pro-Johnson liberals. None of them scored over 50% on the Conservative voting record: *Liberty Ledger.* Their average score was less than 30%.

Even more significant, all of the eight except Trimble (Ark.) and Cooley (N.C.) had voted for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and had already established their images as being pro Civil Rights. For them it was too late to alter that image with a single vote. As for Trimble and Cooley, the only two anti's who suffered defeat in 1966, the aroma of LBJ could not be overcome by their votes against Fair Housing.

But let's be pragmatic. These are the facts, and they boil down to this: Except for Trimble and Cooley, and Glen Andrews of Alabama whose sin was to oppose the party of Lurleen Wallace . . . and none of whom was defeated by a pro-Civil Rights opponent.

NOT ONE OTHER ANTI-CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESSMAN WAS DEFEATED IN 1966

While on the other side of the coin, thirty-two who had voted or paired in favor of Fair Housing lost their seats. And—if we take into account the pro-Civil Rights positions of the six whose Fair Housing vote was not enough to make up for their pre-

vious record of voting against their white constituents—and who lost anyway—the true total of pro-Civil Rights casualties in the 1966 election rises to thirty-eight!

"Pragmatism," like democracy, serves hidden masters. In early 1965, Liberty Lobby prepared its own study of the 1964 election. Called *Looking Forward*, this fact-filled and sensible analysis came up with conclusions completely opposite to those of the liberal "pragmatists." It was clear then, and it is even more clear today, that a pro-civil rights stance by the Republican Party will constitute only the epitaph for its headstone.

The GOP can no longer afford to allow the well-financed theorists of the Left to provide them with policy. Instead, they had better begin looking at the facts and appraising them realistically.

Newsletter

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for the readers of the RECORD, I submit my current newsletter to the people of Kentucky's Fourth District, except material which has already appeared in the RECORD at a previous time. The newsletter follows:

APRIL 1968.

DEAR FRIENDS: Many significant developments have occurred since I last wrote to you. Some of these should help give stability to our country while others may lead to more unrest and strife.

As I draft this portion of this letter, I am on a plane from Washington to Kentucky sitting next to my friend Congressman Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.). We have been discussing recent events—and votes yet to come in The Congress. As he now works on his speech, I felt inclined to put down a few thoughts to you.

Hanoi's response to the President's bombing pause north of the 20th Parallel has created a sense of cautious optimism in Washington. Many Members of Congress—as well as people across the country—are obviously discontent with the gradual escalation policy of the past several years—resulting in a stalemate that was not satisfactory. The President had advice from many quarters calling on him to change course; some wanted all out escalation—(use the atom bomb, if necessary) while others wanted de-escalation. His choice to try for a step by step de-escalation—with each side de-escalating a step at a time was first proposed by Congressman Brad Morse (R. Mass.) about a year ago. He told a group of us at the White House about 6 months ago that he did not then think it would work. Events have obviously changed his mind.

Whether the bombing restraint will lead to meaningful negotiations toward peace remains to be seen—but I am certain that all Americans, whether hawks or doves—whether Democrats or Republicans, are in accord in their hope that an honorable peace can come from these talks.

During the Easter season when the hearts and minds of each of us are directed toward the Prince of Peace—Son of the Architect of the Universe—we should all raise our voices to Him in humble prayer that He will direct those at the negotiating level to say and do those things which will lead to a meaningful peace.

The murder of Rev. King—has been a topic of much discussion across the country. Illegal killing can never be condoned whether the victim be The President of the United States (as we have witnessed), a civil rights leader (as Rev. King) or the innocent victim on a N.W. Washington street stabbed to death by an unruly mob the night of Rev. King's murder.

The maintenance of law and order is primarily the responsibility of law enforcement officers at the local level; City Police, State Police, County Police, sheriffs, firemen, etc.

These men risk their lives daily to preserve law and order. Several have lost their lives in Kentucky in the last year. Everyone of us owe a word of encouragement to these men and as citizens let's shoulder our responsibility in supporting the allocation of an adequate portion of our tax dollar for police and firemen.

The riots in Washington and other major cities are of major concern to us all. We regret the murder of Rev. King. Unfortunately any leader—or prominent person—walks the streets with his life in jeopardy—more jeopardy than the ordinary citizen. Our government, I believe, has been placating and rewarding violence. Many disagree with me on this, I know, but I feel an increase in violence has been nurtured and engendered by legislation and court decisions.

The less fortunate of any race could well be given self help opportunity, but outright gifts to encourage idleness and lawlessness lead to chaos. I believe in charitable legislation along the opportunity line but not to buy the vote of any group—or legislation to destroy the incentive and ingenuity of our people.

I am fearful that I am in the minority here in the firm belief that we should not appease the trouble makers—but should encourage obedience to law and encourage punitive measures for looting and arson as well as murder.

The vast majority of our Negro citizens are acceptable to our society and deserve equal opportunity to achieve greatness in our society, but militants of any color should be dealt with sternly and not appeased.

Copper goes to Communists: In typical Great Society style—amid a copper strike, while U.S. reserves were down to less than one-third of our stockpile needs—the Commerce Department issued a license for shipment of $2,504,500 in copper concentrates to Communist Yugoslavia, Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb (R., Calif.) said the copper "could end up in equipment sent to North Vietnam by other Communist Nations."

Cost of the war. Based on the estimated cost of $30 Billion per year, the war in Vietnam is presently costing over $3.4 Million per hour.

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST TO REAR A CHILD?

Hey, Uncle, how much does it cost to rear a child?

You allow us taxparents only $600 a year to feed, clothe, house and train a youngster.

Yet, to feed, clothe, house and train a youngster in your Federal government Job Corps you spend $7,000 a year!

Now, which is the correct figure? Either we're allowing you too much or you're not allowing us enough.

You allow taxpaying parents a $600 deduction for the care and feeding of each child. . . .

Yet under the Cuban refugee program you assume minimal upkeep requires $1,200 a year—and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school—an extra $1,000 a year.

How come you shortchange the homefolks?

In the austere environs of a federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one person, with no frills, no luxuries, and no borrowing dad's car—$2,300 per year!

By what rule of thumb do you estimate that mom and dad can do it for one-fourth of the amount?

Under Social Security, you will pay $168 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on $50 a month?

And Uncle, your VISTA Program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent $3,100,000 this last fiscal year to turn out only 202 trainees.

That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for one year is more than $15,000.

Then how come we taxpaying parents get an exemption of only $600 to maintain and train one youth for one year?

Or let's see how much you spent upkeeping one youngster in military uniform. House $55.10 a month. Food $30.26 a month. Clothing upkeep $4.20 a month. That comes to $1,074.04 a year.

How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine . . . for $600 a year? With your own figures, you admit it can't be done.

It is possible, Uncle, that you expect us parents to manage more efficiently than you, because we usually do.

With all our expenses, we American individuals have more than enough savings to offset our debts, you don't.

With all our prosperity, you, Uncle, are still spending per year 2.9 billion dollars more for relief than during the depths of the depression. So it may be that you are uncommonly extravagant.

But, however, we try to rationalize and explain you and excuse you, it is still a hurtful affront when you allow us hard working, dues-paying homefolks only $600 a year to rear a legitimate child. . . .

While you, under ADC, will pay more than $800 a year to upkeep an illegitimate one.

YOUR TAXES AT WORK

The Government's contempt for the taxpayers money was illustrated by Vice President Hubert Humphrey when he sent a huge Lockheed Jetstar back to Washington, D.C., from Scranton, Pa., just to pick up a tuxedo he forgot. This abuse of taxpayer funds came shortly after the President had given Sen. Vance Hartke (D, Ind.) a free round trip on Air Force One to Evansville, Ind., to get an honorary degree, then back to Washington to make a cocktail party at the White House. The jet set should make taxpayers upset.

The national debt: I receive quite a few inquiries as to who owns the National Debt. As of Dec. 1967 the total debt was $345.2 Billion. Commercial banks hold $63.9 Billion, Federal Reserve Banks hold $49.1 Billion and Government investment accounts hold $76 Billion. Individuals, insurance companies, state and local governments, corporations, etc. hold $156.2 Billion.

The $76 Billion in Government investment accounts is made up of $10.7 Billion for the Unemployment Trust Fund; $22.1 Billion from the Social Security fund; $17.7 Billion for the Civil Service Retirement Fund; $6.9 Billion for V.A. Insurance Funds; $3.6 Billion from Fed. Dep. Ins. Fund. The balance is from other Trust funds and a complete breakdown will be furnished on request.

Teachers and Politics

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I know of no group having a greater capability to shape the American scene than the teacher-citizen. In our contemporary society the educator is not just the purveyor of information. He, through his actions and statements, communicates a

viewpoint which students will certainly consider and may well choose to adopt. It is, therefore, imperative that the teacher-citizen understand the operation of our political process. Equally importantly, it will prepare and motivate more educators to assume their proper role in forwarding the legitimate aims of the American education profession.

Freedom Is Not Free

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD to the following essay written by Sue Cate of Kodak, Tenn., and a student at Sevier County High School.

Sue's essay won first place in the Americanism essay contest sponsored annually by American Legion Auxiliary Unit 104 of Sevierville, Tenn., and it has now been entered in State competition.

My congratulations and best wishes to this most outstanding young lady whose essay speaks eloquently of her devotion to her country.

The essay follows:

FREEDOM IS NOT FREE

(By Sue Cate)

Is freedom really free? Does it come like the air we breathe—without a price tag. No, freedom carries with it the largest price of any other asset known to man.

Ask a young man torn from his family to fight a war what freedom is costing him. He'll tell you of hours of fear, death surrounding him, plus memories of the people at home who need him. Sometimes these men are "lucky." They don't die on the battlefield. Instead they "merely" lose arms, legs, or maybe just their eye sight or ability to walk. Maybe, if a man is really lucky, he won't be physically disabled. Instead, he greets his family with a mind crippled by the agony of war.

What price does the family pay for their freedom? Mothers and wives spend hours worrying about that man in the combat zone. Children ask, "Do I have a daddy?" The sweethearts and close friends of these men pay their price, too. They listen to well-meaning neighbors talk about our "service boys," when we know very well if anyone deserves to be called a man, it's our soldiers fighting a war to keep America free. To them that's the greatest cause anyone needs.

There is in every group one who measures cost primarily in the terms of monetary worth. These members of our citizenry scream about the taxes we must pay. If our egotistic brother in America could hear someone else's voice besides his own, he might hear the voices of our "brothers across the sea" who tell us that all that they have goes to the government. And we complain of the small duty we must pay for the advantages of a free society!

Freedom costs even more. Its price includes love, self-discipline, patriotism, hard work and honesty. These qualities have been present in America since the time of the Revolution. If we let them die out now, our free society is headed for self-destruction. Unless our leaders learn to put "U. S." before "US" they will soon lead us into the flaming pits of dictatorship.

Freedom may cost a man his dream for power, but isn't freedom worth any price?

A Living Memorial to Dr. King

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the response of America to the tragic murder of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., must be a commitment to the ideals he stood for and the action he sought.

One of Dr. King's primary efforts was to organize the poor people of America to plead more effectively and in a completely nonviolent way for the equality of opportunity which is fundamental to the American creed. To this end, he was a strong promoter of the National Welfare Rights Organization, ably led by Dr. George A. Wiley of Washington, D.C.

This organization proceeds along the same principles of the Peace Corps—with which I was associated—by involving the deprived constructively in the solution to their own problems.

The National Welfare Rights Organization is establishing an effort to memorialize Dr. King with an expansion of its efforts. It is an activity of which all Members of Congress should know more about and understand. I think it is one of the most constructive and promising efforts being made to help the poor help themselves. I therefore insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the text of their memorial plea on behalf of Dr. King:

THE NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATION PROPOSALS FOR A LIVING MEMORIAL TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Dr. Martin Luther King lived and died in the pursuit of social and economic justice for all. His last months were spent in the development of a Poor People's Campaign to confront the nation with the desperate problems of poor people of all races. Frequently he spoke of a guaranteed annual income as one of our country's more urgent needs. He took special interest in the plight of welfare recipients and had been giving us strong support and assistance in the building of our organization.

Those who truly support the ideals for which Martin Luther King fought and died must face and act upon the underlying problems of poverty and injustices in our society.

The National Welfare Rights Organization presents these proposals which speak to some of our central concerns as poor people, in the hope that serious attention will be given to these basic issues. They are offered as a beginning toward the building of the only fitting memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King—a society with liberty and justice for all.

I. REPEAL OF THE WELFARE SECTIONS OF THE 1967 SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS (PUBLIC LAW 90–248 "ANTI-WELFARE LAW")

This law is the most regressive and racist piece of social legislation in the history of the country. Directly or indirectly, it affects the majority of residents of the ghettos and barrios of our country.

A. It freezes federal funds for millions of needy children who are desparately poor but presently receiving no public assistance.

B. It forces mothers to leave their children and accept work or training or be cut off welfare and have their children taken away from them.

C. It seriously restricts the program of aid to children of unemployed fathers.

D. It encourages Welfare Departments to further coerce and intimidate poor people.

II. A NATIONAL GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCOME OF $4,000 FOR EVERY AMERICAN FAMILY

Four thousand dollars per year for a family of four (with $500 per person adjustments for more or fewer family members) would be a minimum to raise families out of poverty.

The Guaranteed Minimum Income should also:

A. provide annual cost of living adjustments.

B. be administered by a simple affidavit, similar to the income tax.

C. include a work incentive allowing families to keep all earnings up to 25% of their guaranteed minimum income and some portion of additional earnings.

III. FEDERAL FUNDS FOR IMMEDIATE CREATION OF AT LEAST 3 MILLION JOBS FOR MEN

There is at least a desperate need for jobs in the ghettos for men to permit them to assume normal roles as breadwinners and heads of families.

These job programs should:

A. focus on building critically needed low income housing and community facilities in the ghettos.

B. contribute manpower to extend vital human services such as health care, education and community organization.

C. give first preference to contracts with organizations controlled by poor people.

IV. ESTABLISHMENT OF A MARTIN LUTHER KING MEMORIAL FUND

This fund should come from private government sources to support the self-determined efforts of poor people for community organization and economic development.

A fitting memorial should be at least $100-million. It should come from contributions from individuals, churches, business, unions, foundations, and other organizations.

THE NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATION

The NWRO is a nationwide organization of welfare recipients and other poor people. It is made up of affiliated local welfare rights organizations from coast to coast. At present there are over 100 affiliated local groups in 26 states, and another 100 local groups in various stages of formation and affiliation.

Most NWRO groups are located in the ghettos and barrios of major U.S. cities, but there are also groups located in rural areas of the South, Appalachia, and the Mid-West. NWRO includes substantial numbers of low-income whites, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans, as well as Negroes in its membership.

NWRO's goals are: jobs or income now—decent jobs with adequate pay for those who can work, and adequate income for those who cannot work.

1. Adequate income: A system which guarantees enough money for all Americans to live dignified lives above the level of poverty.

2. Dignity: A system which guarantees recipients the same full freedoms, rights and respect as all American citizens.

3. Justice: A fair and open system which guarantees recipients the full protections of the Constitution.

4. Democracy: A system which guarantees recipients direct participation in the decisions under which they must live.

Chairman: Mrs. Johnnie Tillmon, Los Angeles; executive director: Dr. George A. Wiley; First Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Etta Horn, D.C.; 2nd Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Carmen Olivo, N.Y.C.; 3rd Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Beulah Sanders, N.Y.C.; Treasurer: Mrs. Marian Kidd, Newark, New Jersey; Rec. Sec.: Mrs. Edith Doering, Columbus, Ohio; Corres. Sec.: Mrs. Dorothy DiMascio, Rochester, N.Y.; Financial Sec.: Mrs. Dovie Coleman, Chicago, Illinois; Sargeant-at-Arms: Mrs. Alice Nixon, Pittsburgh, Penn.

Further information can be obtained by contacting: National Welfare Rights Orga-

nization Headquarters: Poverty Rights Action Center, 1762 Corcoran St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 (202) 462-8800.

Cinco De Mayo: An Example for the World

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the 5th day of May is truly one of the most proud and memorable days in the history of this hemisphere. On this day in 1862 a foreign army was defeated on Mexican soil. The invaders were French troops seeking to pave the way for the liberation and regeneration of Mexico. Their orders were to secure the country and await the arrival and imposition of a monarchial rule under Archduke Maximilian, younger brother of the Hapsburg Emperor of Austria.

The French believed they came as liberators of an oppressed people. Napoleon III of France had been wrongly counseled by Mexican dissidents that a French Army would be welcomed promptly by the people of Mexico. The invaders landed on the Mexican coast at Vera Cruz; meeting little resistance, they proceeded inland toward the capitol at Mexico City.

The self-styled liberators advanced upon Puebla, where, the French commander had been assured, the priests and their parishioners would welcome them with "clouds of incense," and the population would "fling wreaths of flowers about their necks." They were sadly mistaken. Instead, they were met by an army of ex-guerrillas led by amateur generals armed with outdated weapons which the British had captured from the first Napoleon at Waterloo and subsequently sold to the Mexican Government.

The French general, confident of a swift and glorious victory over a "ragtag," undisciplined band, ordered his troops to attack the center of the Mexican fortification—the steep slopes of the Cerro de Guadalupe. He succeeded in adding a new national holiday to the Mexican calendar. On May 5, 1862, the French Army, with the loss of more than a thousand men, was driven back to Orizaba and the coast.

But the French were already too deeply committed to withdraw from Mexico. Napoleon's choice was to escalate, rather than to lose face. He deployed over 30,000 more troops, plus an additional number of cannon, and eventually managed to overwhelm the bankrupt, hard-pressed forces of the Government and impose their rule upon the nation. The Liberal government of Benito Juarez was slowly driven across the border into this country. Guerrilla warfare against the "liberators" never ceased and, in fact, large sections of the country were never fully pacified by the monarchy.

During this tragic period, the United States was deep in the throes of the Civil War, making support of the Mexican Government impossible, even against such a clear transgression of the spirit and letter of the Monroe Doctrine.

The much harassed French and their cohorts were driven out of Mexico in 1867. On June 19 of that year, Emperor Maximilian, a sad and misinformed victim of an unsuccessful attempt to subjugate a proud and brave people, died before a firing squad on the Hill of Bells.

The message which was written into history that day at Puebla is of great significance to all the world. The defenders of Puebla and the people of Mexico stand out as one of the great champions of freedom, self-determination, and independence.

It is a tribute to these people that they were not led astray by those among them who sought to deliver their country unto the hands of a foreign invader. Their perseverance and silence had betrayed a burning ardor in their hearts for freedom and justice. An ardor which was to erupt 43 years later into a demand for fundamental transformation of the Mexican society.

Mr. Speaker, as one scans through the many chapters of Mexican history, he cannot but be instilled with a deep pride and admiration for the great Mexican people and their Republic. They have overcome countless obstacles and continued on to forge a new society for themselves, and the example they hold forth to the world is enviable to all.

We in the Southwestern United States are extremely proud of the many Mexicans who chose to settle in this country. Throughout the Southwest we are continually exposed to the rich Latin culture, architecture, and language. And, may I stress, Mr. Speaker, the legacy that these people brought with them from Mexico—a strong will, determination, and courage which made possible the stand and victory at Puebla on Cinco de Mayo in 1862, has given this society the best that a people can offer.

Memorialization of Vietnam War Dead

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our flag has been flown at half staff since last Friday in recognition by our Government of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., an honor seldom given a private citizen. I do not question the President's decision to pay national respect to a man who devoted his life to the cause of equality, although I, personally, did not agree with Dr. King's views on the Vietnam war. All Americans abhor assassination as a ruthless, senseless crime that blights the heritage of our Republic.

I would like to point out that there have been other American deaths in pursuit of the cause of liberty. They have not been so honored. In the course of the war in Vietnam, more than 20,000 Americans, Negroes and whites, have given their lives in the sacred name of freedom. Their sacrifice was every bit as final, as total, and as noble as that of Dr. King. Their lives were laid on the altar of humanity. They died that others might live as free men.

I propose that, in respect for, and in honor of these brave Americans who died 10,000 miles from home, our flags remain at half staff until the Vietnam war is terminated. If the death of one should be so memorialized, it should be fitting and obligatory that the deaths of 20,000 of our servicemen be so revered.

Our flags at half staff would be a constant reminder to us all that courageous men died for liberty. It would remind us that the task remains unfinished—that we must rededicate our national effort to secure a just, honorable, and lasting peace.

I hereby call upon the President to proclaim this act of tribute—to show through our national banner that in the hearts of their countrymen, their great, supreme sacrifice is recognized and commemorated—that they are remembered and cherished and that their selfless deeds have spoken eloquently for them to a grateful and sorrowing Nation.

An Important Week for the Consumer

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week, House and Senate conferees begin meeting to iron out their differences on the truth-in-lending legislation that each House has passed.

There have been few bills in recent years as vital to the interests of the consumer as truth in lending. Consumer credit is a huge part of the American way of life. It is used to finance almost every kind of purchase. Last year, outstanding consumer credit, excluding mortgage credit, totaled more than $95 billion. On this amount more than $13 billion was paid in interest and other credit charges.

While the consumer knows the goods and services he is buying and their price, he rarely is fully aware of either the dollar cost or the annual percentage rate paid for the use of credit. The reason is the array of practices for starting the cost of credit. There are, for instance, addons, discounts, rule of 78's, service charges, finance charges, term price differentials, sales prices versus cash prices, and so forth. Much of this is clearly beyond the comprehension of the consumer.

The fact that the consumer lacks knowledge about the cost of credit is reflected, at least in part, in the rising tide of employee bankruptcies over the last decade. Since 1950, bankruptcy cases filed in U.S. district courts have risen over 500 percent.

Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues, I am sure, are aware of all of this. Nevertheless, it bears repeating for passage of a strong truth-in-lending bill provides us at long last with the unique opportunity to supply the consumer with the essential

information he needs to shop for credit wisely and prudently.

That opportunity must not be lost by passage of a weak truth-in-lending bill. The Senate bill (S. 5), unfortunately is just such a bill. It provides a number of undesirable exemptions. In comparison, with our own bill, the Consumer Protection Act, S. 5 falls far short of protecting the unsuspecting consumer who even tries to look behind the price tag and the promise of easy credit terms.

Let us look for a moment at a couple of the differences between the Senate and House bills.

First, the Senate bill, unlike the House version, exempts "revolving credit." This loophole would allow large department stores, mail-order houses and others who use revolving credit to express credit charges on a monthly rate rather than the annual rate disclosure required for all other credit transactions. This exemption cannot be allowed to stand because it violates the whole principle of truth in lending, which is to provide a means of comparing credit costs on all types of credit purchases.

Second, the Senate bill, unlike the one the House passed, does not require disclosure on a percentage basis—monthly or annually—for many transactions in which the credit charge does not exceed $10. This would allow lenders to get around making disclosure of finance costs by charging $10 or less on a loan and then constantly refinancing the obligation.

Moreover, this kind of exemption would provide the least protection for those consumers who need protection the most. I am referring here, of course, to poor Americans—yes, many of those caught in the center of terrible disorders we have been having—who, as consumers, are known to make small dollars purchases on credit.

These are but two differences between the House and Senate truth-in-lending bills. There are other crippling loopholes in the Senate version relating, for instance, to garnishments, first mortgage transactions, and credit advertising.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to reiterate my unwavering support for the House bill. It is clearly the only kind of bill that can fully protect the consumer as he must be protected.

Just recently an excellent program appeared on WRC–TV devoted to this important issue of protecting the credit consumer. Produced by the Georgetown University Forum, it was entitled "Truth in Lending: Its Promise and Importance." Participants in the program were: Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs; Treasury Under Secretary Joseph W. Barr and Charles R. McNeill, director of the American Bankers Association's Washington office.

The program did a very effective job of discussing truth in lending in a way that makes sense. For the information of those who missed the program, I would like to insert a transcript of the proceedings into the RECORD at this point:

TRUTH-IN-LENDING: ITS PROMISE AND IMPORTANCE

Moderator: Wallace Fanning, NBC News.

Panel: Hon. Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury; Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan, U.S. Representative, Missouri; chairman, House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs; and Mr. Charles R. McNeill, Director, Washington Office, American Bankers Association.

PROCEEDINGS

Mr. FANNING. Welcome to another in our series of Georgetown University Television Forums. I'd like you to meet the members of today's panel.

The Honorable Joseph W. Barr, the Under Secretary of the Treasury; the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, U.S. Representative from Missouri, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs; and Mr. Charles R. McNeill, Director of the Washington Office of the American Bankers Association.

The question of whether or not there should be Federal legislation in the form of a truth-in-lending bill has been before Congress for eight years. In recent months, both the House of Representatives and the Senate have passed such a bill. The two versions now are being discussed in conference committee representing the two branches.

Consumer credit is a huge fact of American life, and therefore every American might well want to know the latest developments in the congressional efforts to protect the consumers. For that purpose, we have invited a representative of the Executive Branch, a Congresswoman who has fought valiantly for passage of such a bill on the floor of the House, and a representative of the American Bankers Association. They will expound the purpose of the legislation, the problems involved, the needs for and the limitations of, Federal legislation, and the anticipated results when the bill reaches its final form.

Mrs. Sullivan, would you begin the discussion, please?

Representative SULLIVAN. Be happy to, Mr. Fanning.

Basically, the purpose of this legislation is to provide for the customer—the consumer—the facts which he has to have in order to be able to use credit in an informed manner. We require in the bill that in every consumer credit transaction the seller, or the lender, has to tell the buyer, or the borrower, the full amount of all of the extra costs—the full amount of the money that's involved in the transaction, including the principal amount and all of the extra costs added for the purpose of financing the obligation. And these have to be spelled out in understandable terms, and then translated also into an annual percentage rate, so that the customer can compare the credit costs on the rate basis as well as on a dollar-and-cents basis. And in addition to comparing one type of credit offer with another, the consumer can, if he knows the actual percentage rate of a credit charge, compare that rate with the percentage rate of the return on his own money; that is, if he has a savings account or makes an investment, he can compare what he gets when he invests with what he has to pay when he borrows. So I think the annual percentage rate is the heart of this issue—to give the consumer or the customer the proper information in order to "shop for credit" as he shops for merchandise.

Mr. FANNING. Now, Mrs. Sullivan, what you've been talking about, essentially, is the House bill, your bill, is that true?

Representative SULLIVAN. That's right.

Mr. FANNING. Now, how does this differ from the Senate version?

Representative SULLIVAN. Well, there are nine really major differences in the House and Senate bills.

Number one is that all first mortgages covered in the House bill, not the Senate's. Where the Senate has exempted all department and catalog houses from expressing their credit rate on an annual basis for their revolving charge accounts, the House bill has removed that exemption and now these revolving charge accounts must be expressed on a nominal annual percentage rate the same as all other sellers of credit must do. We have also removed the exemption in the Senate bill pertaining to the transactions where the credit charge is $10 or less. These were two very important items that should not be exempted.

We cover in the House bill credit advertising; we cover credit life insurance, as part of the finance charge, which the Senate bill did not. We have a garnishment provision in the bill; we also have a Commission on Consumer Finance, that would last for two years, to oversee and report back to the Congress on any need, or how this legislation is working. And one of the most important things we have, too, is administrative enforcement, so that when someone finds that there's something wrong, they don't have to start suit themselves. They take it to the proper Federal agency right in their area and it's taken from there.

And then the last, is the anti-loan-shark provision that is in the House bill.

Mr. FANNIN. Well, now, those are the things that the House bill has that the Senate bill does not. Does the Senate bill have any features that your bill does not?

Representative SULLIVAN. Yes. The Senate bill requires a percentage rate disclosure, but it leaves a lot of loopholes so that everyone who sells or lends—sells credit—does not have to reveal the same information. In the House bill, we have made it clear-across-the-board, so that everybody who sells an item on credit or makes loans must express the very same kind of percentage rate and dollar amount information.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. Secretary, how does the administration regard these bills?

Mr. BARR. The administration has been fighting, as I think nearly everyone knows, for approximately eight years to get this legislation enacted. We finally are very close. We're going to have to resolve the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. It's the position of the administration that the House bill is a much better bill, for the reasons Mrs. Sullivan has given you.

In the first place, the House bill does get to this whole question of advertising. You can hardly pick up a paper, or turn on your television, or turn on your radio, without being assaulted by all sorts of advertising to come and get credit. Unfortunately, a lot of this advertising—I'm not going to say it's misleading—but it's really confusing. The House bill should remove much of this confusion. That's why it has a great advantage over the Senate bill.

As Mrs. Sullivan says, too, the House bill goes across the whole board; it just doesn't take a certain type of lending or credit operation. It includes all types of credit operations. These are the two really significant advantages that I see between the House and Senate bills.

Wally, you know, I'd like to add just a little bit right here, as we start off, on the importance of this legislation.

Consumers in this country have outstanding right now roughly a hundred billion dollars in consumer debt. This is installment debt on cars, and refrigerators; it's debt to stores, it's debt to doctors and service people, and it's debt to banks.

Now, I'm not talking about mortgages, the mortgage credit we owe on our homes, and I'm not talking about what corporations owe or what the government owes. I am referring only to the debt we owe as a people. Now, of this hundred billion outstanding, over seventy-five billion is repaid each year, so you can see that this debt nearly rolls over every year. The seventy-five billion dollars is paid

every year by the American people on installment plans. That figures out to one dollar out of every six of the disposable income we have. In other words, for the average American, one dollar out of every six he is earning is being used to pay this credit. So, when you're up in magnitudes of this sort, I think it's crucially important that the American consumer have the information he needs to make an installment decision as to what kind of credit he wants, what the terms are, what it's going to cost him, so he can shop between one seller, one lender and another, and get the best deals available. This is a lot of money, and I just don't think we can brush it off the rug. I think we must make it crystal clear to the consumer what he's getting into. That's the whole purpose of this legislation.

Mr. FANNING. Thank you, sir. Let's get to Mr. McNeill now for the Bankers Association.

Mr. MCNEILL. Mr. Fanning, we in the American Bankers Association believe that after many years of consideration of this bill, that the bill that is now before the conferees of the Senate and the House, and as it is likely to be enacted, is one that is both workable and practicable. We see some problems in it, and the administrator, the agency of the government charged with formulating regulations, the Federal Reserve Board, is going to have some problems in being certain that their regulation and their rules are simple and understandable and readily usable by all types of lenders and extenders of credit. But we believe this can be done and if it is done in the manner that we anticipate, that the consumer will then be in a position to have a usable comparison of credit costs. This, of course, means that the consumer takes an interest in this comparison. Some people have said that many borrowers, many consumers, are only interested in how many dollars they have to pay each month, and care very little about the percentage rate or the actual cost of credit over the period of a loan. If this is true, the legislation will not be meaningful to those people.

But for those consumers who want to have a basis of comparison, we believe that this legislation, as it is likely to come out of the conference, will be workable and give them the opportunity for a meaningful comparison.

Mr. FANNING. Well, Mr. McNeill, is it your estimate that the legislation will materially reduce the amount of credit buying and selling that there is or do you think rather it will just work toward eliminating abuses of the system?

Mr. MCNEILL. Mr. Fanning, I doubt if there are abuses of the system. As Under Secretary Barr said, I think the manner in which consumer credit has developed has led to some misunderstandings. I think the legislation will lead to a clarification. I do not believe that this is going to lead to a marked reduction in the amount of consumer credit that is extended. I think it may lead to some reduction during a period of adjustment. For one thing, the consuming public is going to have to realize that the whole idea that six per cent simple interest is the most that should be paid for credit is just not true in terms of small loans, in terms of consumer installment credit, which are most expensive to handle for the lender. Therefore, there is going to have to be a realization that rates, and the rate will be quoted under this bill, and it is not an interest charge, it is a percentage rate expressing the total finance charge; that this finance charge in small loans, in consumer lending, may very well turn out to be 9, 10, 11, 12 per cent, and this is not at all unreasonable.

Mr. BARR. Could I comment on that one point?

I think there are some statistics that I have right here in front of me that would indicate this total of $100 billion is probably not going to shrink. I don't think this legislation will make much difference to the American people except they're going to be able to get better deals.

At the end of 1966, we as a nation owed each other about a trillion, five hundred billion dollars. Now, of this, Federal debt, state and local debts, corporate debts, run six hundred billion. Home mortgages run two hundred sixteen billion, etc. Excluding the $100 billion of consumer debt, all this adds up to a trillion, four hundred and twenty billion, on which there is absolutely no confusion over interest rates. The simple annual interest rate is clear to all. And that total goes up year after year, so I think the full knowledge of what credit really costs is not going to depress the $100 billion consumer debt either. I think we're just going to have a more intelligent American consumer shopping for the credit that he needs.

Representative SULLIVAN. Mr. Fanning, I want to agree with Secretary Barr, that I don't believe we're going to see any lessening of borrowing or lessening of buying on time. But I think that we will possibly stop some of the misuse of credit that's so prevalent today. And we have found during the hearing——

Mr. FANNING. I think I used the word "abuse."

Representative SULLIVAN. Well, it's abuse, but it's really misuse, because it isn't only the uneducated that can't figure what they're paying for credit; I know many intelligent people who are buying on credit today, and they say "How on earth do you ever arrive at the cost? We don't know."

But it is misused by the uneducated, because they are—they are given—what you would say, this——

Mr. FANNING. This come-on.

Representative SULLIVAN. Yes—this come-on, and they're oversold on many items that maybe they want, but sometimes they don't even want it. But it looks like such an easy thing, to sign your name and take the article home and use it, and so when do you pay for it, or can they really pay for this item that was so easy to buy on credit?

Mr. BARR. Lee, tell them the bankruptcy story. You had several hearings about bankruptcy.

Representative SULLIVAN. Well, the question is asked—you know, people say, "Well, why do you need this legislation? Is there a demand for it?" And there really hasn't been a demand by the people. But we who have studied this for the past eight years have seen things happen that are frightening, the way people misuse this very great thing that we have in this country, and that's credit.

We have found, as we looked into the court cases—we looked into the personal bankruptcy cases—that personal bankruptcies have gone from an average of 10,000 a year in the past ten to twelve years—they've gone up to 208,000 personal bankruptcies in the last fiscal year. Now, this shows that people are overbuying; they're buying beyond their means to pay. I don't think most of them buy with the intention "I don't intend to pay; I'll just get it and use it and let them repossess."

Mr. FANNING. May I ask you several questions in that area?

Number one, is there any possibility that there might be included in your legislation something that could help prevent the courts being used as collection agencies for the sharpies?

Representative SULLIVAN. This is what we hope it will lead to. This has to be done, I think, by the states, in great part. But the passage of Federal legislation, and Federal recognition of this problem, I think, will stimulate the states to do something about it. Because, as it is today, after a person takes personal bankruptcy, as they may be advised to do by some lawyer or someone, as they go out the court steps there are people waiting for them and telling them "We'll sign you up for more credit immediately," because these creditors know that the wages of these particular persons can be garnished, and they can't take personal bankruptcy for another seven years. So they're credit risks if they have the kind of a garnishment law under which the court can take all the man earns. But they'll sign him up immediately for more credit, immediately after he completes personal bankruptcy.

Mr. FANNING Is there any way of knowing who these people are who are declaring bankruptcy? What group do they come from?

Representative SULLIVAN. They really come from all groups. But in the cases that I personally have studied in the court records in the District of Columbia, we have seen many of them—the poor, the uneducated—who have been oversold, who have gotten themselves into debt beyond their ability to pay. We have seen many cases, too, where credit was given to some person who has moved in from out of town, or from another state, and as we've searched back into his files after he took bankruptcy in the District, we've found there are amazing cases, and I can just cite one: where a man had come from Buffalo, New York, with $8,000 in debts over his head, and immediately after he got into the District he started to buy from one of the big catalogue houses. The first thing he bought was a gun, a shotgun. The next thing he bought was a hi-fi, and then he bought a second-hand, two-year-old Cadillac convertible.

Well, as we got into it and looked through this case, we called in the gentleman who was representing one of the catalogue houses and said, "Tell me, how do you run a person's credit when they come in to you, brand new, to open an account?" "Oh, we give it a very, very thorough study, and we have use of these credit bureaus that give us fast service, just like this." And he went on to explain a very elaborate system they have for running down a person's credit rating. So then I confronted him with the court record of the man who had just taken personal bankruptcy for another four or five thousand dollars, and I said, "Will you tell me how your company gave this man credit." As I said, the first thing he bought was a shotgun and the second thing he bought was a hi-fi. And he said, "I just don't understand it, Mrs. Sullivan; may I go back and look these up and come back?" And I said "I wish you would; I'd like to have that." Well, he came back with the facts, blushing, and said, "I'm sorry. The man had a job. The man was married. He had just moved into the District from another state. We thought he was a good risk, because he was married and had a job, so we gave him credit without going through all the preliminaries that we're supposed to go through." Now, this is bad.

Mr. FANNING. Mr. McNeill?

Mr. MCNEILL. Mr. Fanning, I'd like to comment on one thing that Mrs. Sullivan said. I think that we have to be careful in this area of not asking the Federal government to do the whole job. The area of creditors' remedies, of interest rate limitations, of usury provisions, has traditionally been a matter of state law. We have many, many state laws that vary in all parts of the country. We felt originally that it would have been better if the states had done an adequate job in this disclosure area. They didn't do it, and Congress felt impelled to move, and we have a bill that, as I say, I think is workable. But I think we should be careful and not expect the Federal government to take over the job of correcting creditors' remedies, enacting a Federal usury statute and other provisions of this kind.

We're very hopeful that an effort now under way of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws for a proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code, greatly inspired and hastened

by the work of Mrs. Sullivan and the Congress in the disclosure area, will result in a very great improvement in this general subject of creditors' remedies and lending practices.

Representative SULLIVAN. I'm glad that Mr. McNeill said that because some of the states have come up with some very good laws. One of our witnesses last August was from the State of Massachusetts, where they had passed a very excellent consumer credit law, and it was working beautifully. And it has not stymied the use of credit, but it's made them—made the people—a little more cognizant of what money costs, because I think we've got to impress upon the people that money is not cheap. If they want to use someone else's money to buy the things that they want now, but can't afford to pay for, then they're going to have to know what it will take to pay for it. It's not cheap; but they should know, and they should have a clear knowledge of what it costs to use your money to buy things that they want and can't pay for.

Mr. BARR. Wally, let me bring this together just a little bit. What does all this mean to the country? As a nation, one of our greatest strengths since the very earliest days of the Republic has been our willingness to go into debt, as a country, as a state, as individuals, and as businesses. This country literally has been in debt up to its ears from the earliest days of the Republic. I might mention that Alexander Hamilton had to borrow—as I remember, it was $30,000 to pay George Washington his salary and the first salaries of the first Members of Congress. We've used debt intelligently to build a great nation. We've used it intelligently to build our educational system, to build most of the things we have in this country. The crucial thrust of this legislation, as I see it, is that we do make available, to Americans as consumers and borrowers, all the information they need, to use credit intelligently. I've got a lot of faith in the American people; traditionally they've never gotten themselves too deeply into debt. Good times or bad times, if you give them the information, they have essentially very good sense, in the management of debt. The only thing we're doing with this legislation is giving them more information so that they can make better choices.

Mr. FANNING. Mr. Secretary, is there any figure that can be cited that would serve as a limit or ceiling to which debt might go, the public debt?

Mr. BARR. No. People ask me this; I think they probably asked that of Alexander Hamilton. It really gets down to the good, hard sense of the American people, Wally. In this area of consumer credit, especially, the statistical studies that I have seen indicate that—in the majority of families—it's the mother who finally determines just how much debt the family can carry. Believe me, when they get to what she thinks is the limit, she cuts it off and cuts it off fast. Essentially, the American people have good sense, and that's it.

Mr. FANNING. This legislation that we're talking about, when and if it becomes law, and in what shape it becomes law, if it's along the present lines, do you think it's enforceable?

Mr. BARR. Yes. I don't see any real difficulty, especially in the House version. The Federal Reserve Board, which has had long experience in this area, will draft the necessary regulations; then the Federal agencies will administer the law in the particular segment of the economy that they regulate. I think it will not be difficult to enforce. As a matter of fact, these things are usually self-enforcing. When somebody thinks he's been cheated or he's had a crooked deal, he'll come in and complain. That's one way this will be enforced.

Representative SULLIVAN. And may I say, Mr. Fanning, that—getting back to the limitation on what might be charged—we have not attempted in either the Senate bill or the House bill to put a ceiling on what rate of interest may be charged; no one has attempted to do that. The only thing we've tried to do, as Mr. Barr said, is to give a measuring stick to the individual consumer so that if they don't like the credit terms that John Jones is giving them, they'll go over to Paul Brown and see what he can give them.

As long as they all have to express, and count in, all these additional finance charges and put it all under a nominal annual percentage rate for financing the item, this will give people an intelligent way to go and shop for the product, to shop for the credit as well as to shop for the merchandise.

Mr. FANNING. You didn't feel then—there wasn't a consensus, then, that there was any need to put a limit on it?

Representative SULLIVAN. Oh, we talked about it, but——

Mr. FANNING. Well, why did you discourage the idea? Can you tell me that?

Representative SULLIVAN. Why did we discouarge it? We discouraged it because I don't believe we could put a hard-and-fast Federal usury law in effect. I think each state does have some sort of a usury law that they apply to their own area. But I just don't think it would be advisable to try to meet every posible contingency through a Federal ceiling. It was in the original bill, but we took it out at my suggestion. I put in a proposed limit of 18 per cent a year, because I really wanted to shock the people into letting them know that 18 per cent was not an unusual amount that they paid for credit. Because everyone who has a revolving credit charge today, in any department store or in any catalog house, is paying at least one and a half per cent per month, which is 18 per cent a year, and they don't realize it. This is why we fought so hard to include revolving credit on an annual rate basis, and I credit the American Banking Association for helping us in this. Because if we had let the retail group, the big stores, have the right to quote a monthly rate and everyone else had to quote an annual rate, there would be no basis for comparison. In the Senate bill they are allowed to do that—to use just a monthly rate. In the House bill, they must quote the annual rate on any loan or any item that is sold for credit.

Mr. MCNEILL. We certainly agree that if this bill is to be effective, the basis of comparison has to be the same for all extenders of credit, banks, other lenders and retailers and others.

Mr. FANNING. Very briefly—we have less than half a minute—is there anything the public can do at this point? I judge it was not by popular demand that you went ahead with this legislation, because there doesn't seem to be any ground-swell of public opinion, but can the public do anything?

Mr. BARR. They don't need to write the House, but I think there are other members of the Senate that should be told what the public feels about truth-in-lending.

Representative SULLIVAN. The people should write to their own Senators, not to any other House Member or Senator, but to their own Senators.

Mr. FANNING. Thank you very much for your discussion of "Truth-in-Lending: Its Promise and Importance."

Thanks to the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, United States Representative from Missouri, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, and to Mr. Charles R. McNeil, Director of the Washington Office of the American Bankers Association.

Join us next week on the Georgetown University Forum when we will discuss "New Towns, New Health Problems."

A Memorial to Martin Luther King, the Civil Rights Act of 1968

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the martyrdom of Martin Luther King has been described as senseless and that word comes close, I suppose, to conveying the grief and horror which so many Americans feel that the loss of this great man. But the word begs the question. When is any brutal death anything but senseless? Is there sense to be found in the killing of any human being? I cannot find any.

But Martin Luther King's death can be as meaningful as was his life, because by his death we are reminded of what his whole life stood for—for the principle that justice can emerge from injustice, and love from hatred. It is not in our hands, Mr. Speaker, to restore Martin Luther King to life, anymore than we could have restored John Kennedy to life in 1963. But it is in our hands to continue the work which he carried on through his last breath—as in 1964 we continued the work of John Kennedy.

The life of Martin Luther King was a successful one. To few Americans has such success been vouchsafed. Almost alone, by the almost unaided moral strength which emanated from this single American, this Nation realized in the 1960's that it had a job to do. That job—which is just begun—involves a wholesale recognition in our hearts but also on our statute books, of the principle that we are one people, and that as long as any American is denied equal justice, all Americans are denied justice.

Many of Martin Luther King's well-wishers have spoken of the work he has done for his people. And, indeed, Mr. Speaker, he worked for his people. But his people are all of us. We, the American people, are Martin Luther King's people.

But some of us are denied the rights that Martin Luther King fought for, lived for, and died for. Some of us, because of distinctions which seek to make a lie of the Declaration of Independence and a farce of the Constitution, are denied the right to buy a home where we want to. Some of us are automatically told, at the day of our birth, that we will get second-class treatment in the job market, that our children will probably be given a second-class education, and that our lives will be drearier, poorer, and shorter because of our selection of parents.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968, which this House will soon have an opportunity to vote for, will not cure all these evils. It will not restore to our fellow Americans all that centuries of history have stolen from them. But it will be another step—another step on a road which is very long, and which we have almost too late begun to travel.

Passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 will not atone for Martin Luther King's death. This Congress has not the power to do that. It will not make his loss easier to bear, it will not wipe out the hatred

and distrust that separates Americans from Americans. But in restoring to all of the American people some of those simple decencies which many of the American people have had taken from them, it will help, I hope, begin to make this people one again.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is shattering before our very eyes. Not Martin Luther King alone, but all of us have had a dream. Jefferson, and Lincoln, and Americans, black and white, famous and obscure, have shared that dream. If we insist on acting as though nothing had happened, if we want to continue to pretend to ourselves that granting to all Americans the rights that some Americans now enjoy, is an act of special privilege, we can turn down this opportunity to enact the Civil Rights Act of 1968. We can, in the same act, do our best to divide our country into two hostile, distrustful camps, between whom there can never be more than coldly polite relationships. We can end our dream. If we want to take that path, then it is not Martin Luther King's death, but our lives, which will be senseless.

But we can take the other path. We can vote to accept the Civil Rights Act, as it comes to us from the other body. We can affirm, by our votes, that we are worthy of the man who, last Thursday, gave his life for his people—for all of us, his people.

Vietnam Veteran Sees Action in Hometown: Washington, D.C.

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 days we have heard and read much about the activity of those who have disturbed the peace of this city and caused great havoc in its streets. We have read much that sought to interpret the meaning of this activity.

It is reassuring, therefore, to read the commonsense comments of a resident of this city who is a veteran of Vietnam. His actions and his words, as reported in the April 8, 1968, edition of the Washington Evening Star, demonstrate that there remain people here who are of good faith and who are willing to work for what they believe is right.

He is Pfc. Theodore Brown, 19 years of age. I commend him. With the hope that my colleagues will share my view, I am pleased to place the article at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

VIET GI SEES ACTION—IN OWN HOMETOWN

(By David Braaten)

A Negro soldier just back from the Vietnam war spent the weekend guarding a liquor store in his Southeast Washington neighborhood from marauding looters because, "This has got to stop—it doesn't make sense."

Pfc Theodore Brown, 19, of the 200 block of I Street, in a public housing project just behind The Evening Star, traded pistol shots Friday night with a man trying to break in and cut his kneecap when he slipped on some broken glass as he ran after the looter.

Brown is home on 30 days' leave from his Okinawa-based quartermaster outfit, which has been shuttling supplies to Vietnam. He will report back to duty in Vietnam at the end of the month.

Friday afternoon, when Brown heard about the looting and arson spreading over the city, he put on his green fatigue uniform and went to No. 5 Precinct to offer his services.

It was there that Mrs. Willie Andrews came seeking help for her husband, an employe of the Corner Store at 3rd Street and Virginia Avenue SE, who was trying to protect the store from looters. Brown volunteered to go.

"I told Bill to board me up inside the store and I'd stay there," Brown said. He had the store owner's pistol at first and later a policeman's shotgun.

Spelled by Andrews and another volunteer, Thomas Peterson, Brown has been at his self-appointed guard post ever since.

His views on the rioters are simple. "When you're wrong, you're wrong. This is their city. They've got to live here. They'll pay for it—they didn't hurt nobody but themselves. This had nothing to do with Martin Luther King. He was for nonviolence, but these people are just taking out a grudge."

A Call to Action on the Civil Rights Bill

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope Dr. Martin Luther King has not died in vain. His life and untimely death should present a challenge to our Nation to build a just society for every man, regardless of race, creed, or color.

His murder forces us to evaluate where we have come as a country, and where we must go. It requires us to look long and hard at ourselves, in the harsh light of reality.

The chains which President Lincoln unshackled more than a century ago have only just recently begun to be discarded.

After decades of indifference, the conscience of the Nation in the last 5 years has finally been aroused. We demontrated our concern through the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965, and with the beginning of the war on poverty.

But we are painfully aware of the racial hatred and bigotry that still lurk in our midst. Divisive forces are struggling to tear our society apart.

There is this week a new urgency surrounding a bill, H.R. 2516, which would remove one major badge of discrimination by making housing freely available to every American.

This bill gives us an opportunity to show the black community that our words are not empty promises, but realistic expressions of concern. It will enable us to reinforce the advocates of moderation, who have been dealt such a severe blow by the death of Dr. King. It will present vivid evidence to a watching world that one hate-crazed assassin does not represent the white majority in the United States.

But let there be no misunderstanding. Nothing is possible within the framework of violence, whether generated by blacks or whites. Violence betrays everything for which Dr. King stood, and for which he died. Violence can only destroy; it can never build.

All responsible Americans, black and white, must unite to overcome the fury and bigotry now rampant in our land. Let us start on the long road to national reconciliation by swiftly and decisively enacting H.R. 2516, the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

Right Wing Campaigns Against Fair Housing

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, within the past 24 hours—on the eve of House consideration of H.R. 2516, the civil rights bill—I have learned that the right wing has been conducting at least three campaigns to stimulate anti-fair-housing mail to Members of the House of Representatives.

These campaigns engage in the wildest kind of extremist distortion and misrepresentation. They involve the peddling of hate, fear, racism, and outright lies.

One of the campaigns involves allegations that Members of Congress are being threatened with physical violence and that fair housing proponents plan to burn down the districts of Congressmen who vote against the bill.

This campaign is being conducted by an organization which calls itself the "Emergency Committee of One Million To Save Our Homes." A letter being sent out by this organization is clearly designed to create hysteria. It tells the recipient that his "liberty and property are threatened" by the "socialistic" civil rights bill and that the legislation "represents complete Federal control of your property."

The letter states:

If this bill passes the House, LBJ's bureaucrats will be swarming over every neighborhood in the United States—setting up Negro-White quotas, forcing homeowners to sell their property, and encouraging vicious gangs of rioters and looters to destroy neighborhoods which dare to resist. A citizen who objects can be put into jail for ten years and fined $10,000.

This letter also charges that—

The Johnson administration is threatening your Representative with a complete cut-off of Federal contracts in your district if he does not vote "yea."

The letter continues:

But these threats are nothing compared with the active campaign of intimidation, terror and blackmail being waged by black-power and civil-rights militants who plan to burn down the districts of those voting "nay." Some Members of Congress have even been threatened with physical violence against their persons and families.

The letter urges recipients to send a telegram to their Congressmen urging

him to "Vote no on forced housing." It also urges them to get 10 of their friends to do the same.

The Emergency Committee of One Million letter is signed by a Mr. John Acord who has been associated with another rightwing group, the American-Southern Africa Council, a sort of unofficial pro-Rhodesian lobbying organization in Washington.

Another campaign is being conducted by a group that calls itself the "'Emergency Committee Against Forced Housing." This group has been sending out a simulated telegram signed by four top officials of other rightwing organizations: Alan MacKay, national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom; James A. Linen IV, a member of the board of the American Conservative Union; David R. Jones, executive director of the Young Americans for Freedom; and Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired, chief executive officer of Americans for Constitutional Action. The simulated telegram urges the recipient to write to both his own Congressman and the House Republican leader calling on them to oppose the fair housing provisions of H.R. 2516. The simulated telegram tells the recipient that the proposed legislation will take away a basic civil right and would give the Federal Government the power to force you to sell or rent to anyone it may dictate.

The letters being sent out by the two Emergency Committee operations both give addresses on the fifth floor of an office building at 1629 K Street NW., in Washington, D.C.

The third campaign is being conducted by Liberty Lobby, one of the leading organizations on the extreme right—an organization which has been characterized by its own executive secretary as being "to the right of the John Birch Society."

On March 16 Liberty Lobby sent an Emergency Liberty Letter to some 130,000 of its subscribers urging them to send both a telegram and a followup letter to their Congressmen calling on him to vote against the fair housing bill. The emergency letter also instructs the recipient to call "as many people as you can reach" and "every realtor, and real estate salesman and broker that you know" and urge them to do the same.

The Liberty Lobby letter tells the recipient that the fair housing bill will "destroy your inherent right to choose for yourself the conditions under which you wish to live." The letter preys on the fears of parents, the elderly, and others and talks about "The utter sellout of the Republican Party in the Senate."

Two of these organizations—Liberty Lobby and the Emergency Committee of One Million—also appeal for funds in their anti-fair-housing letters.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD copies of the three letters referred to above. Then following these letters, I would like to include a memorandum I have had prepared dealing with many of the scurrilous misrepresentations and falsehoods being circulated about fair housing legislation. This memorandum, entitled "Facts About Fair Housing Myths, Misinformation and Misunderstanding," deals with such items as the forced housing argument used in all three of the rightwing mail campaigns.

The material follows:

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE OF ONE MILLION TO SAVE OUR HOMES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: Your liberty and property are threatened by an impending piece of socialistic legislation, the "civil rights bill." It calls for Federal confiscation of a God-given right, the right to dispose of your property as you see fit.

We are writing you today to tell you how you can stop the Congress from giving the Federal bureaucrats control over your home and neighborhood.

Affecting 52.6 million American homes, the bill provides that owners of one-family homes and apartments built with FHA or VA loans, and owners of existing single-family homes, no matter how financed, can no longer choose to whom to sell or rent their property. In addition, owners of apartments and boarding houses, professional builders, developers, real estate agents, banks and savings and loan associations can no longer discriminate in any way.

This so-called "civil rights" or "open housing" bill represents complete Federal control of your property. It has already passed the Senate and must now pass the House of Representatives before LBJ signs it into law.

If this bill passes the House, LBJ's bureaucrats will be swarming over every neighborhood in the United States—setting up Negro-White quotas, forcing homeowners to sell their property, and encouraging vicious gangs of rioters and looters to destroy neighborhoods which dare to resist. A citizen who objects can be put into jail for ten years and fined $10,000.

You must act immediately! Hundreds of LBJ's staff members have descended upon the Capitol Building threatening your Representative with complete cut-off of Federal contracts in your District if he does not vote "Yea." Responding to this pressure, major leaders of industry have praised the bill and applied pressures of their own against our Representatives.

But these threats are nothing compared with the active campaign of intimidation, terror and blackmail being waged by black-power and civil-rights militants who plan to burn down the Districts of those voting "Nay." Some Members of Congress have even been threatened with physical violence against their persons and families.

You must act now! Only you can prevent the destruction of your property and neighborhood. Many Members of the House of Representatives oppose this monstrous piece of legislation, but must rely upon you to demonstrate that they have the wholehearted support of the American people.

The plan is simple . . . can you spare an hour?

Pick up your telephone and send a telegram to your Representative in Washington, demanding that he Vote No on forced housing. Then call ten of your friends and acquaintances and urge them to do the same. If your friends send one telegram each, and then call ten of *their* friends, you will have launched an unbroken chain of telegrams, snowballing into a great protest, one which will halt the Federal removal of your sacred rights. The hour you spend to help launch this protest could be the most valuable hour of your life!

A telegram is a vote!

Twenty million Americans have already voted down Forced Housing in local and state elections throughout the United States. If only a small number of us do the same again the Federal Forced Housing bill will be defeated!

A telegram telling your Representative to Vote No on Forced Housing will cost you only 85¢ from any place in the United States—a small investment to make in America's future.

Register your protest in person.

Can you come to Washington? If you can, it may be the most important trip of your life. If only 10% of the Americans receiving this emergency letter could visit Washington and personally urge their Representatives to Vote No on Forced Housing, the impact would be devastating to the Administration's professional lobbyists and the black power militants now haunting Capitol corridors. If you cannot come, perhaps you know someone who can. Or perhaps you could meet with your neighbors and elect a delegate to represent you with the others sharing in expenses.

Remember, regardless of your ability to come, send that telegram and call your ten friends today!

This Emergency Committee does not have funds. The literature mailed to you was paid for by a loan from another patriotic organization which we must repay. We must reach many more thousands of Americans with this same message before it is too late! Already, thousands of pieces of this literature have been printed, waiting for mailing if we can obtain the necessary postage money. Please send your maximum contribution today: $1,000, $500, $250, $100, $50, $25, $10—whatever you can. We promise to make it the best investment you have ever made in the future of your country, family, home and neighborhood. Regardless of the funds, volunteer members of the Committee are visiting with Members of Congress today urging them to Vote No on forced housing. Please help us back them up!

Very truly yours,

JOHN ACORD,
Chairman.

P.S.—If you are unable to send both a telegram and a contribution, send the telegram!

TELEGRAMS FOR FREEDOM INSTRUCTION SHEET

Here are some simple instructions to make your effort to alert your community to the dangers of forced housing more effective:

1. First, remember to send your own telegram. Do not forget to use Western Union's special Public Opinion Rate, which allows you to wire your Senators and Representatives from any place in the nation for eighty-five cents.

2. Call *at least* ten of your friends and acquaintances, urging that they wire their Representatives in Washington demanding that they vote "no" on forced housing and that they in turn call ten of their own friends and acquaintances urging that they do the same. The object is to maintain an unbroken chain. It is possible that one caller can reach as many as one million people on this vital issue if everyone does his part. The result will be victory over LBJ evil.

3. Keep a list of the persons called. Call again within twenty-four hours to make certain that they have fulfilled their commitment to you. Ask them in turn to call the friends and neighbors they contacted, making certain that the chain is unbroken.

4. Within seventy-two hours, compile a list of all persons who have wired their Representatives as a result of your phone calls and mail it to: The Emergency Committee of One Million, 5015 Davis Building, 1629 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

This will enable us to assess the affectiveness of your efforts in order to make our own on-the-spot efforts more effective.

5. Many individuals will be able to call many more than ten friends and acquaintances. We urge you to call all members of your social clubs, study groups, church, office, union, and fraternal organizations, urging them to join with you in this effort to defeat forced housing.

6. Always remember to urge anyone you speak to and call to come to Washington

and register their protest with their Congressmen in person.

[Simulated telegram]

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE AGAINST FORCED HOUSING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: Next week you will have lost your basic civil right to sell or rent your home to whom you please—unless *you* act now, today! Before April 11th, the U.S. House of Representatives will vote on H.R. 2516, a bill which would give the Federal Government the power to force you to sell or rent to anyone it may dictate. This bill has already passed the Senate. Only House action remains before this forced housing bill will become law.

In 1966 a similar forced housing bill was defeated by united opposition from Senate Republicans, but this year their leader, Senator Dirksen, reversed his stand and the bill passed. Now House Republican leader Gerald Ford, who also voted against the 1966 bill, indicates that he may switch sides. Washington observers say only a tremendous outpouring of voter sentiment can stop this destruction of the right of private property. The House vote will be very close.

We urge you to protest your civil right to own and control your property. *Write to your Congressman* and to House Republican leader Ford today (address: U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 25015.) Tell them you oppose the so-called "open housing" provision of H.R. 2516, and ask them to vote "No" on title 8 of the bill.

Every American, regardless of race, creed, or color should have the right to do as he pleases with his property. If you value this right, act now to save it. Write your Congressman *today*.

ALAN MACKAY,
National Chairman, Young Americans for Freedom.
JAMES A. LINEN IV,
Board Member, American Conservative Union.
DAVID R. JONES,
Executive Director, Young Americans for Freedom.
Gen. THOMAS A. LANE,
USA (Ret.), Author and Columnist.

[Emergency Liberty Letter No. 21, Mar. 16, 1968]

FORCED HOUSING CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

As you read this Emergency Liberty Letter, the Congress prepares to destroy your inherent right to choose for yourself the conditions under which you wish to live.

The House of Representatives must now accept or reject the Senate-passed Civil Rights Bill of 1968. There may be several crucial votes over a period of days—even weeks—but the first vote will take place within a day or so.

The Congress is motivated by fear. Fear of political turmoil. Fear of the power of LBJ. Fear of the planned invasion of Washington next month by the fanatic Martin Luther King and his camp-followers. Fears with small foundations, these.

But what of the fear—the very *real* "pit-of-the-stomach" fear—of the worried parent whose small child is long overdue from the neighborhood playground?

What of the fear experienced by the elderly, the weak and the all-alone who do not recognize the shadowy figure (a neighbor?) that stands waiting inside the darkened vestibule or the elevator of the apartment building?

Is fear to become the final pattern of the American way of life?

"For what we have done, we cannot expect undiluted and prolonged applause." (Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan, following Senate passage of the bill.)

Let there be no question about the matter. The issue before the Congress is not a case of "property rights" weighed against "human rights."

The case is simply one of human rights against special privilege.

Seen in this light, there is no way to compromise—no way to soften the impact of—Forced Housing.

The Republican leadership in the House of Representatives believes that it can make the Civil Rights Bill "acceptable" to American voters by "exempting" certain categories of homeowners from its provisions. But . . . What about the American citizens—the human beings—who must have a place to *live* in peace and safety . . . who will *not* be exempted? There are literally *tens of millions* of people who will find little to applaud in this monstrous legislation!

Perhaps you are not one of these. Perhaps no member of your family is.

Perhaps you do not care . . . now . . . yet.

If you *do* care, you have little time in which to act.

If you *do* act, you can change the course of history.

WHAT CAN YOU DO

1. In fifteen (15) words or less, write a message to your Congressman to express your opposition to the Civil Rights Bill and Forced Housing. Politely make it clear that you want him to vote NO. A space for your message has been provided on the next page.

2. Pick up your telephone and dial Western Union. Tell the operator that you wish to send a public opinion telegram to your Congressman in Washington. Your fifteen words or less (plus one signature) will be charged to your telephone bill at a flat rate of 85¢ from anywhere in the United States.

3. Get out your Christmas card list, club roster or other mailing list of local friends and acquaintances. Call up as many people as you can reach, telling each one what you have done, and urging them to send a telegram also. Remember to explain the special rate on public opinion telegrams.

4. Read to your friends the telegram you have sent, but warn them to use their own words in their telegram, rather than to copy yours. "Form" telegrams have no more effect than "form" letters.

5. Call up every Realtor, and real estate salesman and broker that you know, and point out the features of the Forced Housing Bill that will affect their business (refer to the "Explanation of the Bill"). Urge them to send telegrams, and to call up their friends and other colleagues and customers to get them to send telegrams. Don't forget the special "public opinion" telegram rates!

6. Whenever someone you call agrees to send a telegram, ask them to call others—*their* friends—to ask them to do the same. Set yourself a minimum goal—or quota—of ten or more telegrams, and ask your friends to help you reach your goal. If everyone who receives this Emergency Liberty Letter generates just ten telegrams today—the Congress will receive 1,500,000 (one-and-a-half million) telegrams tomorrow!

7. Tomorrow, check back and ask your friends to read you the telegram *they* sent. (This is a polite way of making sure they sent it.)

8. Use your imagination! You may be able to think of many ways to generate even more telegrams and letters—bringing this issue to the attention of even more voters. Remember—this is election year. It might not hurt gently to remind your Representative of this.

9. Follow up your telegram with a letter. There will probably be at least two decisive votes on this issue. If so, there will be time. If you have written before, write again!

10. Remember—Your influence counts . . . use it!

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

H.R. 2516 Civil Rights Act of 1968 title VIII

The Forced Housing title forbids selectivity by race in the advertisement, rental or sale of housing—

Immediately, in all dwellings owned or operated by the Federal government, and all dwellings financed with Federal assistance received since November 20, 1962, except single family owner-occupied VA and FHA-financed homes.

After December 31, 1968, in all multi-unit housing and real estate developments with more than three units.

After December 31, 1969, in all housing, public or private, except that

(1) single-family, owner-occupied dwellings are exempted if sold without the aid of a real estate broker, and the property is not advertised in a selective manner;

(2) multi-family dwellings of no more than four units are exempted if the owner occupies one of the units;

(3) owners of up to three single-family houses not occupying any of the properties may sell one house in any 24-month period if no real estate broker or selective advertising is used; and

(4) non-commercial housing used by the members of private clubs and religious organizations would be exempted.

After December 31, 1968, the bill forbids selectivity in the financing of housing by banks, insurance companies and other financial institutions.

Enforcement sections provide extensively for civil suits by individuals, and by the Attorney General against any person or group who in his judgment is engaged in a "pattern of resistance" to the law. Citizens guilty of practicing selectivity by race are subject to fine of $10,000 and imprisonment of 10 years for "interfering" with the "rights" of an individual to "participate" in the benefits granted by law.

WHY AN EMERGENCY LIBERTY LETTER?

The answer is simply this: The Congress has unexpectedly collapsed in utter chaos. Witness the fantastic action of the Senate in the gold issue. With every prediction and warning of Liberty Lobby coming true; as overseas gold demand reached a state of frenzy; as it became obvious that every bar of American gold was being claimed by foreigners; the Senate voted by a *two* vote margin to allow our gold to be drained away.

Liberty Lobby has been fighting the Forced Housing issue since 1964. The issue has been repeatedly defeated overwhelmingly by the people and the Congress. Since the beginning of 1968, the staff of Liberty Lobby has constantly weighed the potential danger of Forced Housing against the obvious dangers of other issues such as gold, and we have never felt justified in spending your hard-earned dollars on an issue which, to all practical purposes was sure to be defeated, anyway.

The utter sellout of the Republican Party in the Senate was not foreseen by anyone, even on Capitol Hill. But it happened, and that is why it is now necessary to come up with Ten Thousand Dollars to do what is necessary, and this battle *will* be won, no matter what the cost, even if we *all* have to forego our pay as a result. But *we will never forget Everett Dirksen!*

There is not enough in the bank account to cover the cost of envelopes for this Emergency Liberty Letter. As a result, there is no handy way of asking you to help meet the cost of the battle. As you can—as you see fit—we earnestly seek your helping hand. The address: Liberty Lobby, 300 Independence Ave., S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.

P.S.—Telegrams 1st—then contribution. Can we count on you?

FACTS ABOUT FAIR HOUSING MYTHS, MISINFORMATION AND MISUNDERSTANDING

This memorandum deals with some of the main charges and arguments being raised against fair housing legislation such as is contained in H.R. 2516.

Included are sections dealing with the attitude of the real estate industry, the relation of open housing to riots and social unrest, the constitutionality of fair housing

legislation, the argument that housing integration causes property values to decline, the concern that fair housing will result in a "black deluge" engulfing the white suburbs, the charge that fair housing is really "forced housing," a comparison of the proposed federal law with the 159 state and local fair housing laws presently in force, the argument that the problem of housing discrimination can and should be handled through state and local rather than by federal law, and some information on the number of Members who represent districts covered by state and local open housing laws.

(NOTE.—The page references throughout this memorandum refer to the Fair Housing hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, August 21, 22 and 23, 1967.)

Assertion: The procedure of seeking a direct House vote on the Senate amendments to H.R. 2516, rather than first sending the bill to conference, is unusual and improper.

Answer: The House frequently agrees to Senate amendments to House-passed legislation without sending the legislation to conference. Generally this is done by unanimous consent. However, when unanimous consent cannot be obtained—as in this instance—there is ample precedent for seeking a Rules Committee resolution to give the House an opportunity to vote immediately to either approve or disapprove the bill as amended and passed by the Senate.

In the civil rights area alone, this identical procedure has been used twice in recent years. Both the 1960 and 1964 Civil Rights bills were amended by the Senate and then returned to the House. In both instances backers failed to obtain unanimous consent to vote on the Senate amendments without a conference, in both instances a Rules Committee resolution was obtained bringing the bill directly before the House for an immediate vote, and in both instances the House agreed to accept the Senate amendments. (See *Congressional Record*, April 21, 1960, p. 8497 and July 2, 1964, p. 15869.)

Assertion: Fair housing is too radical to be accepted in most Members' districts.

Answer: Most Members already have fair housing in their districts. In fact, better than two-thirds of the Members of the House represent districts either totally or partly covered by a state or local fair housing law.

255 Members (124–R and 131–D) represent districts which are entirely covered by state fair housing laws. (22 states have fair housing laws.)

130 Members (59–R and 71–D) represent districts which are either totally or partly covered by local fair housing laws. (137 local communities have fair housing laws.)

These 130 Members include 91 Members (41–R and 50–D) from fair-housing states and 39 Members (18–R and 21–D) from non-fair-housing states.

Thus, 294 Members (142–R and 152–D) represent districts in fair-housing states which are entirely covered by state fair housing laws, or districts in non-fair-housing states which are either totally or partly covered by local fair housing laws.

Assertion: The proposed federal fair housing law is extreme in its coverage and enforcement provisions.

Answer: Not true. In fact, many of the 22 states and 137 local fair housing laws presently in force have broader coverage and enforcement provisions than the proposed federal fair housing law.

All of the state laws except Maine have broader administrative enforcement powers than the proposed federal law.

13 state laws have broader coverage than the proposed federal law (Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont).

3 state laws have comparable coverage (Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin).

6 state laws have narrower coverage (California, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Oregon).

All 22 state laws and more than two-thirds of the local laws prohibit discrimination by real estate brokers.

16 state laws and two-thirds of the local laws cover discrimination by financial institutions. (This includes 18 local laws with limited coverage, primarily to cases involving discrimination by a real estate agent.)

15 state laws and about two-thirds of the local laws cover discrimination through advertising. (This includes 18 local laws with limited coverage, primarily to cases involving discrimination by a real estate agent.)

13 state laws and two-thirds of the local laws prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of single-family homes. (This includes 25 local laws with limited coverage, primarily to uses involving a real estate agent.)

Assertion: Housing discrimination can and should be handled through local and state laws, not by national legislation.

Answer: The problem cannot be solved through local and state laws. They are scattered geographically and represent a hodgepodge of good and bad. Some are effective while others contain glaring loopholes and inadequacies. What is needed to end housing discrimination is a universal law with uniform coverage so that there will be a single set of rules everywhere for everyone—buyers, sellers and real estate brokers. As the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders noted: "The great bulk of housing produced by the private sector remains unaffected by (state and local) anti-discrimination measures. So long as this continues public and private action at the local level will be inhibited by the argument that local action produces competitive disadvantage."

Some of the realtors who testified at the Senate fair housing hearings last August also commented on the argument that the problem should be handled on the state and local level.

Edward Durchslag of Chicago said: "It is wishful thinking to hope that our national problem will ever be solved in this manner." (Senate hearings, p. 414)

Elliot Couden of Seattle commented: "The problems are on such a large scale, beyond the capabilities of the smaller than state governments and political units to either grasp or cope with, that nothing less than national responsibility and power can break the cycle and avert eventual public tragedy that will make all past uprising pale by comparison." (Senate hearings, p. 400)

Assertion: Enactment of fair housing would not prevent civil disturbances and riots.

Answer: True. But ending racial discrimination in housing through enactment of a Fair House law is a key and indispensable part of any solution of the inter-racial problems of our country. Numerous witnesses at last August's hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, from civil rights leaders to real estate men, said the insult of housing discrimination contributes to racial unrest and riots. The knowledge that even were he to meet all the criteria of white middle class America—in terms of education, personal habits, a good job—he would still have to live in the ghetto or some other racially segregated neighborhood, creates a sense of rage and frustration in the ghetto resident, according to these witnesses. For example, Algernon D. Black, Senior Leader of the Ethical Culture Society and a member of the Board of Directors of the American Civil Liberties Union commented: "The real evil in the ghetto effects is the rejection and humiliation of human beings . . . This sense of humiliation goes all through the ghetto. It is the primary cause of the frustration and rage in the youth which has acted with such violence in the recent riots. In the ghetto no matter what they do, what they become, they don't get anywhere. They feel they are in a cage. And this is why this bill is of crucial importance now." (Senate hearings, p. 179)

Assertion: The real estate industry is totally opposed to fair housing legislation.

Answer: False. While the leadership of the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) testified against fair housing (Senate hearings, page 182), the hearings made clear that the old monolithic opposition of the real estate industry to fair housing no longer exists. Many realtors, in fact, would welcome enactment of a law which would eliminate the pressure on them to discriminate. Several responsible, substantial, experienced realtors—representing significant segments of the industry—testified in support of a national fair housing law at the Senate hearings last August. Here are some of their comments:

W. Evans Buchanan, Washington, D.C., former president of the National Association of Home Builders: "The fair housing provisions are needed by the real estate industry as a means of eliminating unsound competitive practices in protecting those who choose to do business on a non-discriminatory basis.

"Participants in FHA and VA programs are now pledged to the policies and practice of non-discrimination under the provisions of the Executive Order 11063. Enactment of this bill will provide the uniform standards of conduct so greatly needed in today's real estate market.

"Many business firms and organizations would long since have discontinued practices of discrimination except for their fear of adverse economic consequences stemming from competitors who choose to capitalize on racial and religious prejudices.

"With a national law commanding the acceptance of all, the entire industry will sell or rent without discrimination and without fear of economic reprisal." (p. 416)

Elliott N. Couden, Seattle, Washington, real estate broker; president of Couden Agency, Inc.; member of the Seattle Real Estate Board, the Washington Association of Realtors and the National Association of Real Estate Boards: "A universal law would remove many of the shackles and impasses we in the real estate business are subjected to . . . Many real estate salesmen and brokers who would voluntarily provide equal service to all clients suffer a reasonably well-grounded apprehension that their efforts will result in intimidation from other realtors and economic attrition from potential clients. This legislation frees all parties from coercion, probably the greatest single element in the minority housing syndrome." (page 403–404)

Fred Kramer, Chicago, Illinois, President of Draper & Kramer, Inc.; real estate and mortgage banking business, which manages some 15,000 residential units: "I think it is to the interest of all of us in the real estate business to be put on an equal basis when it comes to accepting minority groups as buyers, borrowers, or tenants." (p. 398)

Edward Durchslag, Chicago, Illinois, real estate business on city's South side for three decades: "The real state industry, our various communities, as well as the country as a whole would benefit from the enactment of fair housing legislation." (p. 412)

Ken Rothchild, St. Paul, Minnesota—President of H. Val Rothchild, Inc., and President of the Minnesota Mortgage Bankers Association: "Minnesota open housing laws have not hurt the real estate business. It has been good. . . . There was . . . great fear among the real estate people and none of their fears have been justified. . . . Realtors and apartment owners and builders have experienced greater demand for their products. The entire community has benefited from

rapidly improving housing and housing conditions and from reduced racial tensions." (p. 415)

Other realtors who testified in support of a national open housing law included: Tighe Woods, Bethesda, Maryland, real estate broker and appraiser (p. 397); Philip M. Klutznick, Chicago, Illinois—Senior Partner, Klutznick, Enterprises; Managing Partner, KLC Venture, Ltd.; President of Old Orchard, Oakbrook, and River Oaks regional shopping centers; and President of Oak Brook Utility Company, all of metropolitan Chicago; Chairman of the Board of the American Bank and Trust Company, of New York City (p. 394).

Assertion: The open housing provisions of H.R. 2516 are unconstitutional.

Answer: The constitutionality of the fair housing provisions of H.R. 2516 is based on the XIV Amendment and the Commerce Clause in the Constitution, and Supreme Court decisions in other civil rights cases. (Heart of Atlanta Motel vs. the United States, and Katzenback vs. McClung) leave little doubt about the constitutionality of fair housing. Further, during the Senate hearings on fair housing last August, a variety of qualified witnesses testified to the constitutionality of such a law. U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark said he had "no doubt whatsoever" about the constitutionality of the proposal. (Senate hearings, p. 7) Also testifying to the constitutionality of open housing legislation were the deans of three major law schools—Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., of Boston College Law School; Jefferson B. Fordham of the University of Pennsylvania Law School; and Louis H. Pollak of Yale Law School. (Senate hearings, p. 127)

Finally, the constitutional authority of Congress to enact fair housing legislation was confirmed by a committee consisting of some 30 constitutional experts and legal scholars headed by Mr. Sol Rabkin of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. (Senate hearings, p. 253–254)

Assertion: Integration causes property values to decline.

Answer: This is a myth. Almost every study in this area confirms the fact that property values do not decline when Negroes move into all-white neighborhoods. The practice of blockbusting, in fact, is based on the opposite assumption—that prices will rise. The best known study in this area was an analysis of some 10,000 property transfers in seven cities by Luigi Laurenti in 1960. His data showed that in 85% of the cases studied property values actually increased with the entry of nonwhites into formerly all-white neighborhoods. In only 15% of the cases was there a price decrease. A bibliography of several other studies with similar findings may be found on page 88 of the Senate hearings. Several of the realtors who testified also commented on the property value argument. Here are a few of their comments:

"When minority buyers appear, some people in the immediate vicinity are often impelled into panic selling. Panic selling tends to depress prices, at least for awhile . . . A national law would put an end to panic selling and price dislocation." (Elliott Couden, Seattle, Wash., page 404.)

"The facts show that if and when a drop in values does happen, it is again the result of the 'panic and run' pattern . . . which suddenly expands the supply of overanxious sellers over the normal damands" (Edward Durchslag, Chicago, Ill., page 413.)

"Value is determined by the law of supply and demand. If a lot of similar housing is on the market at the same time and there are no buyers to absorb them, prices will go down. Similarly, if there is a great demand in a neighborhood, because of the popularity of a certain school or some other factor, and there are not many houses being offered for sale, the prices are going to rise, regardless of the color of the neighbor's skin." (Tighe Woods, Bethesda, Md., page 397.)

Assertion: Fair housing will result in white suburbs being innundated by a "black deluge" from big city ghetto areas.

Answer: This is nothing more than a bogeyman raised by fair housing opponents. The fact of the matter is that only a few Negro families—those who have adequate financial resources—will be able to escape the ghetto as a result of fair housing legislation. For most ghetto residents, the impact of fair housing would be symbolic. But it would be an important symbol. It would show that white America is willing to correct such injustices and it would make the level of their income—not the color of their skin—the main factor in determining where they could live.

Assertion: Fair housing violates property rights and is actually "forced housing" because it denies homeowners the right to decide how to dispose of their property by "forcing" them to sell to Negroes.

Answer: The "forced housing" charge is totally inaccurate and unfair. The only "forced housing" in America is in the ghetto where Negro families who have the means to live elsewhere are forced to live because of housing discrimination.

Property rights are not—and never have been—absolute. Real property has always been subject to regulation by the state, and restraints on the disposal of property date back to early English land law. In the case of fair housing, the law would not force homeowners to sell to Negroes or anyone else. It would merely prohibit them from using a real estate agent or some other person to discriminate against prospective buyers on racial grounds. It would make the color of the buyer's money the dominant consideration, not the color of his skin. As Tighe Woods, Bethesda, Md., real estate broker and appraiser, noted in his testimony during the Senate hearings:

"Any experienced real estate broker knows that up until the time the race question entered the picture not one seller in a hundred cared about who was going to buy his house so long as the buyer had the money and met the seller's terms." (Page 397)

As Holy Week Begins

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the article appearing in the Washington Daily News on April 8, 1968. Its analysis of the importance of a reorganized District of Columbia government in the context of our present urban crisis is well stated. I hope that my colleagues will take a minute of their time to read this excellent analysis of the situation in Washington, D.C., the handling of the disorders and some thoughts on the future steps that must be taken by all Americans, of all races.

The article follows:

AS HOLY WEEK BEGINS

There were many reasons why the District of Columbia's municipal government should have been reorganized, and why Walter E. Washington should have become its mayor. But when it happened, no one could have foreseen the events of the past few days, and, consequently, no one could have known how much all of us in this city would now have special reason to be grateful for the fact that Walter E. Washington was in charge.

On Saturday, this newspaper wondered why the call for troops to assist the wearied D.C. police department was deferred so long. This delay cannot be laid at Mayor Washington's door. Once the troops arrived, they were used sensibly and with effect. Given those troops, Mayor Washington was able to organize an operation of containment that now apparently has brought the looting and arson to a stop.

At this moment, Washingtonians—and Americans everywhere—must pay tribute to the policemen and firemen, whose efforts, under the most difficult of orders and circumstances, were more than exemplary. They were heroes. Their orders were, no matter what the provocation: Don't shoot! To those who saw some of these provocations, the discipline of the policemen and firemen was almost beyond belief.

These past days here have seen a mere handful of fatalities. It might well have been otherwise. Instead, these days have seen the total or partial destruction of hundreds of businesses and dwellings.

The financial losses, when we know the final reckoning, will be staggering.

But, even now, there are those who would perhaps have had it otherwise. They would, now that the violence is past, rather have seen more deaths and less economic loss.

We hope that those who feel so will reexamine their feelings.

On the other hand, many who took part in the looting thought they did so—if, in fact, they really know why they did it—because of economic deprivation. How, then do they add it all up now, beyond the fact that some of them have ill-begotten clothes and liquor and television set? Does the gutting of stores improve their economic state? Does the disappearance of a place of employment improve their economic state? These people, too, must reexamine their thinking.

And then, there are the many Negroes in this city who have spoken out eloquently against what has happened here. They are not "leaders", nor are they "Uncle Toms." They are hardworking, respectable people, with a true sense of their own dignity. In the final analysis, they are the real losers in all of this. They are the ones who saw, with Dr. Martin Luther King, the light at the end of the tunnel, who saw his dream crystal clear. We hope they will not lose that dream, nor the sight of that light.

Now, in this Holy Week, parts of this city are a repugnant shambles. Other parts of the city greeted this special season in an eerie, unwholesome silence.

It was, in both instances, in both parts of the city, not unlike any morning in London during the great Blitz. The lesson we in Washington can learn from that experience of the people of London, is as simple as it is difficult.

It is just this: Get about the business of going on from here!

The mayor and the voluntary Urban Coalition are embarked upon a program of cleaning up; of feeding the needy; of finding jobs for the people whose places of employment have been burned out; of providing housing for the families that cannot return to gutted dwellings.

To this program, all of us must bend every effort.

Washington has lived thru a Blitz of its own making. It is our duty to make a new start—now for the immediate needs, and, in the days to come, toward the long-term fulfillments that have been put off too long.

What is needed now is nothing short of a massive effort to provide better schools, truly equal employment opportunities, decent housing and an end to unfairness of every sort directed at any citizen. It will require money, in huge amounts, much of which will have to be obtained from Congress, which holds such a grip on our city. But if the community demands it, it will be forthcoming, even from these reluctant men.

But, more than money will be needed. What is truly essential is a solemn commitment by the entire community to abolish, once and for all, every form of discrimination.

Meanwhile, however, the main effort must be, as it was a century ago, and by whatever means, "to bind up the nation's wounds . . ."

Seven Years of Warnings

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "Seven Years of Warnings":

SEVEN YEARS OF WARNINGS

Historians will marvel at the unheeding blindness with which the Kennedy and Johnson administrations plunged for seven years toward monetary chaos, despite a rising crescendo of warnings.

Ever since October, 1960, when the first serious run on gold occurred in London, it became clear that we could not go on as we were going, recklessly spending money at home and abroad, without sooner or later wrecking the dollar. Voices began pleading, tentatively at first, then more, more, and more insistently, for an end to deficits and inflation and a restoration of fiscal sanity. The Tribune was never alone in this, but we were among the earliest to protest.

The international gold pool was established in London in the fall of 1960 to mend the gold leak, and on Jan. 25, 1961, we said: "We can't decree a sound dollar by price-fixing in London, nor can any international organization decree it for us."

By August of 1961, the outflow of gold had resumed, and on Nov. 1 we said: "It may take more than words this time to reassure the foreign bankers. . . . What our foreign creditors are awaiting is some belt tightening by the government, and without it we can expect the outflow of gold to keep rising."

Still nothing was done, and on Nov. 9, 1962, we warned: "The tediously optimistic stream of forecasts and assurances from Chairman Heller of the President's council of economic advisers and Secretaries Dillon and Hodges can only become less and less persuasive until there is more tangible evidence to persuade foreign bankers to keep their dollars, they will keep on buying gold—and the less gold we have to back up our dollars, the harder the job will be."

With Mr. Johnson came new promises of frugality and new programs of spending. In May, 1964, the late Sen. Harry F. Byrd reported "waste and extravagance in virtually every federal program and activity." The French government announced a policy of systematically converting its dollars into gold. "It has served notice," we said on Jan. 7, 1965, "that the spending implicit in the Great Society is incompatible with a sound dollar. Its message is clear enough; the question is whether anybody in Washington is still interested in profiting from it."

Nobody was. On Feb. 23 we asked again: "Is the government going to discipline itself now, while we still have gold and a reasonably sound dollar? Or is it going to wait until we have neither and it has no choice?"

Other countries began to wonder whether they should risk holding on to their accumulating dollars and thus, as a statement from Brussels said, "contribute toward financing the American balance deficit."

But the Great Society sailed blindly ahead. In January, 1966, Mr. Johnson assured us that "we are a rich nation and can afford to make progress at home while meeting obligations abroad." On Feb. 2, we warned that the "policies of the Johnson administration have placed us in a fool's paradise, where the rug can be jerked from under us at any moment." And on July 1: "Foreign bankers look on in disbelief as we build toward collapse, devaluation, and the crash of our currency."

The President began to promise some economies but threw himself into the battle, as we said on Sept. 10, 1966, "with all the enthusiasm of a small boy answering a summons to the principal's office." Sen. Williams of Delaware said at the same time that "we've never had a man in the White House who has spoken better in the interest of economy, and we've never had a man who has done less."

Mr. Johnson's message to Congress in early 1965 brought new spending programs, chiefly against poverty, on top of the rising costs of the war in Viet Nam. By last fall, the gold rush had picked up again and it began to look as if it would take a miracle to save us. "If a genuine effort to balance our foreign and domestic accounts is a miracle," we said last Nov. 25, "then it will have to be one."

Now we are being swept overboard, clinging by a dual price system to the formality of a gold-backed dollar, and we wonder whether even a miracle can save the dollar.

Martin Luther King, Jr., 1929–68

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that all Americans watch today while in Atlanta, Ga. the mortal remains of the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., are being laid to rest.

I was deeply shocked and saddened when I learned of the tragic assassination in Memphis, Tenn., on April 4, 1968 of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. My personal sympathy and that of the many thousands of people I have the honor of representing in the U.S. Congress goes out to Mrs. King, their children, and his people. Dr. King was a man of peace whose goal in life was to bring about full equality for all men through nonviolent means. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Dr. King in 1964 is the most eloquent testimony of his effective leadership towards the attainment of his goals.

Mr. Speaker, the use of force and violence as a means of expressing dissatisfaction with those things we believe to be wrong in America must come to a halt at once. Looting, arson, sniping, and all forms of violence must be stopped in this country for these senseless acts only do disservice to our country and to the memory of those of our fellow countrymen who have died in pursuit of a better life for all of our citizens and for our country as a whole. Dr. King must not have died in vain.

Let each and every one of us join today in mourning the loss of Dr. King while at the same time let us resolve to continue to strive more fervently for peace and full equality for all our citizens. It is only with God's help and the recognition of the true brotherhood of all men under the same God that the people of the United States will be able to live in peace and harmony and an effective victory over our racial struggles will be accomplished.

May he rest in peace.

The Challenge of the Seas: Congressman Paul Rogers

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, Congressman PAUL ROGERS, of the Ninth District of Florida, addressed the Federal Bar Association's Space Age Law Conference at Cape Kennedy, Fla. This was an excellent speech concerning some of the challenges of oceanography, a field with which we should all be greatly concerned. Congressman ROGERS is a member of the House Committee on Oceanography and is an expert. At his suggestion, President James McI. Henderson, of the Federal Bar Association, has established the first National Oceanographic Law Committee under the chairmanship of Ken Burns, assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Adm. John Harllee. Congressman ROGERS; Adm. John Harllee; Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., Executive Secretary, the President's National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; and Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr., U.S. Navy, Oceanographer of the Navy, will serve as honorary consultants to this new Federal bar committee.

Because Congressman ROGERS is a recognized leader in this field, and because his remarks are timely and thoughtful, I am sure my colleagues will be interested in his remarks, as follows:

Man has long had an adventure with the sea. At first it offered an additional source of food supply. Then a mode of transportation to other places. Finally, as man came to a point in time where he had big ships and navigational gear of sorts, it became a challenge.

This challenge led to the discovery and opening of the New World. Then, little by little, the world as we know it today was uncovered as man ventured farther and farther.

But now, almost 500 years later, we find ourselves again flirting with the seas. We are again about to answer a newer and greater challenge. For now as we continue to go down to the sea in ships, we are embarking on a journey that will take us into the last unexplored frontier on the earth.

I am speaking, of course, not of a journey on the seas, but of a journey into the seas of the world.

There is a point which I should make at the onset about this nation's efforts in the field of marine science and oceanography. Although we are only on the frontier now, and by comparison it will look like the Wright Brothers stage to people only 20 years from now, we are heavily committed.

It would not be fair to leave the impression that marine science and oceanography at this point in time consists of dropping

a man in an iron ball into the depths of the ocean, although we do indeed still do this.

We are progressing beyond that stage, or the stage where an old bearded sea captain rows to the middle of the channel to test the temperature.

Business, and I might add big business, has combined with technology to push us past that point.

Oil and mineral exploration and exploitation has accounted for the major investments by private industry in the seas. I would like to mention just a few figures to indicate what lies ahead in our adventure into the seas.

The value of oil and gas extracted off the coast of the United States now runs more than one billion dollars a year and is increasing at the rate of around 20 percent a year.

Total new investment in offshore oil and gas leases has averaged more than $234 million a year since 1960 and in 1967 approached $600 million on federally administered land alone.

Only last month, more than a dozen major oil companies and some independents paid more than $603 million for drilling rights off the coast of California—at one auction.

The economic worth of the petroleum being produced and the money being spent by industry offshore in the Free World is believed to be close to $4.5 billion, more than twice what it was only three years ago.

Within the next 10 years it is expected to triple to about $16 billion.

Another estimate says that within the coming decade, the investment in offshore oil and gas industry will amount to between $25 and $30 billion.

More than 700 companies are listed in one directory as offering products and services in ocean science and technology.

Fortune's annual list of 500 great companies makes note that 98 have roles in ocean engineering.

Gentlemen, Wall Street has put on flippers, goggles and mask and has tested the water. The obvious conclusion is that the dip was bracing.

From all indications, all signs are go.

We have initiated an academic base for producing manpower through the Sea Grant College Program which I introduced in the Congress two years ago. Of the first 6 project grants made this year in this program, two are in Florida—Florida Atlantic University and the University of Miami.

I would expect and hope that a number of our universities in Florida will participate very actively in this program, in order to help produce the necessary manpower for oceanography.

Industry has taken a toehold and with the help of the government has started what I am sure will be called the Ocean Boom in the financial journals in the not-too-distant future.

It is my personal opinion that the Ocean Boom will be as meaningful to the people of this nation as our Space Boom, if indeed not more so.

We are on the verge now.

Our breakthroughs in technology will dictate how far we can go. The input of funds from government and industry will tell us how fast we can go.

Yet the entire spectrum of ocean development—science, technology, business, economics, foreign relations—no matter how fast or profitable, is tied together—the string is law.

The law of the sea must be established in many areas. I would just like to touch on a few to give an idea of the depth of this field.

There are laws of ownership, between individuals and between state and federal government. And then there is the granddaddy of them all, the law of ownership between national states.

There are leasing laws as the sea bottom is developed and used. There are antitrust laws. Public utility laws as water is used for power and desalinization processes, patent laws, mineral laws, safety regulation laws and so on.

Almost to the item, any law which we have studied to this date can be equated to a marine situation. And then there are some more.

Generally speaking, however, we have basic concepts of law to apply to most situations until we reach the limits of the Continental Shelf. Roughly speaking, the Continental Shelf is the edge of the land mass on which nations boarding the oceans sit. It extends from the shore seaward on a gradual slope. When that slope increases to a sharp angle it is termed the Continental Slope and again generally speaking, that is where a nation's right of possession is supposed to end unless a nation has the capability to exploit beyond that point. And the United States has that capability.

This definition is foggy at best and of course is not at all uniform throughout the world, as one nation's continental shelf is wider than another. In fact, at points along the California coast the sharp descent of the continental shelf begins only one mile off shore. The general rule is that the shelf extends to about 200 meters, or about 600 feet.

This definition, even though sketchy, was all good and well when it was adopted in 1958 at the Geneva Convention. Those who sat on that international council could not visualize the rapid progress which was to come, and so the apparently obtrusive appendage of "or beyond that depth" was not a heavy issue. But progress has allowed us to go beyond what was considered reasonable at that time.

Now we are faced with a problem which can be stated simply:

Should the United States take the existing letter of the law, thus allowing this nation to push its boundaries into the seas beyond the Continental Shelf and reap the rewards of this exploration and exploitation; or should this nation join others and turn over the resources of the ocean bottom itself to an international body: i.e., the United Nations.

I have for several years now favored, indeed promoted, the first. For it is my belief that the United States has reached a point in technology where we can take advantage of the resources of the oceans. These resources are bountiful, as the figures I quoted to you earlier on oil and gas expenditures will attest.

In addition to these, there are minerals, metals and food. There, too, are elements which have excited men of medicine, and promise to be useful in formulating cures for many diseases. Life in the sea is no longer just fantasy.

And again, there is another primary reason why I feel we should expand our borders to the fullest—that is the basic issue of national security and defense.

The accepted international law which allows us to expand into the seas is the Geneva Convention of which I spoke earlier. And I would like to quote from the section which is the key to the present international and national debate of ocean rights for all nations.

"Article 1—For the purpose of these articles, the term 'continental shelf' is used as referring (a) to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters, or, beyond that limit, to where the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas."

The key phrase "or to where the depth of the superjacent water admits of the exploitation" is the letter of the law to which I have referred.

Simply put, it means we can go as far as our technology will carry us until we reach the halfway point between ourselves and another nation.

However, this clear issue has been blunted by those who wish to spread the wealth of the seas among all nations, with the United Nations acting as the superior state in the matter of leases, rights, and supply quotas.

I must disagree with the policy which the State Department, the Administration and certain members of the Congress seem to be exploring along these lines.

Because I felt the United States should establish national goals and a blueprint which would set out the most desirable way to attain those goals through a list of priorities, I introduced legislation which created a Presidential Commission made up of representatives from industry, government and the scientific community.

It is the purpose of that commission to study the entire field of the development of the seas and to set for the nation goals to be reached in marine science and oceanography and to recommend the best possible course of action to attain these national goals.

I have great faith in the work the commission is doing and am looking forward to the report, which is due at the beginning of the year.

Because of this, I feel it is not in good faith nor the proper time for this government to ask its representative to the United Nations to push for a United Nations study group on oceanography. We should wait and see what our own commission recommends. Only then will we have data which will set out the goal which this nation should pursue.

I do believe that all nations should be given a right to exploit the resources of the deep at present—but only on two counts. One, where those resources are within their sovereign domain, and secondly, where another sovereign nation grants them the rights to exploitation and exploration.

The point is, I do not believe that the United States should waive the benefits of the oceans to an international body.

I do believe that American industry, which has invested billions of dollars in ocean research and development, should have guarantees that when they stake out a plot on the bottom of the ocean, no one from another company or another nation can come along and junk that stake. They should have the guarantee of law.

I do not believe it is in the best interest of the national economy to have an international body setting production quotas for ocean resources.

If for some reason this nation needs more oil than it is producing on the land, our offshore production of the future should not be hampered by quotas set by the United Nations. Our economy could be saddled by the UN.

I do not believe that the United Nations has the expertise to manage the oceans nor the militia to enforce decisions.

I do not think any government unit can properly, and with reason, establish rules, regulations and standards to do tasks that it is incapable of doing itself.

The military is presently programming ocean detection systems for the security of the nation. It would not be to the advantage of the United States to allow such detection systems to be regulated by an international power.

The Malta Plan presented to the United Nations would just about do these things. There are other plans, proposed by members of the Senate, which would accomplish the same thing. I oppose either suggestion which would establish international control of the ocean bottoms and the resources thereof.

I hope you will agree that we did not build this nation by ceding away rights to our natural resources.

I would sum up by saying what I have discussed here today is not a problem of tomor-

row or next year or the year following. It is a problem of today.

The Geneva Convention might be reconvened next year. The core of that convention would be the establishment—or reestablishment—of international law concerning the resources of the seabed.

I believe we as a nation should press for the enforcement of the existing law or a clearer definition of present law. Any change in that law which would lessen our existing rights would be catastrophic when considering the potential of the United States in this area.

If the convention is convened next year and our legal minds have not given proper consideration to the problems facing the nation in the area of marine science and oceanography, our journey into the seas will be vitally hampered.

We not only face the possibility of losing an expanded national frontier and the material gains, but the problems of ocean pollution, territorial seas, fishing rights and freedom of passage will receive only half solutions.

I urge that you, as lawyers, give these very pressing and important problems your utmost consideration. The Federal Bar should assert its leadership and help direct the development of the law of the sea.

The consequences are very meaningful, both to the individual and to the nation.

Congressman Machen Opposes Cuts in Impacted Area Funds

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly disappointed by the action taken by the House last Thursday on amendment VI of the conference committee report on H.R. 15399. I was disappointed that the amount of funds provided for local school districts in federally impacted areas was not increased above only the $20 million provided for in section 3(a) of Public Law 874.

When this matter was debated on the floor, I made it clear that I was opposed to any reduction in the amount of funds provided for our education programs. In fact, I stated that I believed our education expenditures should be maintained and should not be cut because of the tremendous human cost which such action would cause. Only Vietnam expenditures should have as high a priority.

I realize full well that there must be budget reductions made this year if we are ever to put our fiscal house in order. However, I did not support then, nor will I support in the future, budget reductions in our educational programs.

The principle of special financial assistance to federally impacted local school districts has been tested over a period of years. It has been proven most successful in helping meet absolutely vital common school requirements in local areas which otherwise would be handicapped by the existence of a military installation or other Federal facility.

Certainly, I do not support paying money to school districts in excess of their actual needs.

In his 1965 budget message, President Johnson recommended that a thorough study be made of Public Law 874 and 815 programs. I believe that some of the conclusions of that report should be noted here in answer to those who argue that there is no effective means to police this program's operations.

First of all, it was determined that financial burdens are in fact created for local school districts by Federal activities of the types covered by Public Law 874. Second, it was found that it is, in fact, possible to determine the financial burden each school district bears as a result of these activities. Thus, it is possible to determine that a school district is receiving only its fair share of the funds provided under this law. Third, the report stated that the financial burdens created by the establishment of a Federal project are not restricted to their initial impact but present a continuing burden.

In view of these facts, I must admit that I was at a loss to determine why efforts which were made to increase the level of appropriations under Public Law 874 for fiscal year 1968 failed. I believe that there was, and is, a matter of good faith involved. The affected school districts rely on this Federal money to compensate for the extraordinary burdens caused by excessive Federal activity in their areas. They prepare their annual budgets accordingly. I was most disappointed to see the House break its promise to these school districts.

This program of aid for impacted school districts was initiated in 1950 as a response to the excessive costs which are incurred in areas where school rolls have become abnormally high due to military or other Federal concentrations. It brings about an unbearable burden on the local taxing capability. I believed last Thursday, and I still believe, that a way must be found to provide these school districts with 100 percent of their entitlements under the Public Law 874 program and I assure you that I will do everything in my power to bring this to pass as soon as possible.

Dr. Martin Luther King: Beyond Vietnam and Remaining Awake Through a Revolution

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1967, exactly 1 year before his tragic death, almost to the hour, Dr. Martin Luther King spoke to a congregation of clergy and laymen concerned about Vietnam at the Riverside Church in New York City. Robert McAfee Brown said of that occasion:

> Martin Luther King has placed the Vietnam war precisely where it belongs—on the conscience of every American. His New York speech of April 4, 1967, marks a national turning point in concern about the war, and expresses the moral outrage of increasing numbers of Americans. No one must be allowed to escape its disturbing challenge.

On March 31, 1968, at the Washington National Cathedral, Dr. King preached his last Sunday sermon, titled "Remaining Awake Through a Great Revolution." In that sermon, he spoke for brotherhood and against racism, poverty, and war which plague all of mankind.

These sermons, in themselves, say much of what needs to be said for this great American. I believe that they deserve being read by every American, and I include these two addresses in today's RECORD in memory of Dr. King, as follows:

BEYOND VIETNAM

(By Dr. Martin Luther King)

"A TIME COMES WHEN SILENCE IS BETRAYAL"

I come to this magnificent house of worship tonight because my conscience leaves me no other choice. I join you in this meeting because I am in deepest agreement with the aims and work of the organization which has brought us together: Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. The recent statement of your executive committee are the sentiments of my own heart and I found myself in full accord when I read its opening lines: "A time comes when silence is betrayal." That time has come for us in relation to Vietnam.

The truth of these words is beyond doubt, but the mission to which they call us is a most difficult one. Even when pressed by the demands of inner truth, men do not easily assume the task of opposing their government's policy, especially in time of war. Nor does the human spirit move without great difficulty against all the apathy of conformist thought within one's own bosom and in the surrounding world. Moreover when the issues at hand seem as perplexing as they often do in the case of this dreadful conflict we are always on the verge of being mesmerized by uncertainty; but we must move on.

"A FIRM DISSENT BASED UPON THE MANDATES OF CONSCIENCES"

Some of us who have already begun to break the silence of the night have found that the calling to speak is often a vocation of agony, but we must speak. We must speak with all the humility that is appropriate to our limited vision, but we must speak. And we must rejoice as well for surely this is the first time in our nation's history that a significant number of its religious leaders have chosen to move beyond the prophesying of smooth patriotism to the high grounds of a firm dissent based upon the mandates of conscience and the reading of history. Perhaps a new spirit is rising among us. If it is, let us trace its movements well and pray that our own inner being may be sensitive to its guidance, for we are deeply in need of a new way beyond the darkness that seems so close around us.

Over the past two years, as I have moved to break the betrayal of my own silences and to speak from the burnings of my own heart, as I have called for radical departures from the destruction of Vietnam, many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my path. At the heart of their concerns this query has often loomed large and loud: Why are you speaking about the war, Dr. King? Why are you joining the voices of dissent? Peace and civil rights don't mix, they say. Aren't you hurting the cause of your people, they ask? And when I hear them, though I often understand the source of their concern. I am nevertheless greatly saddened, for such questions mean that the inquirers have not really known me, my commitment or my calling. Indeed, their questions suggest that they do not know the world in which they live.

"I COME TO MAKE A PASSIONATE PLEA TO MY BELOVED NATION"

In the light of such tragic misunderstanding, I deem it of signal importance to try to state clearly, and I trust concisely, why I believe that the path from Dexter Avenue

Baptist Church—the church in Montgomery, Alabama, where I began my pastorate—leads clearly to this sanctuary tonight.

I come to this platform tonight to make a passionate plea to my beloved nation. This speech is not addressed to Hanoi or to the National Liberation Front. It is not addressed to China or to Russia.

Nor is it an attempt to overlook the ambiguity of the total situation and the need for a collective solution to the tragedy of Vietnam. Neither is it an attempt to make North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front paragons of virtue, nor to overlook the role they can play in a successful resolution of the problem. While they both may have justifiable reason to be suspicious of the good faith of the United States, life and history give eloquent testimony to the fact that conflicts are never resolved without trustful give and take on both sides.

"POVERTY PROGRAM: BROKEN AND EVISCERATED—A SOCIETY GONE MAD ON WAR"

Tonight, however, I wish not to speak with Hanoi and the NLF, but rather to my fellow Americans who, with me, bear the greatest responsibility in ending a conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

Since I am a preacher by trade, I suppose it is not surprising that I have seven major reasons for bringing Vietnam into the field of my moral vision. There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Vietnam and the struggle I, and others, have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor—both black and white—through the Poverty Program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the build-up in Vietnam and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such.

Perhaps a more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and to die in extrordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. So we watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.

"GREATEST PURVEYOR OF VIOLENCE TODAY—MY OWN GOVERNMENT"

My third reason moves to an even deeper level of awareness, for it grows out of my experience in the ghettos of the North over the last three years—especially the last three summers. As I have walked among the desperate, rejected and angry young men I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through non-violent action. But they asked—and rightly so—what about Vietnam? They asked if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today—my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of the hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent.

For those who ask the question, "Aren't you a Civil Right leader?" and thereby mean to exclude me from the movement for peace, I have this further answer. In 1957 when a group of us formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, we chose as our motto: "To save the soul of America." We were convinced that we could not limit our vision to certain rights for black people, but instead affirmed the conviction that America would never be free or saved from itself unless the descendants of its slaves were loosed completely from the shackles they still wear. In a way we were agreeing with Langston Hughes, that black bard of Harlem, who had written earlier:

"O, yes,
I say it plain,
America never was America to me,
And yet I swear this oath—
America will be!

"BROTHERHOOD OF MAN TAKES ME BEYOND NATIONAL ALLEGIANCES"

Now, it should be incandescently clear that no one who has any concern for the integrity and life of America today can ignore the present war. If America's soul becomes totally poisoned, part of the autopsy must read Vietnam. It can never be saved so long as it destroys the deepest hopes of men the world over. So it is that those of us who are yet determined that "America will be" are led down the path of protest and dissent, working for the health of our land.

As if the weight of such a commitment to the life and health of America were not enough, another burden of responsibility was placed upon me in 1964; and I cannot forget that the Nobel Prize for Peace was also a commission—a commission to work harder than I had ever worked before for the "brotherhood of man." This is a calling that takes me beyond national allegiances, but even if it were not present I would yet have to live with the meaning of my commitment to the ministry of Jesus Christ. To me the relationship of this ministry to the making of peace is so obvious that I sometimes marvel at those who ask me why I am speaking against the war. Could it be that they do not know that the good news was meant for all men—for communist and capitalist, for their children and ours, for black and for white, for revolutionary and conservative? Have they forgotten that my ministry is in obedience to the one who loved his enemies so fully that he died for them? What then can I say to the Viet Cong or to Castro or to Mao as a faithful minister of this one? Can I threaten them with death or must I not share with them my life?

Finally, as I try to delineate for you and for myself the road that leads from Montgomery to this place I would have offered all that was most valid if I simply said that I must be true to my conviction that I share with all men the calling to be a son of the Living God. Beyond the calling of race or nation or creed is this vocation of sonship and brotherhood, and because I believe that the Father is deeply concerned especially for his suffering and helpless and outcast children, I come tonight to speak for them.

This I believe to be the privilege and the burden of all of us who deem ourselves bound by allegiances and loyalities which are broader and deeper than nationalism and which go beyond our nation's self-defined goals and positions. We are called to speak for the weak, for the voiceless, for victims of our nation and for those it calls enemy, for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our brothers.

And as I ponder the madness of Vietnam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond in compassion my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them too, because it is clear to me that there will be no meaningful solution there until some attempt is made to know them and hear their broken cries.

"THEY MUST SEE AMERICANS AS STRANGE LIBERATORS"

They must see Americans as strange liberators. The Vietnamese people proclaimed their own independence in 1945 after a combined French and Japanese occupation, and before the communist revolution in China. They were led by Ho Chi Minh. Even though they quoted the American Declaration of Independence in their own document of freedom, we refused to recognize them. Instead, we decided to support France in its reconquest of her former colony.

Our government felt then that the Vietnamese people were not "ready" for independence, and we again fell victim to the deadly, Western arrogance that has poisoned the international atmosphere for so long. With that tragic decision we rejected a revolutionary government seeking self-determination, and a government that had been established not by China (for whom the Vietnamese have no great love) but by clearly indigenous forces that included some communists. For the peasants this new government meant real land reform, one of the most important needs in their lives.

For 9 years following 1945 we denied the people of Vietnam the right of independence. For 9 years we vigorously supported the French in their abortive effort to recolonize Vietnam.

Before the end of the war we were meeting 80 per cent of the French war costs. Even before the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu, they began to despair of the reckless action, but we did not. We encouraged them with our huge financial and military supplies to continue the war even after they had lost the will. Soon we would be paying almost the full costs of this tragic attempt at recolonization.

"AFTER THE FRENCH WERE DEFEATED WE SUPPORTED ONE OF THE MOST VICIOUS MODERN DICTATORS"

After the French were defeated it looked as if independence and land reform would come again through the Geneva agreements. But instead there came the United States, determined that Ho should not unify the temporarily divided nation, and the peasants watched again as we supported one of the most vicious modern dictators—our chosen man, Premier Diem. The peasants watched and cringed as Diem ruthlessly routed out all opposition, supported their extortionist landlords and refused even to discuss reunification with the North. The peasants watched as all this was presided over by U.S. influence and then by increasing numbers of U.S. troops who came to help quell the insurgency that Diem's methods had aroused. When Diem was overthrown they may have been happy, but the long line of military dictatorships seemed to offer no real change—especially in terms of their need for land and peace.

The only change came from America as we increased our troop commitments in support of governments which were singularly corrupt, inept and without popular support. All the while the people read our leaflets

and received regular promises of peace and democracy—and land reform. Now they languish under our bombs and consider us—not their fellow Vietamese—the real enemy. They move sadly and apathetically as we herd them off the land of their fathers into concentration camps where minimal social needs are rarely met. They know they must move or be destroyed by our bombs. So they go—primarily women and children and the aged.

"SO FAR WE MAY HAVE KILLED A MILLION—MOSTLY CHILDREN"

They watch as we poison their water, as we kill a million acres of their crops. They must weep as the bulldozers roar through their areas preparing to destroy the precious trees. They wander into the hospitals, with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for one Viet Cong-inflicted injury. So far we may have killed a million of them—mostly children. They wander into the towns and see thousands of the children, homeless, without clothes, running in packs on the streets like animals. They see the children degraded by our soldiers as they beg for food. They see the children selling their sisters to our soldiers, soliciting for their mothers.

What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Vietnam we claim to be building? Is it among these voiceless ones?

"WE HAVE DESTROYED CHERISHED INSTITUTIONS—FAMILY AND VILLAGES"

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in the crushing of the nation's only non-communist revolutionary political force—the Unified Buddhist Church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men. What liberators!

Now there is little left to build on—save bitterness. Soon the only solid physical foundations remaining will be found at our military bases and in the concrete of the concentration camps we call fortified hamlets. The peasants may well wonder if we plan to build our new Vietnam on such grounds as these? Could we blame them for such thoughts? We must speak for them and raise the questions they cannot raise. These too are our brothers.

Perhaps the more difficult but no less necessary task is to speak for those who have been designated as our enemies. What of the National Liberation Front—that strangely anonymous group we call VC or Communists? What must they think of us in America when they realize that we permitted the repression and cruelty of Diem which helped to bring them into being as a resistance group in the South? What do they think of our condoning the violence which led to their own taking up of arms? How can they believe in our integrity when now we speak of "aggression from the North" as if there were nothing more essential to the war? How can they trust us when now we charge them with violence after the murderous reign of Diem, and charge them with the violence while we pour every new weapon of death into their land? Surely we must understand their feelings even if we do not condone their actions. Surely we must see that the men we supported pressed them to their violence. Surely we must see that our own computerized plans of destruction simply dwarf their greatest act.

"HOW CAN WE SPEAK OF FREE ELECTIONS WHEN THE SAIGON PRESS IS CENSORED AND CONTROLLED"

How do they judge us when our officials know that their membership is less than 25 percent Communist and yet insist on giving them the blanket name? What must they be thinking when they know that we are aware of their control of major sections of Vietnam and yet we appear ready to allow national elections in which this highly organized political parallel government will have no part? They ask how we can speak of free election when the Saigon press is censored and controlled by the military junta. And they are surely right to wonder what kind of new government we plan to help form without them—the only party in real touch with the peasants. They question our political goals and they deny the reality of a peace settlement from which they will be excluded. Their questions are frighteningly relevant. Is our nation planning to build on political myth again and then shore it up with the power of new violence?

Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and non-violence when it helps us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see the basic weakness of our own condition, and if we are mature, we may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition.

So, too, with Hanoi. In the North, where our bombs now pommel the land, and our mines endanger the waterways, we are met by a deep but understandable mistrust. To speak for them is to explain this lack of confidence in Western words, and especially their distrust of American intentions now. In Hanoi are the men who led the nation to independence against the Japanese and the French, the men who sought membership in the French commonwealth and were betrayed by the weakness of Paris and the wilfulness of the colonial armies. It was they who led a second struggle against French domination at tremendous costs, and then were persuaded to give up the land they controlled between the 13th and 17th parallel as a temporary measure at Geneva. After 1954 they watched us conspire with Diem to prevent elections which would have surely brought Ho Chi Minh to power over a united Vietnam, and they realized they had been betrayed again.

"AMERICA HAS SPOKEN OF PEACE AS IT DROPS THOUSANDS OF BOMBS ON A POOR WEAK NATION MORE THAN 8,000 MILES AWAY"

When we ask why they do not leap to negotiate these things must be remembered. Also it must be clear that the leaders of Hanoi considered the presence of American troops in support of the Diem regime to have been the initial military breach of the Geneva Agreements concerning foreign troops, and they remind us that they did not begin to send in any large number of supplies or men until American forces had moved into the tens of thousands.

Hanoi remembers how our leaders refused to tell us the truth about the earlier North Vietnamese overtures for peace, how the President claimed that none existed when they had clearly been made. Ho Chi Minh has watched as America has spoken of peace and built up its forces, and now he has surely heard the increasing international rumors of American plans for an invasion of the North. He knows the bombing and shelling and mining we are doing are part of traditional pre-invasion strategy. Perhaps only his sense of humor and of irony can save him when he hears the most powerful nation of the world speaking of aggression as it drops thousands of bombs on a poor weak nation more than 8,000 miles away from its shores.

At this point I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless on Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called enemy, I am as deeply concerned about our own troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved. Before long they must know that their government has sent them into a struggle among Vietnamese, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create a hell for the poor.

Somehow this madness must cease. We must stop now. I speak as a child of God and brother to the suffering poor of Vietnam. I speak for those whose land is being laid waste, whose homes are being destroyed, whose culture is being subverted. I speak for the poor of America who are paying the double price of smashed hopes at home and death and corruption in Vietnam. I speak as a citizen of the world, for the world as it stands aghast at the path we have taken. I speak as an American to the leaders of my own nation. The great initiative in this war is ours. The initiative to stop it must be ours.

"THE AMERICANS ARE FORCING EVEN THEIR FRIENDS INTO BECOMING THEIR ENEMIES"

This is the message of the great Buddhist leaders of Vietnam. Recently one of them wrote these words: "Each day the war goes on the hatred increases in the heart of the Vietnamese and in the hearts of those of humanitarian instinct. The Americans are forcing even their friends into becoming their enemies. It is curious that the Americans, who calculate so carefully on the possibilities of military victory, do not realize that in the process they are incurring deep psychological and political defeat. The image of America will never again be the image of revolution, freedom and democracy, but the image of violence and militarism."

If we continue there will be no doubt in my mind and in the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. It will become clear that our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony and men will not refrain from thinking that our maximum hope is to goad China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations. If we do not stop our war against the people of Vietnam immediately the world will be left with no other alternative than to see this as some horribly clumsy and deadly game we have decided to play.

The world now demands a maturity of America that we may not be able to achieve. It demands that we admit that we have been wrong from the beginning of our adventure in Vietnam, that we have been detrimental to the life of the Vietnamese people. The situation is one in which we must be ready to turn sharply from our present ways.

In order to atone for our sins and errors in Vietnam, we should take the initiative in bringing a halt to this tragic war. I would like to suggest five concrete things that our government should do immediately to begin the long and difficult process of extricating ourselves from this nightmarish conflict:

1. End all bombing in North and South Vietnam.

2. Declare a unilateral cease-fire in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiations.

3. Take immediate steps to prevent other battlegrounds in Southeast Asia by curtailing our military build-up in Thailand and our interference in Laos.

4. Realistically accept the fact that the National Liberation Front has substantial support in South Vietnam and must thereby play a role in any meaningful negotiations and in any future Vietnam government.

5. Set a date that we will remove all foreign troops from Vietnam in accordance with the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

"WE MUST CONTINUE TO RAISE OUR VOICES IF OUR NATION PERSISTS IN VIETNAM"

Part of our ongoing commitment might well express itself in an offer to grant asylum

to any Vietnamese who fears for his life under a new regime which included the Liberation Front. Then we must make what reparations we can for the damage we have done. We must provide the medical aid that is badly needed, making it available in this country if necessary.

Meanwhile, we in the church and synagogues have a continuing task while we urge our government to disengage itself from a disgraceful commitment. We must continue to raise our voices and our lives if our nation persists in its perverse ways in Vietnam. We must be prepared to match actions with words by seeking out every creative means of protest possible.

As we counsel young men concerning military service we must clarify for them our nation's role in Vietnam and challenge them with the alternative of conscientious objection. I am pleased to say that this is the path now being chosen by more than seventy students at my own alma mater, Morehouse College, and I recommend it to all who find the American course in Vietnam a dishonorable and unjust one. Moreover, I would encourage all ministers of draft age to give up their ministerial exemptions and seek status as conscientious objectors. These are the times for real choice and not false ones. We are at the moment when our lives must be placed on the line if our nation is to survive its own folly. Every man of humane convictions must decide on the protest that best suits his convictions, but we must all protest.

"THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS BUT A SYMPTOM OF A FAR DEEPER MALADY WITHIN THE AMERICAN SPIRIT"

There is something seductively tempting about stopping there and sending us all off on what in some circles has become a popular crusade against the war in Vietnam. I say we must enter that struggle, but I wish to go on now to say something even more disturbing. The war in Vietnam is but a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit, and if we ignore this sobering reality we will find ourselves organizing clergy-and-laymen-concerned committees for the next generation. They will be concerned about Guatemala and Peru. They will be concerned about Thailand and Cambodia. They will be concerned about Mozanbique and South Africa. We will be marching for these and a dozen other names and attending rallies without end unless there is a significant and profound change in American life and policy. Such thoughts take us beyond Vietnam, but not beyond our calling as sons of the living God.

In 1957 a sensitive American official overseas said that it seemed to him that our nation was on the wrong side of a world revolution. During the past 10 years we have seen emerge a pattern of suppression which now has justified the presence of U.S. military "advisors" in Venezuela. This need to maintain social stability for our investments accounts for the counter-revolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Colombia and why American napalm and green beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru. It is with such activity in mind that the words of the late John F. Kennedy come back to haunt us. Five years ago he said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

"IF WE ARE TO GET ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION"

Increasingly, by choice or by accident, this is the role our nation has taken—the role of those who make peaceful revolution impossible by refusing to give up the privileges and the pleasures that come from the immense profits of overseas investment.

I am convinced that if we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin the shift from a "thing-oriented" society to a "person-oriented" society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

A true revolution of value will soon cause us to question the fairness and justice of many of our past and present policies. On the one hand we are called to play the Good Samaritan on life's roadside; but that will be only an initial act. One day we must come to see that the whole Jericho Road must be transformed so that men and women will not be constantly beaten and robbed as they make their journey on life's highway. True compassion is more than flinging a coin to a beggar; it is not haphazard and superficial. It comes to see that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring. A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the countries, and say: "This is not just." It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of Latin America and say: "This is not just." The Western arrogance of feeling that it has everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just. A true revolution of values will lay hands on the world order and say of war: "This way of settling differences is not just." This business of burning human beings with napalm, of filling our nation's homes with orphans and widows, of injecting poisonous drugs of hate into the veins of peoples normally humane, of sending men home from dark and bloody battlefields physically handicapped and psychologically deranged, cannot be reconciled with wisdom, justice, and love. A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.

"AMERICA CAN WELL LEAD THE WAY IN THIS REVOLUTION OF VALUES"

America, the righest and most powerful nation in the world, can well lead the way in this revolution of values. There is nothing, except a tragic death wish, to prevent us from reordering our priorities, so that the pursuit of peace will take precedence over the pursuit of war. There is nothing to keep us from molding a recalcitrant status quo with bruised hands until we have fashioned it into a brotherhood.

This kind of positive revolution of values is our best defense against communism. War is not the answer. Communism will never be defeated by the use of atomic bombs or nuclear weapons. Let us not join those who shout war and through their misguided passions urge the United States to relinquish its participation in the United Nations. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness. We must not call everyone a Communist or an appeaser who advocates the seating of Red China in the United Nations and who recognizes that hate and hysteria are not the final answers to the problem of those turbulent days. We must not engage in a negative anti-communism, but rather in a positive thrust for democracy, realizing that our greatest defense against communism is to take offensive action in behalf of justice. We must with positive action seek to remove those conditions of poverty, insecurity and injustice which are the fertile soil in which the seed of communism grows and develops.

"THE SHIRTLESS AND BAREFOOT PEOPLE ARE RISING UP AS NEVER BEFORE"

These are revolutionary times. All over the globe men are revolting against old systems of exploitation and oppression and out of the bombs of a frail world new systems of justice and equality are being born. The shirtless and barefoot people of the land are rising up as never before. "The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light." We in the West must support these revolutions. It is a sad fact that, because of comfort, complacency, a morbid fear of communism, and our proneness to adjust to injustice, the Western nations that initiated so much of the revolutionary spirit of the modern world have now become the arch anti-revolutionaries. This has driven many to feel that only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit. Therefore, communism is a judgment against our failure to make democracy real and follow through on the revolutions that we initiated. Our only hope today lies in our ability to recapture the revolutionary spirit and go out into a sometimes hostile world declaring eternal hostility to poverty, racism, and militarism. With this powerful commitment we shall boldly challenge the status quo and unjust mores and thereby speed the day when "every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain."

A genuine revolution of values means in the final analysis that our loyalties must become ecumenical rather than sectional. Every nation must now develop an overriding loyalty to mankind as a whole in order to preserve the best in their individual societies.

"LOVE IS SOMEHOW THE KEY THAT UNLOCKS THE DOOR TO ULTIMATE REALITY"

This call for a worldwide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one's tribe, race, class and nation is in reality a call for an all-embracing and unconditional love for all men. This oft-misunderstood and misinterpreted concept so readily dismissed by the Nietzches of the world as a weak and cowardly force—has now become an absolute necessity for the survival of man. When I speak of love I am not speaking of some sentimental and weak response. I am speaking of that force which all of the great religions have seen as the supreme unifying principle of life. Love is somehow the key that unlocks the door which leads to ultimate reality. This Hindu-Moslem-Christian-Jewish-Buddhist belief about ultimate realty is beautifully summed up in the first epistle of Saint John:

"Let us love one another; for love is God and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us."

"WE CAN NO LONGER AFFORD TO WORSHIP THE GOD OF HATE"

Let us hope that this spirit will become the order of the day. We can no longer afford to worship the God of Hate or bow before the altar of retaliation. The oceans of history are made turbulent by the ever-rising tides of hate. History is cluttered with the wreckage of nations and individuals that pursued this self-defeating path of hate. As Arnold Toynbee says: "Love is the ultimate force that makes for the saving choice of life and good against the damning choice of death and evil. Therefore the first hope in our inventory must be the hope that love is going to have the last word."

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life often leaves us standing bare, naked and dejected with a lost opportunity. The "tide in the affairs of men" does not remain at the flood; it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is deaf to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residue of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words: "Too late."

These is an invisible book of life that faithfully records our vigilance or our neglect. "The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on . . ." We still have a choice today: Non-violent co-existence or violent co-annihilation.

We must move past indecision to action. We must find new ways to speak for peace in Vietnam and justice throughout the developing world—a world that borders on our doors. If we do not act we shall surely be dragged down the long, dark and shameful corridors of time reserved for those who possess power without compassion, might without morality, and strength without sight.

"SHALL WE SAY THE ODDS ARE TOO GREAT? TELL THEM THE STRUGGLE IS TOO HARD?"

Now let us begin. Now let us rededicate ourselves to the long and bitter—but beautiful—struggle for a new world. This is the calling of the sons of God, and our brothers wait eagerly for our response. Shall we say the odds are too great? Shall we tell them the struggle is too hard? Will our message be that the forces of American life militate against their arrival as full men, and we send our deepest regrets? Or will there be another message, of longing of hope, of solidarity with their yearnings, of commitment to their cause, whatever the cost? The choice is ours, and though we might prefer it otherwise we must choose in this crucial moment of human history.

REMAINING AWAKE THROUGH A GREAT REVOLUTION

I need not pause to say how very delighted I am to be here this morning . . . to have the opportunity of standing in this very great and significant pulpit . . . and I do want to express my deep personal appreciation to Dean Sayre and all of the Cathedral clergy for extending the invitation.

It is always a rich and rewarding experience to take a brief break from our day to day demands and the struggle for freedom and human dignity . . . and discuss the issues involved in that struggle with concerned friends of good will all over our nation. And certainly it is always a deep and meaningful experience to be in a worship service. And so for many reasons. I'm happy to be here today.

I would like to use as a subject from which to preach this morning: "Remaining awake through a great revolution". The text for the morning is found in the book of Revelation. There are two passages there, that I would like to quote, in the sixteenth chapter of that book—"Behold I make all things new, former things are passed away".

I am sure that most of you have read that arresting little story from the pen of Washington Irving, entitled "Rip Van Winkle". The one thing that we usually remember about the story is that Rip Van Winkle slept 20 years. But there is another point in that little story that is almost completely overlooked. It was the sign in the end, from which Rip went up in the mountain for his long sleep.

When Rip Van Winkle went up into the mountain, the sign had a picture of King George III of England. When he came down 20 years later the sign had a picture of George Washington, the first President of the United States. When Rip Van Winkle looked up at the picture of George Washington, and looking at the picture he was amazed . . . he was completely lost—he knew not who he was. And this reveals to us that the most striking thing about the story of Rip Van Winkle is not merely that Rip slept 20 years, but that he slept through a revolution. While he was peacefully snoring up in the mountain a revolution was taking place that at points would change the course of history—and Rip knew nothing about it: he was asleep. Yes, he slept through a revolution. And one of the great liabilities of life is that all too many people find themselves living amid a great period of social change and yet they fail to develop the new attitudes, the new mental responses—that the new situation demands. They end up sleeping through a revolution.

There can be no gainsaying of the fact that a great revolution is taking place in the world today. In a sense it is a triple revolution; that is a technological revolution, with the impact of automation and cybernation; then there is a revolution in weaponry, with the emergence of atomic and nuclear weapons of warfare. Then there is a human rights revolution, with the freedom explosion that is taking place all over the world. Yes, we do live in a period where changes are taking place and there is still the voice crying through the vista of time saying, "Behold, I make all things new, former things are passed away".

Now whenever anything new comes into history it brings with it new challenges . . . and new opportunities.

And I would like to deal with the challenges that we face today as a result of this triple revolution, that is taking place in the world today.

First, we are challenged to develop a world perspective. No individual can live alone, no nation can live alone, and anyone who feels that he can live alone is sleeping through a revolution. The world in which we live is geographically one. The challenge that we face today is to make it one in terms of brotherhood.

Now it is true that the geographical oneness of this age has come into being to a large extent through modern man's scientific ingenuity. Modern man through his scientific genius has been able to dwarf distance and place time in chains. And our jet planes have compressed into minutes distances that once took weeks and even months. All of this tells us that our world is a neighborhood.

Through our scientific and technological genius, we have made of this world a neighborhood and yet . . . we have not had the ethical commitment to make of it a brotherhood. But somehow, and in some way, we have got to do this. We must all learn to live together as brothers. Or we will all perish together as fools. We are tied together in the single garment of destiny, caught in an inescapable network of mutuality. And whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. For some strange reason I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. And you can never be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be. This is the way God's universe is made; this is the way it is structured.

John Donne caught it years ago and placed it in graphic terms—"No man is an island entire of itself. Every man is a piece of the continent—a part of the main". And he goes on toward the end to say, "Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind. Therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee". We must see this, believe this, and live by it . . . if we are to remain awake through a great revolution.

Secondly, we are challenged to eradicate the last vestiges of racial injustice from our nation. I must say this morning that racial injustice is still the black man's burden and the white man's shame.

It is an unhappy truth that racism is a way of life for the vast majority of white Americans, spoken and unspoken, acknowledged and denied, subtle and sometimes not so subtle—the disease of racism permeates and poisons a whole body politic. And I can see nothing more urgent than for America to work passionately and unrelentingly—to get rid of the disease of racism.

Something positive must be done, everyone must share in the guilt as individuals and as institutions. The government must certainly share the guilt, individuals must share the guilt, even the church must share the guilt.

We must face the sad fact that at 11:00 on Sunday morning when we stand to sing, "In Christ there is no East or West", we stand in the most segregated hour of America.

The hour has come for everybody, for all institutions of the public sector and the private sector to work to get rid of racism. And now if we are to do it we must honestly admit certain things and get rid of certain myths that have constantly been disseminated all over our nation.

One is the myth of time. It is the notion that only time can solve the problem of racial injustice. And there are those who often sincerely say to the Negro and his allies in the white community, "Why don't you slow up? Stop pushing things so fast. Only time can solve the problem. And if you will just be nice and patient and continue to pray, in a hundred or two hundred years the problem will work itself out.

There is an answer to that myth. It is that time is neutral. It can be used either constructively or destructively. And I am sorry to say this morning that I am absolutely convinced that the forces of ill will in our nation, the extreme rightists of our nation—the people on the wrong side—have used time much more effectively than the forces of goodwill. And it may well be that we will have to repent in this generation. Not merely for the vitriolic words and the violent actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence and indifference of the good people who sit around and say, "Wait on time".

Somewhere we must come to see that human progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and the persistent work of dedicated individuals who are willing to be co-workers with God. And without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the primitive forces of social stagnation. So we must help time and realize that the time is always ripe to do right.

Now there is another myth that still gets around; it is a kind of over reliance on the boot-strap philosophy. There are those who still feel that if the Negro is to rise out of poverty, if the Negro is to rise out of slum conditions, if he is to rise out of discrimination and segregation, he must do it all by himself. And so they say the Negro must lift himself by his own boot-straps.

They never stop to realize that no other ethnic group has been a slave on American soil. The people who say this never stop to realize that the nation made the black man's color a stigma; but beyond this they never stop to realize the debt that they owe a people who were kept in slavery 244 years.

In 1863 the Negro was told that he was free as a result of the Emancipation Proclamation being signed by Abraham Lincoln. But he was not given any land to make that freedom meaningful. It was something like keeping a person in prison for a number of years and suddenly discovering that that person is not guilty of the crime for which he was convicted. And you just go up to him and say, "Now you are free", but you don't give him any bus fare to get to town. You don't give him any money to get some clothes to put on his back or to get on his feet again in life.

Every court of jurisprudence would rise up against this, and yet this is the very thing that our nation did to the black man. It simply said, "You're free", and it left him there penniless, illiterate, not knowing what to do. And the irony of it all is that at the same time the nation failed to do anything for the black man—through an act of Congress it was giving away millions of acres of land in the west and the mid-west—which meant that it was willing to undergird its white peasants from Europe with an economic floor.

But not only did it give the land, it built land-grant colleges to teach them how to farm. Not only that, it provided county agents to further their expertise in farming; not only that, as the years unfolded it pro-

vided low interest rates so that they could mechanize their farms. And to this day thousands of these very persons are receiving millions of dollars in federal subsidies every year not to farm. And these are so often the very people who tell Negroes that they must lift themselves by their own boot-straps. It's all right to tell a man to lift himself by his own boot-straps, but it is a cruel jest to say to a bootless man that he ought to lift himself by his own boot-straps.

We must come to see that the roots of racism are very deep in our country, and there must be something positive and massive in order to get rid of all the effects of racism and the tragedies of racial injustice.

There is another thing closely related to racism that I would like to mention as another challenge. We are challenged to rid our nation and the world of poverty. Like a monstrous octopus, poverty spreads its nagging, prehensile tentacles into hamlets and villages all over our world. They are ill-housed, they are ill-nourished, they are shabbily clad. I have seen it in Latin America; I have seen it in Africa; I have seen this poverty in Asia.

I remember some years ago Mrs. King and I journeyed to that great country known as India. And I never will forget the experience; it was a marvelous experience to meet and talk with the great leaders of India; to meet and talk with and speak to thousands and thousands of people all over that vast country. These experiences will remain dear to me as long as the cords of memory shall let them.

But I say to you this morning, my friends, there were those depressing moments—how can one avoid being depressed?—when he sees with his own eyes evidences of millions of people going to bed hungry at night. How can one avoid being depressed when he sees with his own eyes God's children sleeping on the sidewalks at night.

In Bombay more than a million people sleep on the sidewalks every night. In Calcutta more than 600,000 sleep on the sidewalks every night. They have no beds to sleep in; they have no houses to go in. How can one avoid being depressed when he discovers that out of India's population of more than 500,000,000 people—some 480,000,000 make an annual income of less than $90.00. And most of them have never seen a doctor or a dentist.

As I noticed these things, something within me cried out, "Can we in America stand idly by and not be concerned?". And an answer came—"Oh, no!". Because the destiny of the United States is tied up with the destiny of India and every other nation. And I started thinking of the fact that we spend in America millions of dollars a day to store surplus food, and I said to myself, "I know where we can store that food free of charge—in the wrinkled stomachs of millions of God's children all over the world who go to bed hungry at night". Maybe we spend far too much of our national budget establishing military bases around the world rather than bases of genuine concern and understanding.

Not only do we see poverty abroad, I would remind you that in our own nation there are about 40,000,000 people who are poverty-stricken. I have seen them here and there. I have seen them in the ghettos of the north; I have seen them in the rural areas of the south; I have seen them in Appalachia. I have just been in the process of touring many areas of our country and I must confess that in some situations I have literally found myself crying.

I was in Marks, Mississippi, the other day, which is in Whitman County, the poorest county in the United States. I tell you I saw hundreds of little black boys and black girls walking the streets with no shoes to wear. I saw their mothers and their fathers trying to carry on a little head-start program, but they had no money. The federal government hadn't funded them but they were trying to carry on. They raised a little money here and there; trying to get a little food to feed the children; trying to teach them a little something.

And I saw mothers and fathers who said to me not only were they unemployed, they didn't get any kind of income—no old age pension, no welfare check, nor anything. I said, "How do you live?" And they say, "Well, we go around—go around to the neighbors and ask them for a little something. When the berry season comes, we pick berries; when the rabbit season comes, we hunt and catch a few rabbits, and that's about it."

And I was in Newark and Harlem just this week. And I walked into the homes of welfare mothers; I saw them in conditions—no, not with wall-to-wall carpet, but wall-to-wall rats and roaches. I stood in an apartment and this welfare mother said to me "The Landlord will not repair this place. I've been here two years and he hasn't made a single repair." She pointed out the walls with all of the ceiling falling through. She showed me the holes where the rats came in. She said night after night we have to stay awake to keep the rats and the roaches from getting to the children. I said, "How much do you pay for this apartment?" She said, "$125.00." I looked and I thought and said to myself, "It isn't worth $60.00.' Poor people are forced to pay more for less. Living in conditions day in and day out where the whole area is constantly drained without being replenished. It becomes a kind of domestic colony. And the tragedy is so often—these 40,000,000 people are invisible because America is so affluent. so rich; because our expressways carry us away from the ghetto, we don't see the poor.

Jesus told a parable one day, and He reminded us that a man went to hell because he didn't see the poor. His name was Dives. He was a rich man. And there was a man by the name of Lazarus who was a poor man, but not only was he poor, he was sick. Sores were all over his body, and he was so weak that he could hardly move. But he managed to get to the gate of Dives every day, wanting just to have the crumbs that would fall from his table. And Dives did nothing about it. And the parable ends saying, "Dives went to hell, and there were a fixed gulf now between Lazarus and Dives.

There is nothing in that parable that said Dives went to hell because he was rich. Jesus never made a universal indictment against all wealth. It is true that one day a rich young ruler came to Him, and He advised him to sell all, but in that instance Jesus was prescribing individual surgery and not setting forth a universal diagnosis. And if you will look at that parable with all of its symbolism, you will remember that a conversation took place between heaven and hell and on the other end of that long-distance call between heaven and hell was Abraham in heaven talking to Dives in hell.

Now Abraham was a very rich man. If you go back to the Old Testament, you see that he was the richest man of his day, so it was not a rich man in hell talking with a poor man in heaven, it was a little millionaire in hell talking with a multi-millionaire in heaven. Dives didn't go to hell because he was rich; Dives didn't realize that his wealth was his opportunity. It was his opportunity to bridge the gulf that separated him from his brother, Lazarus. Dives went to hell because he was passed by Lazarus every day and he never really saw him. He went to hell because he allowed his brother to become invisible. Dives went to hell because he maximized the minimum and minimized the maximum. Indeed, Dives went to hell because he sought to be a conscientious objector in the war against poverty.

And this can happen to America, the richest nation in the world—and nothing's wrong with that—this is America's opportunity to help bridge the gulf between the haves and the have-nots. The question is whether America will do it. There is nothing new about poverty. What is new is that we now have the techniques and the resources to get rid of poverty. The real question is whether we have the will.

In a few weeks some of us are coming to Washington to see if the will is still alive or if it is alive in this nation. We are coming to Washington in a Poor People's Campaign. Yes, we are going to bring the tired, the poor, the huddled masses. We are going to bring those who have known long years of hurt and neglect. We are going to bring those who have come to feel that life is a long and desolate corridor with no exit signs. We are going to bring children and adults and old people; people who have never seen a doctor or a dentist in their lives.

We are not coming to engage in any histrionic gesture. We are not coming to tear up Washington. We are coming to demand that the government address itself to the problem of poverty. We read one day—We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. That among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. But if a man doesn't have a job or an income, he has neither life nor liberty nor the possibility for the pursuit of happiness. He merely exists.

We are coming to ask America to be true to the huge promissory note that it signed years ago. And we are coming to engage in dramatic non-violent action, to call attention to the gulf between promise and fulfillment; to make the invisible visible.

Why do we do it this way? We do it this way because it is our experience that the nation doesn't move around questions of genuine equality for the poor and for black people until it is confronted massively, dramatically in terms of direct action.

Great documents are here to tell us something should be done. We met here some years ago in the White House conference on Civil Rights, and we came out with the same recommendations that we will be demanding in our campaign here, but nothing has been done. The President's commission on technology, automation and economic progress recommended these things some time ago. Nothing has been done. Even the urban coalition of mayors of most of the cities of our country and the leading businessmen have said these things should be done. Nothing has been done. The Kerner Commission came out with its report just a few days ago and then made specific recommendations. Nothing has been done.

And I submit that nothing will be done until people of goodwill put their bodies and their souls in motion. And it will be the kind of soul force brought into being as a result of this confrontation that I believe will make the difference. Yes, it will be a Poor Peoples' Campaign. This is the question facing America. Ultimately a great nation is a compassionate nation. America has not met its obligations and its responsibilities to the poor.

One day we will have to stand before the God of history and we will talk in terms of things we've done. Yes, we will be able to say we built gargantuan bridges to span the seas, we built gigantic buildings to kiss the skies. Yes, we made our submarines to penetrate oceanic depths. We brought into being many other things with our scientific and technological power.

It seems that I can hear the God of history saying, "That was not enough! But I I was hungry and ye fed me not. I was naked and ye clothed me not. I was devoid of a decent sanitary house to live in, and ye provided no shelter for me. And consequently, you cannot enter the kingdom of greatness. If ye do it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye do it unto me". That's the question facing America today.

I want to say one other challenge that we face is simply that we must find an alternative to war and bloodshed. Anyone who feels, and there are still a lot of people who feel that way, that war can solve the social problems facing mankind is sleeping through a revolution. President Kennedy said on one occasion, "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind." The world must hear this. I pray God that America will hear this before it is too late because today we're fighting a war.

I am convinced that it is one of the most unjust wars that has ever been fought in the history of the world. Our involvement in the war in Viet Nam has torn up the Geneva Accord. It has strengthened the military-industrial complex; it has strengthened the forces of reaction in our nation; it has put us against the self-determination of a vast majority of the Vietnamese people, and put us in the position of protecting a corrupt regime that is stacked against the poor.

It has played havoc with our domestic destinies. This day we are spending $500,000 to kill every Viet Cong soldier—every time we kill one we spend about $500,000 while we spend only $53.00 a year for every person characterized as poverty-stricken in the so-called Poverty Program; which is not even a good skirmish against poverty.

Not only that, it has put us in a position of appearing to the world as an arrogant nation. And here we are 10,000 miles away from home fighting for the so-called freedom of the Vietnamese people when we have not even put our own house in order. And we force young black men and young white men to fight and kill in brutal solidarity. Yet when they come back home they can't hardly live on the same block together.

The judgment of God is upon us today, and we could go right down the line and see that something must be done . . . and something must be done quickly. We have alienated ourselves from other nations so we end up morally and politically isolated in the world. There is not a single major ally of the United States of America that would dare send a troop to Viet Nam and so the only friends that we have now are a few client-nations like Taiwan, Thailand, South Korea and a few others.

This is where we are. Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind, and the best way to start is to put an end to war in Viet Nam because if it continues, we will inevitably come to the point of confronting China which could lead the whole world to nuclear annihilation.

It is no longer a choice, my friends, between violence and non-violence. It is either non-violence or non-existence, and the alternative to disarmament, the alternative to a greater suspension of nuclear tests, the alternative to strengthing the United Nations and thereby disarming the whole world may well be a civilization plunged into the abyss of annihilation, and our earthly habitat would be transformed into an inferno that even the mind of Dante could not imagine.

This is why I felt the need of raising my voice against that war and working wherever I can to arouse the conscience of our nation on it. I remember so well when I first took a stand against the war in Viet Nam, the critics took me on and they had their say in the most negative and sometimes most vicious way.

One day a newsman came to me and said, "Dr. King, don't you think you're going to have to stop, now, opposing the war and move more in line with the administration's policy? As I understand it, it has hurt the budget of your organization and people who once respected you, have lost respect for you. Don't you feel that you've really got to change your position?" I looked at him and I had to say, "Sir, I'm sorry you don't know me. I'm not a consensus leader. I do not determine what is right and wrong by looking at the budget of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. I've not taken a sort of Gallup poll of the majority opinion. Ultimately a genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus, but a moulder of consensus."

On some positions, cowardice asks the question, is it expedient? And then expedience comes along and asks the question—is it politic?

Vanity asks the question—is it popular? Conscience asks the question—is it right?

There comes a time when one must take the position that it is neither safe nor politic nor popular, but he must do it because conscience tells him it is right. I believe today that there is a need for all people of goodwill to come with a massive act of conscience and say in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "We ain't goin' study war no more". This is the challenge facing modern man.

Let me close by saying that we have difficult days ahead in the struggle for justice and peace, but I will not yield to a politic of despair. I'm going to maintain hope as we come to Washington in this campaign, the cards are stacked against us. This time we will really confront a Goliath. God grant that we will be that David of truth set out against the Goliath of injustice, the Goliath of neglect, the Goliath of refusing to deal with the problems, and go on with the determination to make America the truly great America that it is called to be.

I say to you that our goal is freedom, and I believe we are going to get there because however much she strays away from it, the goal of America is freedom. Abused and scorned though we may be as a people, our destiny is tied up in the destiny of America.

Before the Pilgrim fathers landed at Plymouth, we were here. Before Jefferson etched across the pages of history, the majestic words of the Declaration of Independence, we were here. Before the beautiful words of the Star Spangled Banner were written, we were here.

For more than two centuries our forebearers labored here without wages. They made cotton king, and they built the homes of their masters in the midst of the most humiliating and oppressive conditions. And yet out of a bottomless vitality they continued to grow and develop. If the inexpressable cruelities of slavery couldn't stop us, the opposition that we now face will surely fail.

We're going to win our freedom because both the sacred heritage of our nation and the eternal will of the almighty God are embodied in our echoing demands. And so, however dark it is, however deep the angry feelings are, and however violent explosions are, I can still sing "We Shall Overcome".

We shall overcome because the arc of a moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice. We shall overcome because Carlyle is right—no lie can live forever. We shall overcome because William Cullant Bryant is right—truth crushed to earth will rise again. We shall overcome because James Russell Lowell is right—as we were singing earlier today. "Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne, yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the demon known, stands a God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own".

With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair the stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

Thank God for John, who centuries ago out on a lonely, obscure island called Patmos caught vision of a new Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God, who heard a voice saying, "Behold, I make all things new—former things are passed away."

God grant that we will be participants in this newness and this magnificent development. If we will but do it, we will bring about a new day of justice and brotherhood and peace. And that day the morning stars will sing together and the sons of God will shout for joy. God bless you.

Today's Airport: An Investment in the Future

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the extent of the new airport facilities needed to meet an enormously expanding air travel is impressive. Commenting on a speech by Stuart Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, the Miami Herald said on March 31 in an editorial titled "Big Business in the Sky," "things look even busier in the years ahead. Airline passenger traffic is expected to triple by 1975."

This means about 330 million passengers in that year.

To meet this surge of traffic, the airlines have embarked on a major reequipment program with more than 740 million aircraft valued at almost $7 billion on order for delivery between now and 1972.

However, air transportation cannot expand unless airports expand with all the elements of aviation. It is estimated that the needed airport expansion and improvement program will cost some $6 billion. While a large part of this money will be generated from airlines, airline passengers and through bond issues underwritten by airline earnings, it is essential that the Federal Government, because of its stake in the air transport system, come up with an overall financial program.

This need for Government actions was clearly defined in the Tipton talk made March 29 in Coral Gables, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, this very interesting and informative analysis of the airport problem is of interest to all my colleagues and I am pleased to call it to their attention, as follows:

TODAY'S AIRPORT: AN INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE

It is a pleasure to be here with you today. That's a very easy statement for me to make because it's always a pleasure to be in Florida—especially when there's a blustery March back up north.

I've been asked to tell you about the future of air transportation, and about airports, and about Southern Florida. I could sum it up in a few words: they're all booming, and prospects are bright.

But this is a distinguished audience whose knowledge of commerce and finance is impressive. There's little I can tell you about the business cycle and about the marketplace, but I think there are some currents and trends in air transportation which I think you will find of interest.

What I'd like today is to tell you about the role of air transportation in the next ten years, not only in Southern Florida, but throughout the United States.

For the past two days you have been treated to a close look at one of the great aviation and tourist centers of the U.S. Dade

County, and with it, South Florida, has a real success story to tell, and its leaders are understandably proud.

South Florida, served through Miami International Airport, is a leading resort for the U.S. and indeed the western hemisphere. Six and one-half million tourists were attracted last year by the promise of lots of sunshine, a wide range of entertainment and recreation and sumptuous hotels. These tourists spent, during their stay, at least $700 million or $240 per person, staying an average of 11 days. Taken together, the tourist industry makes up the largest single industry in South Florida. Sixty-four cents out of every income dollar comes from it.

What might not be so well known is that Miami is also becoming a business and commercial center. Last year the dollar value of new construction reached $300 million, the best year in post-war history. Non-agricultural employment topped the 400 thousand mark for the first time last December, and thus metropolitan Miami joined the elite "400 Club." It became the twenty-fifth in rank of 150 major labor areas in the U.S. The Dade County Development Department reports that at least nine major national firms are considering expansion into Dade County this year. In addition, at least a half dozen more are expected to set up headquarters for their operations in Latin America.

This growth was founded, in part, on Miami's aviation leadership which you have seen closeup in the last two days. Two of your airports ranked last year in the ten busiest list in the U.S. In fact, Opa Locka is the second busiest airport in the nation.

And although according to the 1965 census figures, metropolitan Miami ranks 27th in terms of population, it ranked 8th in airline passengers emplaned—clearly an air-minded city.

But Miami International does more than just pour in tourists. It and the airlines that serve it employ 70 thousand persons, earning $500 million a year. This makes aviation and its allied industry the largest single employer in Dade County; one out of every five persons is supported by an aviation payroll.

Miami's airport system is certainly the focal point for the economic well-being of South Florida. This could not have been possible without the full cooperation of all elements of the business and aviation communities. The foresight that has marked this partnership has been remarkable and unique. Back in the 1950's, your leaders foresaw the jet age and its tremendous growth in passenger traffic and in 1959 opened a new passenger terminal to handle it. This terminal can readily accommodate twelve million passengers a year and will, therefore, avoid much of the congestion and delay that are increasingly characterizing other airport operations.

And now, even long before Miami should reach saturation point, you are talking about plans for a new airport for the jumbo jets and SST age. We expect that U.S. airline passenger traffic will triple its 1966 traffic of 110 million passengers by 1975. We also know that many airports can barely handle the traffic of 1968 much less that which is to come. The Dade County Port Authority should be congratulated for such farsighted vision. And much of that vision comes from enthusiastic and dynamic leaders such as Alan Stewart who has been a guiding spirit behind aviation in Miami for over twenty years.

Miami has even more to be proud of than its foresighted handling of commercial airline traffic. Another problem that is now plaguing other large airports is that of congestion on the runway. A common sight at many of these airports is large jets carrying as many as 200 to 250 passengers waiting to take off behind a little two-seater. This sight will be even more absurd and frustrating when that jet holds upward of 400 passengers. But Dade County has anticipated this problem and has provided outstanding facilities for private aviation. Opa Locka, as I have mentioned, is the second busiest airport in the U.S. and is only a large cog in a system of reliever airports that take the pressure off of Miami International. Last year you opened new Tamiami Airport and are now in the process of building Opa Locka West. In addition, private aviation interests find these airports safer for their slower aircraft and more convenient because the operations of the airports are geared to them and not the airlines.

The example of the Dade County Airport system is one that all airport systems would be wise to examine carefully. The cost of delays to airlines—which now approach the $50 million-dollar-a-year mark and the millions of dollars of productive time lost by their passengers—is a growing problem throughout the U.S.

You have seen the airport at Miami. It is certainly a very impressive plant. It serves its users well. It is also an enormously successful financial institution. I don't want to take a lot of time telling you how successful it is, as I am sure you will hear it from others, but let me just outline a few basic financial figures about MIA's operations.

The latest available figures show that MIA, on operating income of $9.1 million, earned total net income of $5.6 million in fiscal year 1966. The operating income was derived mainly from airline payments or from airline passenger facilities. The largest item is $5.2 million for rentals, a large per cent of which is airline payments for terminal facilities. Aviation fees totaled $1.0 million. Automobile parking, transportation and concessions earned the airport $2.9 million.

It has been estimated that approximately half of airport income is contributed directly by the airlines.

It's truly remarkable that this viable commercial entity and public utility, which is worth as much as $500 million, has hardly cost the Dade County taxpayers a cent.

An examination of fiscal 1965 data shows that the only source of public funds in the total $138.4 million invested so far in MIA has been $33.2 million in grants by the Federal government. Over 75 per cent of the required investment has been generated either directly from operations of the airport itself or represents indebtedness secured by the profits of airline operation or directly by rentals from the airlines themselves.

There are several ways to measure the economic strength of a commercial enterprise. One of these is return on total investment. The same study shows that in fiscal year 1965, Miami International Airport earned a return of 5.7 per cent on total investment and a return of 13.4 per cent on average equity.

Another significant measure is bond interest coverage or how many times net income before bond interest covers interest to be paid. In fiscal year 1965, this figure was 3.1 times for the airport.

And although Miami is certainly an outstanding airport, it is not unique among the nation's leading airport systems in its attractiveness to investors. The three largest hub airports in the United States, as of December 31, 1966, covered their bond interest in amounts ranging from 1.9 to 4.2.

Looking further at the leading major airports in the U.S., we found that for five big city systems well over 90 percent of the capital investment was secured either by revenues of the airport or were actually earned by airport activities. The funded debt at these airports totaled $649 million of which all but $8 million was in airport revenue bonds.

To demonstrate how important bond issues are to our airport systems, consider the fact that since World War II local bond issues are estimated to have developed 80 percent of all investment in airports. The remainder has been made up of federal and state grants.

Recently, bond issues have become even more important to airport financing programs. The several sizable tax-exempt airport revenue issues have been marketed at coupon rates ranging from 5 percent to 5.7 percent. This compares with 5.5 percent to 6.25 percent paid by communities to attract buyers for tax-exempt industrial revenue bonds. And, of course, this rate is well below the 6.25 percent to 7 percent which will have to be paid, even by top-rated corporations to attract funds with taxable corporate bonds.

I think this testifies eloquently to the integrity of the airport bond today. Today about one-fourth of all airport debt is in the form of general obligation bonds and the remaining 75 percent is taken up by revenue bonds.

I said earlier that I wanted to talk a bit about the air transportation system in the years ahead. Almost any discussion of the future begins and ends at the edge of the airport. Clearly, air transportation cannot expand unless airports expand along with all the elements of aviation.

I don't have to tell you that any kind of expansion carries a price tag. The Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, has said that it will cost about $6 billion to properly expand the nation's airport system. As you know, the Federal government, through the Federal Aid to Airports program, currently appropriates about $75 million a year for certain airport improvements. Even if this program were to continue and to be increased to a $100 million a year level, the total amount would fall far short of the required amount. Airport earnings which at the major traffic centers are quite healthy, cannot provide enough additional funds to meet the requirements.

Some studies we have made of airport financing indicate that perhaps as much as $3 billion for airport expansion purposes through 1975 can be developed with revenue bonds.

But even taken together these sources of funds will fall short of the requirements. Thus it is quite clear that what we face is a capital bulge. A large infusion of capital is necessary right now and for several years to provide the capability for expansion.

This provides, then, a real opportunity for investors. Financial advisors could well sharpen their pencils now and consider ways in which they could get in on the ground floor. There are few investment opportunities with as much solidity as today's modern airport.

Because of the Federal government's considerable stake in the air transport system, it would behoove the government to now assert leadership in developing financing to keep pace with the efforts of private industry and local municipalities. There has been considerable discussion about the form that such a government program might take and I suspect that there will be a lot more discussion before a program is finally agreed upon.

Airline traffic projections lend a sense of urgency to the problem. Miami, even with its built-in expansion capability, faces a tight squeeze in the years ahead. The Federal Aviation Administration has projected an increase of more than five times the number of passengers now enplaned by 1980. Nationwide, the FAA sees an increase in passengers of more than four times today's level by 1980.

The expansion of the nation's aviation system poses a heavy financial burden for the nation's airlines. There never has been a time in airline history when it has been more important for the airlines to maintain an adequate level of earnings. Airline earnings today

have many jobs to do. They must underwrite the multi-billion dollar aircraft re-equipment program which they have undertaken.

To meet the surge of traffic, the airlines have embarked on a large re-equipment program. As of the first of the year, more than 740 aircraft have been ordered for delivery between now and 1972. The total value is close to $7 billion. Since the first of the year additional orders have been placed for the present family of jets as well as the jumbo and tri-jet aircraft. To give an idea of the amount of new additional seats the airlines will provide, consider the fact that this year the airlines will take delivery of almost two aircraft every working day. The average cost of these new airplanes is $6.5 million per plane.

We have seen how important revenue bonds are to airport expansion. Airline revenues and, consequently, airline earnings are the strong central core of all airport revenue bonds. So, airline earnings must also support this important aspect of the airport expansion.

The nation's air traffic control system, while safe, is inadequate to do the job of the seventies. It needs expansion. It needs improvements. It must be made more efficient and it must be done at once. This program will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and the airlines will provide a sizeable contribution.

But funds and financing alone will not provide all of the answers to aviation's problems of the seventies. The aviation system is a vital national resource. It must be made as efficient as possible, to serve as many as possible. It is imperative then, that all of the users work together, and with the Federal government, so as to provide the maximum utilization of the airspace, and of the airport network.

That spirit of cooperation is epitomized by the history of aviation in Miami. I have no doubt that the progress made here is in no small part attributable to the fact that all elements of aviation, and the business community, and the local and Federal governments have worked together. Miami, then, provides a pattern for progress which could well serve as a national model.

Dr. King's Death Is Call to Action for America

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the incalculable tragedy of Martin Luther King's assassination was also a call to action for every American. It was a call to action especially for those of us in Congress, because it is we who bear the responsibility for passing laws to remedy the Nation's social and economic ills. That responsibility is now more awesome than ever.

Many of us have been proud of congressional accomplishments in civil and human rights in recent years. The balance sheet reflects a commitment to laws which have built a legal framework for these rights.

But laws alone do not create jobs where none exists.

Laws alone do not improve the understanding and sensitivity of our police forces.

Laws alone do not confer skills on the unskilled.

Laws alone do not instill hope and motivation in personalities that have developed in an environment of hopelessness and apathy.

And laws alone do not automatically confer upon us the perception and understanding so badly needed to interpret our current crisis.

I do not minimize the real progress that has been made in the last 5 years.

But in terms of where we must go, tremendous gaps remain. These gaps have led to today's racial crisis. It is a crisis of substance, but a crisis equally of attitude and spirit.

I urge the people of this country, Mr. Speaker, to take the initiative, to commit themselves to steps that will:

First. Deepen our understanding of this racial crisis.

Second. Develop an ideology that is responsive to the full dimension of the crisis.

Third. Take actions that will lead to sustained initiatives by government.

We have, throughout our land, many thoughtful, perceptive people, both black and white, who can contribute to an improved understanding. We need seminars, institutes, discussion groups and public meetings in order to get this process started.

In the matter of race, a special effort is needed to instill understanding and sharing of common concerns. For in this matter there are barriers to communication and understanding that can grow more serious as events march onward.

Most important, we must act positively to chop out the roots of racial crisis.

We need to create jobs so that everyone who wants to work may work.

We need to strengthen the continuity and diversity of job training and work experience—through adequate, sustained funding.

We need to seek stronger and more adequate housing programs.

We need to strengthen education programs.

We need to study and understand the intangibles that facilitate or obstruct the paths to improved racial understanding.

We need to develop a deeper appreciation of the ways in which racial stresses arise—and then develop planning and action to head them off.

Finally, we need to move toward a sustained series of actions that will make the United States a genuine multiracial society, one that we can hold up to ourselves and to the world with pride.

When I first heard the news of Dr. King's assassination, I reflected on the time when I heard him at his best—during the march on Washington in August 1963. A number of us from Congress went to the Lincoln Memorial and sat on the steps near the podium where Dr. King spoke. We looked out over the grounds below the memorial and around the reflecting pond and saw hundreds of thousands of people who had joined together for the march.

And we listened to the eloquent plea that Martin Luther King made on that historic occasion. The deep, religious quality of what he said moved America and helped move Congress to enact the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Dr. King told us that day of his dream of liberty, justice, and equality for all. We in Congress, and all Americans, must now dedicate ourselves to making his dream a reality.

Mr. Speaker, no event during my three terms as a Congressman has inspired such a flood of spontaneous mail as has Dr. King's martyrdom. Dozens and dozens of messages have come into my office, as I am sure they have come into the offices of other Members, urging prompt passage of a strong civil rights bill. It is my fervent desire that the House will vote overwhelmingly in favor of the bill this week. Although this bill is only a beginning of the programs Congress should adopt, it is nevertheless an important measure because it represents a key step toward realization of Dr. King's dream.

With the permission of the House, I include some of the moving excerpts from the letters and telegrams I have received:

THE DEEPER MEANING OF THE MURDER IN MEMPHIS

The assassination of Martin Luther King should shock every white person in America into new courses of action. We need to reorder our system of priorities. We cannot continue to spend thirty to fifty billion dollars a year on a war in Asia, and nearly nothing by comparison on the basic solution of the problems of unemployment brought about by mechanization in this country, without destroying ourselves. We must put first things first. It is nonsense to talk about saving democracy abroad while allowing it to be destroyed at home.

The Congress of the United States is in the process of gutting every constructive program at home in order to feed the military machine abroad. The menace to American society today is not the Viet Cong. It is the reactionary coalition in Congress that demands full scale prosecution of a futile and inhuman war while it engineers the destruction of our essential domestic programs. That coalition is apparently willing to see America lose its character as a land of freedom and opportunity in order that it may become the policeman of the world.

The people of America must call a halt to the wastage of our human and material treasure abroad and demand a war on the causes of the rot at home. Responsibility for Martin Luther King's murder must be laid at least in large part at the door of a Congress which has failed to take the leadership in funding an all-out attack on the economic and educational problems of our American society. Another large share of the blame must fall on every American, white and black, but especially upon those of us who are in the white majority, for not having demanded such action from our Congress a long time ago.

MAURICE B. VISSCHER,
Regents' Professor,
University of Minnesota.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

We urge you to press for immediate passage of the current civil rights bill as a living memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King and as a pledge of goodwill toward Negroes by the majority of the white community.

In the wake of this ghastly tragedy some very strong bills can be passed. Only in this way can we encourage non-violent protest.

We should use our schools in summer to

coach the underprivileged and offer vocational training. This could be more flexible than the regular school year and these people deserve individual attention. The tenement owners should be brought to accounting and some efforts at pest control and rubbish removal are needed.

Let us spend the $30 billion yearly that has been going to the war in Vietnam on the problems of our cities. Let us confess our guilt in sack cloth and ashes this Holy Week and arise in a resurrection of brotherly love among races and classes.

In light of last night's tragic murder of Dr. King, we feel that surely without some quick action there is no reason for the Afro-American population to have any trust any longer in our white society.

The white man must show that he cares, and passage of this bill is a feeble gesture indeed. Do your best.

I am writing . . . Perhaps not so much for Dr. King's memory but rather for the 16 or 17 black students who were in the class where I, a student, taught last quarter. Maybe then in six years when they hopefully graduate from high school, they will have the same opportunities and freedoms as the other 15 or 16 children.

We cannot sit around while frustration and hatred arise to fever pitch.

We can no longer continue turning around and sticking our heads in the sand. We have to face the reality that our society is and has been falling apart at the seams. If steps are not taken and taken fast we are going to have more and more riots with more and more violence and much as the white man may hate to admit the facts, he deserves every bit of it.

As white homeowners, we have had the experience of being, for all practical purposes, denied the right to sell our home to minority persons by real estate agents who refuse to show property to non-whites. We think nothing is to be gained by sitting on our hands waiting for the real estate industry to change their highly discriminatory policies.

White Americans and the congressmen whom we have selected to represent us must carry the burden and guilt of the heinous, damnable assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Why must we continue to perpetuate the causes that lead to such national disasters? How in the name of our Lord can we sit back and do nothing?

As a young American who will be voting for the first time this November and who is finding it very difficult to maintain faith in her nation, I urge you to do everything in your power to ensure the passage of the civil rights bill now before Congress.

Early Action Needed on H.R. 8176 To Enfranchise the Largest Possible Number of Americans Abroad

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1967, I introduced H.R. 8176 to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend—and I stress the word "recommend," Mr. Speaker—to the several States that they extend to their citizens temporarily residing abroad the right to register and vote absentee. The simple, uniform, virtually fraud proof Federal post card application procedure, which has proved highly successful in practice for members of the Armed Forces, the merchant marine, civilians employed abroad by the Federal Government, and their families, would be used for registration and voting.

H.R. 8176 is designed to remedy the virtual disenfranchisement of many of our fellow citizens temporarily residing abroad. Their number has multiplied since 1955, when the Federal Voting Assistance Act was enacted, with the tremendous expansion of American business, cultural and other interests overseas. Estimates of their number now vary between 750,000 and 3 million.

Mr. Speaker, these American citizens are engaged in activities important to our national interests—our foreign commerce, our balance of payments, and, in general, our relations with other peoples. Indeed, they are continuously engaged in interpreting America to the people of the countries where they reside. Consequently, many of these Americans are vitally interested in our politics and policies.

All too often, however, in election years these citizens find themselves "disenfranchised by distance"—especially in those 21 States and the District of Columbia which require registration in person.

H.R. 8176 would remedy this serious oversight in the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955.

Mr. Speaker, 11 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from every section of the country have joined in cosponsoring identical bills. The House Elections Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], has held a hearing on H.R. 8176, and the Committee on House Administration will be considering the bill this week.

On January 29, 1968, the same bill was introduced in the Senate as S. 2884 by Senator HOWARD W. CANNON of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Two hearings were held by the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and yesterday the Senate passed the bill.

Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., speaking for the administration, referred to H.R. 8176 and the companion bills sponsored by my colleagues and testified that they "deserve favorable consideration." Moreover, the American Civil Liberties Union endorsed H.R. 8176 as "logical, desirable, and completely noncontroversial."

Mr. Speaker, with the 1968 national elections coming on apace, early action on H.R. 8176 is imperative if it is to help enfranchise our fellow citizens abroad. As of February 13, 1968, I am informed that 30 State legislatures were still in session, 25 of them in regular session and five in special session. The sooner we act, the more States will have an opportunity to consider and respond to the recommendation embodied in H.R. 8176.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly commend H.R. 8176 to my colleagues. I urge its early consideration and enactment so that the States may have the opportunity to enfranchise the greatest possible number of our fellow citizens in accordance with the bill's recommendations in time for the coming national elections. By enacting H.R. 8176 we would go far toward extending to many of our fellow citizens the most basic right in our democracy—the right to vote. We must not tarry longer.

That a number of the States are likely to respond is indicated in an article by Arlen J. Large which appeared on page 1 of the Wall Street Journal on March 20, 1968, entitled "Easing Voting Bars." The article follows:

EASING VOTING BARS: NEW UNITED STATES, STATE LAWS WILL BROADEN ELECTORATE IN NOVEMBER BALLOTING—SOME STATES RELAX RESIDENCE RULES; FEDERAL LEGISLATION ADDS MANY NEGROES TO ROLLS—WHICH PARTY STANDS TO GAIN?

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—A pauper in Maine. A Maryland teen-ager. A Seattle businessman temporarily living in Paris. A Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican in New York, and an illiterate Negro in Louisiana. A sales vice president transferred to Dallas, and a new arrival in Pennsylvania.

These are some of the people who could be voting in the Presidential election next November, thanks to a widespread relaxation of voting-eligibility requirements since the 1964 Johnson-Goldwater race. The electorate-broadening reforms for the most part have been made by individual states, so the changes aren't uniform. But the activity has been brisk enough to contribute to expectations of a substantially greater turnout of voters than the 70.6 million who voted for President last time.

For this and other reasons, voting expert Richard Scammon expects a record-busting Presidential vote of around 75 million next November. Mr. Scammon, former head of the Census Bureau and now elections research director of the nonprofit Governmental Affairs Institute, sees a probable heavier turnout of both whites and Negroes in the South (due largely to the Federal voting rights law) as the biggest single source of new voters in 1968, other than simple population growth.

In theory, the voting rule changes would seem to promise a net boost for the Democrats in November; the larger groups benefiting tend to vote Democratic. But in actual Election Day practice, voting won't necessarily conform to theory.

THE "TRUE APATHETIC"

Relaxation of voting rules by many states since 1964 will mainly help highly motivated citizens of either party who couldn't hurdle the old legal barriers to the polls. "Your true apathetic isn't going to register and vote no matter how easy the requirements are," says Mr. Scammon.

By far the most common reform since 1964 has been a reduction in residence requirements, and some of these changes may aid the GOP more than the Democrats.

New York formerly required a newcomer to live in the state for one year, in his county for four months and in his precinct for a month before he could qualify for full voting rights. Now the required wait is a flat three months in the state, county and precinct. Wisconsin's former one-year wait has been cut in half; new Pennsylvanians now can vote in all elections after 90 days in the state.

Thirty-three states still require a year's wait before giving a newcomer full voting rights, a rule that in the past has disfranchised millions of voters in the mobile U.S. population. But a growing number of states are making special provision for new arrivals who want to vote for President and Vice President. Those newcomers who take the trouble to apply tend to be in the better-educated, higher-income groups. This means, says Mr. Scammon, that the special new-resident voting laws probably favor the Republicans slightly.

NEW MEXICO, TEXAS ACT

Now, 29 states permit a shorter stay for Presidential voting than for other offices, up from 16 states that had these special rules in 1964. In New Mexico, to cite a recent example of change, the legislature last year decided to waive the one-year residence rule for citizens arriving as little as 30 days before a Presidential election; the newcomers will use special ballots next November that omit non-Presidential contests.

The old laws that penalized voter mobility have been reversed in Texas. While a stay-at-home Texan is out of luck if he missed the Jan. 31 registration deadline, a newcomer from Ohio, say, will be able to sign up to vote for President if he arrives as late as next August.

It's just as well that the states are gradually enfranchising mobile Presidential voters, for Congress isn't likely to do so soon. President Johnson seeks enactment of a national law allowing people who establish new residence anywhere by Sept. 1 to vote for President and Vice President in the following November elections, provided they meet all other state voting requirements.

"I think it's good legislation," says Democratic Sen. Howard Cannon of Nevada, chairman of the Senate elections subcommittee. "But there's no chance of getting it passed this session in time to be in effect for the November election." The reason, in part, is resistance to a Federal law telling the states what to do.

ABSENTEE REGISTRATION

Mr. Cannon is more optimistic about early enactment of a Congressional "recommendation" asking the states to relax rules for absentee registration and voting. Register-by-mail laws are being urged by the League of Americans Residing Abroad, which argues it's impossible for U.S. businessmen overseas to sign up in person in their home towns; though the state of Washington last year approved registration by mail for absentee voters, the league feels the states need a formal prod by Congress.

Backers of a lower voting age also have little hope of early success at the national level. Some 40 Senators are sponsoring various Constitutional amendments to reduce the voting age to something less than 21, but this Senate band is far short of the two-thirds needed.

The youth-at-the polls cause received a sharp setback in 1966, when Michigan voters overwhelmingly rejected a proposal to cut the voting age to 18. Next November proposals for 19-year-old voting will be on the ballot in both Nebraska and North Dakota, and proponents say they detect a change in sentiment as a result of the Vietnam war. "When there's a war on, it gets harder and harder to say a kid is old enough to defend his country in Vietnam but not old enough to vote," says a Nebraskan here.

In Maryland, an estimated 125,000 youngsters will become eligible to vote next November if the existing electorate ratifies the state's new constitution in a special May 14 election; in the package of changes is a cut in the voting age to 19. At this point, chances for ratification are considered good.

Maryland politicians already are shaping strategy to appeal to a younger electorate. A group called "first voters for Brewster" is operating on behalf of incumbent Democratic Sen. Daniel Brewster. After the constitution is ratified, says Chairman Robert Tinder, a 21-year-old University of Maryland student, "we'll be holding campaigns to get the new voters registered." One recent day, Sen. Brewster took 13 of the university's students to lunch at the Capitol, listened to their gripes and then fired off a letter to the school recounting complaints about the food and library facilities.

IGNORING ELECTIONS

Similarly, a youth auxiliary is planned by Sen. Brewster's November opponent, Republican Rep. Charles Mathias. Mr. Mathias is sharpening up his arguments against the existing draft system, and his strategists hope his somewhat dovish stance on the Vietnam war will appeal to the young. Sen. Brewster is an Administration-praising hawk.

If limited experience with youthful voting elsewhere is a guide, most of Maryland's newly enfranchised youngsters won't show up at the polls. Georgia and Kentucky allow voting to start at 18, Alaska at 19 and Hawaii at 20. In 1964, according to a Census Bureau survey, only 39% of eligible voters in the 18-through-20 age bracket actually cast ballots. Nationally, the turnout in 1964 was 63% of the total voting-age population.

Like the young, the poor tend to ignore elections The same Census Bureau survey showed that almost half the eligible voters with family incomes below $2,000 stayed away on Election Day, 1964. This suggests that Maine, by repealing an old law forbidding "paupers" to vote, won't be bringing any new throngs of voters to the polls. A pauper was defined as anyone getting certain types of welfare, not counting such important payments as veterans benefits and old-age assistance. Because of the limited definition of "pauper," says Deputy Secretary of State Stanley Hanson, "only a few people really fell into that category in the first place."

Since the last Presidential election, the biggest single boost to voting has been enactment of the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965. The law suspended literacy tests and "good character" requirements in areas where low voter turnout indicated Negroes were being kept from the polls. According to Justice Department figures, Negro registration in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina is 833,000 higher than just before the law was passed. As a by-product, the surge of Negro registrations has inspired more Southern whites to sign up.

AIDING PUERTO RICANS

The Federal Voting Act technically didn't suspend New York State's English literacy test in the same way the tests were knocked out in the South. However, one provision says a literacy test can't block a voter if he has at least a sixth-grade education in a school under the U.S. flag where the language wasn't English. The provision will make new voters out of a considerable number of New Yorkers educated in Puerto Rico.

Though the trend of both Federal and state action in recent years has been to expand the potential electorate, advocates of even bigger turnouts complain a major impediment still remains: The widespread practice of purging a voter from the registration lists if he doesn't vote frequently.

Billie Farnum, the Democratic National Committee's registration chief, estimates there were about 80 million Americans registered to vote in 1964. Now, he says with vexation, the number registered is some 10 million fewer than that because of the purging of people who didn't vote in the 1966 off-year elections; he figures a vigorous registration drive in the months ahead will be needed to make up the lost ground.

Mr. Farnum, a former Michigan Congressman, complains "politics" motivated the Republican legislature in Michigan to adopt the rule that a citizen who doesn't vote at least once every two years must be dropped from the rolls. "They knew a lot of Democrats don't vote in off-year elections," he says.

On the other hand, periodic purging of nonvoters is an important safeguard against stuffing ballot boxes with votes of people who actually have died or moved away. Mr. Scammon, who headed a Presidential study commission on voting in 1963, suggests purging a man only after he has failed to vote once in four years. Election officials would send such a nonvoter a letter saying he was about to be dropped from the rolls and giving him a chance to re-register by mail.

The Single-Emergency Telephone Number

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1968, the Franklin Institute Research Laboratories conducted a 1-day consultation on the single-emergency telephone number in Philadelphia, Pa. The institute, a nonprofit institution performing contract research for government, industry and the public sponsored this 1-day institute to bring together all those groups interested in emergency communications.

Attending the meeting were representatives of health departments, highway safety bureaus, fire departments, police departments, civil defense, telephone companies, public health officials, universities, the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Justice, and many others involved in protecting the health, the safety, and the security of the American public.

The keynote speaker for that occasion was my colleague from Indiana, Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH, who has been instrumental in alerting the Nation to the need for and practicality of a single, uniform, nationwide emergency number.

In his speech Congressman ROUSH traced the history of his interest in this subject. I would like to include his address to that group at this time:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN J. EDWARD ROUSH, OF INDIANA, AT THE CONSULTATION ON THE SINGLE-EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER, SPONSORED BY THE FRANKLIN INSTITUTE RESEARCH LABORATORIES, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MARCH 18, 1968

A telephone number in Jackson, Mississippi, can be dialed free from any of the 93 million telephones in this country to make nationwide hotel and motel reservations.

A single number can be dialed from these same phones to locate, through information, any phone number anywhere in the United States.

We can dial direct, long distance, without the aid of the Operator.

Yet, in times of crisis we are confronted with a confusing multitude of police and fire telephone numbers, in Los Angeles county there are some 50 distinct phone numbers for the police; in St. Louis county about 45 fire numbers.

Yet, throughout the United Kingdom, since 1937, a caller has been able to dial "999" from either a private or public telephone, without any cost on either kind of phone, and on being answered by the exchange Operator, request either "Police," "Fire," or "ambulance." Thus, England enjoys a uniformity unknown in America.

For us Americans, this is an embarrassing bit of information. Granted we are much larger in size than mother England; nevertheless, this is somewhat offset by the fact that we are the leading nation in the world in technological progress. If this progress does not make the American people more secure, have not we failed in some regard?

CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL

We must face the fact that we in the United States are using new technological improvements for our convenience, even our luxury, while we are negligent in applying these to crime prevention and control; to fire protection and control; two of the most dreaded killers and terrorists of our society. These are facts well known to most of you here today.

Such negligence is in part explainable in terms of political and geographic complications; to a lack of information and initiative; to cost factors; to technical difficulties. But, generally speaking, we in America accomplish those things we really want to do and even the impossible is supposed to take only a little longer for us.

My own interest in and concern for uniform, emergency telephone communications rests on these principles, convictions, facts, and derives from two related and consistent concerns of mine. I am a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives. In that capacity I am frequently exposed to the miracles of science (particularly in the Subcommittees on Advanced Research and Technology and on Science, Research and Development). And I am alerted to the varied ways in which these scientific discoveries can be applied to better the life of man.

As a Congressman I must be concerned with not just the funding of pure science (for which I have profound respect), but also with the manner in which these inventions, these discoveries in the *abstract* may come to contribute to American life in the *concrete*. In a democracy we must be concerned with both; in my position of responsibility and representation I must consider both. Thus, simply, my interest in a uniform emergency telephone number.

COMMUNICATIONS PROBLEM

I can date my initial consideration of this problem rather exactly for you. Late last May as I sat in a Science and Astronautics Committee hearing on a bill to establish a comprehensive Fire Research and Safety program, a bill I had introduced, I was struck by the magnitude of this communications problem in time of emergency. Whom would you call; would you know the number; would you have to run down a list of possible numbers; who would be calm enough to do so?

I decided that the first step was to get a Congressional resolution passed which would encourage such uniformity. So I introduced on May 25, H. Con. Res. 361 which stated: "That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should have one uniform nationwide fire reporting telephone number and one uniform nationwide police reporting telephone number."

Hearings were never held on this bill, so it did not reach the floor of the House. But I contacted all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to enlist their support; many responded favorably.

Then I took on the giant. I began conversations with AT&T; with Indiana Bell. They recapitulated a kind of position paper on this problem. In summary they concluded that dialing "O" for Operator in case of emergency to be the most efficient, universal number because: there is then no doubt about getting the right number (even in cities where police or fire departments have a single number, people often forget the number in a crisis); fright would not scare this out of mind; this is universal; "O" for Operator requires only a single pull of the dial; the digit zero is next to the finger stop where it can be found quickly by anyone, even in the dark, and even on the new touch phones. Moreover, the Telephone Company representatives stressed that they have publicized this dial "O" for sometime. Furthermore, if the caller for any reason loses the ability to talk, or drops the phone, cuts the connection, the Operator is trained to hold that call and trace the caller.

A SINGLE NUMBER

I was impressed with these arguments. I was not convinced that there was nothing better; a single number that would be easily learned, retained, used.

Indiana Bell and the representatives from AT&T promised to re-think the issue. Meanwhile I was comforted by the fact that I had behind me a very reputable authority for the importance of this innovation, namely the President's Crime Commission Report. In the special task force report on Science and Technology the relationship between rapid calls to the police and their capacity to make arrests was noted. Their conclusions closely paralleled my own. Making a controlled study of a particular city they discovered that "on the basis of this data, short response time correlates with ability to make an arrest."[1] The Report recommended:

"Wherever practical a single number should be established, at least within a metropolitan area and preferably over the entire United States, comparable to the telephone company's long-distance information number. This is difficult but feasible with existing telephone switching centers; it appears more practical with the new electronic switching systems being, installed by the telephone companies, and should be incorporated."[2]

Meanwhile, I was busy pursuing other lines of attack. I contacted more than 40 police and fire chiefs from coast to coast; as well as Scotland Yard; the Attorney General's office; the FBI. And I got a lot of replies.

I began to get them from civic organizations and private citizens and fire and police chiefs whom I had *not* written, when, in September of last year I published an article in Parade Magazine outlining the problem and my proposed solution. Subsequently, the Catholic Digest, Amvets, the National Observer published articles on what was fast becoming a time-consuming crusade!

For a time there seemed to be a communications problem, or a lack of communications between myself and telephone company officials. We seemed to be talking about different things. When it was made clear that I merely wanted something like the "411" information facility, a single number to be used nationwide, not any kind of a national switching center, resolution of the problem seemed more likely.

EMERGENCY NO. 911

With this bit of history you can better understand my enthusiasm when I was informed the evening before the public announcement of AT&T on January 12, that they would provide "911" as that single, nationwide, emergency number at a cost of some $50,000,000 to themselves. AT&T indicated that they could begin to make this new number available in 1969, with the cooperation technically and financially of cities and communities around the nation.

This was better than I had dared to hope. You can imagine my reaction and the reasons therefor.

On January 15, 1968 I introduced a new resolution, H. Con. Res. 610: this time expressing the sense of Congress that "911" be adopted as our nationwide, uniform, emergency telephone number.

There are two points I would like to make at this juncture. First of all as to the nature of the bill I introduced. It does not in any way bring federal power to bear on imposing any kind of uniformity. It simply puts the Congress on record as supporting the idea of a uniformity in emergency communications which would increase simplicity.

Secondly, there is, as you notice, a difference between the earlier resolution and this one. In the earlier resolution I proposed a single uniform fire reporting number and a single, uniform, police reporting number. However, I always thought that the greater uniformity the better; that our objective is to make the emergency communications number so easy that anyone at any time could immediately resort thereto.

COMMON NATIONWIDE NUMBER

Therefore, when AT&T offered the single number, I was elated. Can you imagine, for a moment, what implementation of this nationwide would mean? What a step this would be in making order out of chaos? I am reminded of one of the letters I received, a comment that was made, that seemed to me to hit the mark. This was in a letter from Frank D. Campbell, Capt., Superintendent of Communications, Indiana Police Department:

"Population explosion, as it is called, provides our communities with thousands of new citizens, each of whom must be taught survival; one phase of survival is learning not only their own phone numbers but their respective police and fire department numbers. If a common number for our country was used then regardless where a child might be the call for assistance could save a life."

On March 1 of this year, I am happy and proud to report to you, my hometown of Huntington, Indiana inaugurated the new "911" with the help of the Indiana Bell system, at an initial cost of a little over $40. Huntington is a town of 18,000 with 6,846 main line phones in the city. Huntington thus became the first city served by the nationwide Bell System to receive the "911" emergency telephone number service.

This is an example of what can be done. Through conversations with the mayor of Huntington, the police and the fire chief, the local telephone company there, this was easily accomplished.

In other places it will cost more and take more time to install "911." However, I am convinced of the importance of this single number and of the need to alert the public to its potentialities. So, I have written each of the governors to bring this matter to their attention and to encourage them to investigate the possibilities in their state, to inspire city and county local officials to do likewise. We are at the "end of the beginning" only.

USE OF 911

I am aware that everyone will not approach the implementation of "911" as enthusiastically, even unreservedly as I. I know that there are those who believe it impossible or at least most difficult to use one single number for both police and fire emergency calls. I hope they are wrong. I am in no position to prove or disprove the matter. What I do recommend is the following: given the "911" offered by AT&T, can we not try it out, test it empirically? Surely we will discover many things in so doing; possibly we will find that we can nationwide use the single number; perhaps not. But we must make some demonstrations of just what effect this new facility will have.

To my mind, considering the safety, security, peace of mind and availability of help thereby—this single number is the best. If this can be disproven, it should be. But we must start somewhere and now.

I am reminded of what the great French Marshal Lyautey once said to his gardener: "Plant a tree tomorrow." And the gardener said, "It won't bear fruit for a hundred years." "In that case," Lyautey said to the gardener, "plant it this afternoon."

That is the way I feel about improved emergency telephone communications for the American public.

---

[1] The Institute for Defense Analyses, Task Force Report: *Science and Technology* (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 9.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

Support We Need—Sympathy We Can Do Without

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I share with my colleagues in the House and Senate a letter from Tom Esslinger, lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. Lieutenant Esslinger is the commanding officer of Mike Company, 3d Battalion, 26th Marines. His present station is Hill 881 South, located near Khesanh in Quang Tri Province, Vietnam. Tom Esslinger was a classmate of my eldest son at Yale University. It is unnecessary for me to express the opinion that this young man is a fine officer, because when you read his letter the conclusion will be as inescapable to you as it is to me. I am sure that every Member of the Congress will wish to join me in sending our thanks and best wishes to Lt. Tom Esslinger and Mike Company. Under leave previously granted, I am pleased to include the following letter from Lieutenant Esslinger in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THIRD MARINE DIVISION (REIN),
FMF, VIETNAM, HILL 881 SOUTH,
KHESANH COMBAT BASE, QUANG
TRI PROVINCE, RVN,

March 22, 1968.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: I have decided to exercise my right to communicate with my man in Washington and although you are not the man I vote for, I decided that yours would be a good ear to bend.—I write concerning an irritation more than a problem. Mike Company, 3d Bn., 26th Marines of which, as you know, I am Commanding Officer, has been located on hill 881 South since 19 January of this year. During the past two months we have been under siege by a sizable NVA force and, of course, this has subjected us to some hardships. There have been days without chow and water, weeks without mail, and months without showers or shaves. None of this has ever reached a really critical stage, and considering the overall circumstances in the Northern Provinces of South Viet-Nam, I am amazed that we have been taken care of as well as we have been. Every bit of supply that reaches this hill comes in by helicopter and each chopper receives small arms, .50 caliber automatic weapons fire, and mortar up to 120 mm. We have lost several choppers during such resupply efforts. Despite this, the situation has steadily improved. It is significant to note that we have never been in a really critical situation ammunition wise. Oh, certainly there have been occasions when our stockpile of one item or another has been lower than we would have liked it to be, but we have never been in a position where a lack of ammunition made our position tactically unsound.

As for comfort items: In early February, our complaint was a shortage of food and water. By late February we had the chow and were lamenting a shortage of mail. Shortly thereafter our supply complaints revolved around a shortage of fresh oranges and most recently the major source of consternation has been the hair clippers that the last chopper brought to us and my small unit leaders have diligently put to use.

So, you are wondering what is the "irritation" of which I spoke. Apparently back in the dark days of February when chow was short, several of the hungrier of the crew on the hill felt desperate enough to seek outside help. Some of them used the time-honored device of writing to their congressmen. Their congressman, responding to a plea from a distraught constituent instituted congressional interest inquirys, the ramifications of which are reaching me at this time. Certainly these pleas and the resulting inquiries can accomplish no good at this end. There is no congressman nor an American citizen who desires to help us here any more than do the fellow Marines who are responsible for our support. Surely no member of Congress can do more to quiet the .50 calibres and 120 mm mortars that make resupply hazardous than can the Marines who constantly prowl the skies in F4B Phantom jets. Therefore, the only good that can come of such letters is the sympathy they cause back home.

My fear is that a wave of such sympathy could, indeed, have an adverse effect on what we're trying to do here. The vast majority of my Marines are far from crybabies. They complain continually—that's the way of the Corps, but rarely do they do so publicly. Most of them are amazingly content here. It is another example of the working of that human quality which is my favorite—the resiliency of the individual. In two months, hill 881 south has gone from surface to subterranean living. Wood from empty ammo crates lines brooches (living quarters). New arrivals bring radios and through sharing of speakers and that most precious of Marine Corps commodities, common wire, we now have music piped into a large number of bunkers, including my command bunker. The Marines continue to maintain a jaunty smiling morale. When a buddy is struck down by a mortar round or a sniper's bullet, they give him aid and chalk up another score which will be settled before this battle is over. The American people may worry about whether Khe Sanh or hill 881S can be held, but we don't worry much about it up here. We dig our fighting trenches deeper, we don't clear escape routes. This is *our* hill. Fellow Marines bought it the hard way, we raised the flag over it, and *we* will take the flag down. Most of us would like to see the NVA try to take it away from us. Our biggest concern is what we will do with all the enemy dead after the smoke clears.

Maybe some of these thoughts are bravado designed to mask that gut-clawing fear which grips each one of us whenever a 120 mortar comes whistling into our area. Certainly all of us would just as soon have this battle, and our chances to be war heroes, in our past. However, until such time as all the enemy have been repulsed, destroyed, or driven to shelters, we shall stay here and aim in on each one who has the audacity to challenge the firepower and courage of the United States Marines.

I am still civilized enough to realize that some of the things I say make strong reading to someone a bit more removed from the fracas than I am. My remarks are not dispassionate, however, because this is not a dispassionate business. Its primary prerequisite is a passion of the highest order, patiotism, and each one of these 19 year old PFC's up here with me has this passion, whether he will admit it or not.

My purpose then is to tell the story in perspective. Support we crave and need, sympathy we can do without. The purpose of this letter is to let *you* know how *I* feel. If you feel that there is some good to be derived through the sharing of these pages with others, you, of course, have my full blessing. My purpose is to provide you with information which you can put to purposes that might aid the country, the Marine Corps, my Marines, or myself.

Please convey my best wishes to the entire Rhodes household and to Jay and Peggy. Thank you for your time and, of course, the best to you and to the party in the coming free-for-all.

Very respectively, semper fidelis,

TOM ESSLINGER,

Lt., USMCR, Commanding Officer, Mike Company, 3d Battalion, 26th Marines.

New Frontiers of Understanding the U.S.S.R.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater, general misconception held in our country than that the Soviet Union is "Russia," "a nation," "a country of over 200 million Russians." This grave misconception is almost daily encountered not only in the private realm but also in the highest official circle. Regrettably, many of our misdirected policies toward the U.S.S.R. are based on this misconception and will undoubtedly cost us much in this historic struggle with Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

The new book on "The Vulnerable Russians" explodes this basic misconception and illuminates the new frontiers of understanding the U.S.S.R. It also sets forth concrete recommendations for a rapid rectification of the Red empire. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book is lucidly written, quite revealing in many areas, and well documented throughout. With broad perspective, it shows the blinders of misunderstanding by which our policymakers have approached the Russian problem.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work.

The excerpts follow:

THE NEED OF A FREEDOM COMMISSION

Colonel Maillard: "No! the secret victory does not reside in instruments of destruction. It is a power old as the world, yet always young, more redoubtable than arms; apt to give birth to great surprises, because it creates in an hour the most unexpected means of action, the most varied artifices, applying them to circumstances with admirable precision. It is Moral Power resulting from three forces: the Intelligence which conceives; the Will which executes; the Courage which faces death."

* * * * *

The clear answer to the question is that many, many things can be done to defeat Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, and through this defeat that of the entire Red Empire, including Red China. Remember, the base of so-called Communist power is the USSR, not Red China nor any of the others in the empire. Some of these things have already been suggested.

* * * * *

How to cope with the Cold War thrusts and maneuvers of Moscow has been a vexing problem for some time. By no means has the problem, in any real sense, been resolved. In fact, our Government has not faced up squarely to all the demands and issues involved in the problem. No clear-cut decision has been made on how to meet it, and no apparatus or coordinating body exists at present to adequately deal with it. Our dearth of operation can only accommodate a defensive reaction to the successive challenges staged by Moscow, as seen in the Congo, in part in the Dominican Republic, Viet Nam and elsewhere. In each instance some gain of a psycho-political nature accrues to the enemy. This could not be otherwise since our defensive posture can only

serve to minimize, not prevent entirely, his inroads into the broad field of operation offered by the simply reacting Free World.

* * * * *

We have become so obsessed by the fear of "escalations" that Moscow can rightly credit itself with a propaganda job well done. It would do well for many to memorize the Maillard quote above, which may quite appropriately emblazon a United States Freedom Academy.

* * * * *

Just a few years ago some legislators on the House Appropriations Committee were amazed to receive a State Department request for funds to establish a section for the purpose of studying Communist tactics and techniques As one of them pointed out, he had been under the natural impression all these years that appropriations made along these lines were being continually applied to this primary and necessary end.

* * * * *

There are numerous reasons accounting for this state of affairs. For one, the nature and scope of cold war activity continue to elude the understanding of many Americans. Some, weak in their understanding of Russia's historical background, view it as part of a "strange new force" that has entered our world—"the strangest and most enigmatic in all history." When, for instance, any Kremlinite makes an actor's plea for "the lessening of international tensions," they find it difficult to understand that this gesture is only another purposeful maneuver in Moscow's cold war operations. The zag—after the zig—is nothing new in Russian (not just in the so-called Soviet) history, and the end has had both political and psychological import. When Moscow or its totalitarian dependents crave for trade with the Free World, it is surely not for our politico-economic interest.

* * * * *

But many of our leaders, steeped in Western traditions, continue to believe that a high level conference with the Russians is an appropriate occasion for settling differences of view on particular issues. They fool not only themselves but also a sizable portion of our populace. The great proponent of "peaceful coexistence," Nikita Khrushchev, gave expression to the standard Kremlin line when he declared, "We do not negotiate on the basis of the give-and-take principle. We have nothing whatsoever to give—we will not make any concessions because our proposals do not form the basis of a barter deal." In Russian eyes negotiation is itself a cold war instrument, designed for the "soft chance" of gaining an advantage or merely demonstrating "peaceful intentions."

* * * * *

Differing views as to the administration of a full-fledged cold war undertaking constitute a third reason for the absence of such a program Those having these views are in complete agreement that such a project is a must; but to a greater or lesser extent they do disagree as to its content. For example, this writer sees nothing really new in the cold war techniques and methods of the Soviet Russian colonialists. There has been nothing peculiarly "Communist" about them. Unfortunately, people learn this when their fate is sealed. "We were becoming victims of a deception," writes Juana Castro, "since, in spite of Fidel's public denials of the communist character of the revolution, we could see as the days passed how the country was being delivered to Russian imperialists."

* * * * *

Many exclamations over the years that something creative and different must be done, have clearly indicated a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction with existing agencies on this score. Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington has soundly declared that "We have never been in the same league with the Russians in the psychological war of wits and words." The columnist David Lawrence has often made the point expressed in these words: "What a spectacle the Western governments are making of themselves these days as they flounder indecisively in the midst of Soviet threats and ultimatums, seemingly afraid to meet squarely the challenging issues of the hour!" At one time, the then Senator Lyndon Johnson gave eloquent expression to this growing restlessness about our operational inadequacies when he urged a summit meeting of Free World heads of state. Also, at the dedication of the Hoover Presidential Library in 1962, former President Herbert Hoover, in an inspiring address, called for a Council of Free Nations including "only those who are willing to stand up and fight for their freedom."

* * * * *

THE PROTRACTED STRUGGLE

A paramount means in the march toward the new frontier of understanding and combating the USSR—indeed, in fortifying ourselves to cope with and to win the Cold War—is the Freedom Commission project. In both the 86th and 87th Congresses some realism in the Cold War was manifested in the measure known as the Freedom Commission Bill. This measure was sponsored in the House of Representatives by Congressmen A. Sydney Herlong, Jr. of Florida and Walter Judd of Minnesota. In the Senate its sponsors were Senators Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota and Paul H. Douglas of Illinois. The bill called for the creation of a Freedom Commission, the establishment of a Freedom Academy, and the formation of a Joint Congressional Freedom Committee. The basic idea of a commission was first advanced by the Select House Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, led by Congressman Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin.

* * * * *

The Freedom Commission itself would be an independent agency composed of six members and a chairman. The members and chairman would be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. It has been emphasized that one of the prime functions of the Commission would be the establishment and supervision of a Freedom Academy. Training at the Academy would concentrate on knowledge of Soviet Russian political warfare techniques and ways and means of counteracting them. The students at the Academy would be carefully drawn from governmental, private, and foreign areas. Other recommended functions of the Commission include the establishment of an information center to aid organizations and groups in an understanding of Soviet Russian conspiracy and a broad spectrum of psycho-political operations, the conduct of research and surveys, and a host of additional tasks designed to realize the objectives of this national project.

* * * * *

MEANING OF COLD WAR EDUCATION

In the permanent Cold War this measure of realism has a broader significance than what may appear on the surface. First, it should be recognized that it isn't impossible for this country, and with it the Free World, to suffer disastrous defeat at the hands of the Soviet Russian Empire. The possibility of such defeat is not necessarily grounded in any precondition of a hot global war. As a matter of historical fact, the great advances in the expansion of the Russian Empire, both past and present, have been achieved primarily through systematic subversion, duplicity, and conspiracy rather than by military means.

* * * * *

Throughout this book one example after another is offered to illustrate this stubborn misunderstanding or, better, protracted lack of understanding with regard to the nature of the main enemy. It is a vertible blind spot, accruing enormously to the advantage of the power center of so-called world Communism. This Western blind spot contributed to the formation of the Soviet Russian Empire in the form of the USSR, following World War I. It preserved this empire in World War II. Read any of the memoirs by World War II leaders on the Western Allied side, and you can begin to understand why this empire expanded, despite its military and political inferiority. Neither Churchill nor Roosevelt nor Eden understood how profoundly weak, politically, Stalin and his gang were. Here is a prime example of Stalin's basic fears: "Stalin: If you say that you might well say tomorrow that you do not recognize the Ukraine as forming part of the U.S.S.R." "Eden: That is a complete misunderstanding of the position. It is only changes from the pre-war frontiers that we do not recognize. The only change in the Ukraine is its occupation by Germany, so of course we accept the Ukraine as being part of the U.S.S.R."

* * * * *

In this country, curiously enough, with all its rich tradition of freedom, national independence, and principled opposition to colonialism and imperialism, the real chasm that exists between imperialist Russian totalitarianism and freedom-aspiring non-Russian nationalism seems to escape the minds of many, including many on the highest levels of Government.

* * * * *

To cite another example on a high level of our Government, Professor W. W. Rostow, who was appointed by President Kennedy to the position of chief in the policy planning body of the State Department, personifies this labyrinth well. He evidently still labors under the illusions that "Russian peoples" inhabit the USSR, that the "Soviet Union" is "Russia" and thus "a nation," that economic growth in the USSR is a "Russian" phenomenon, and in another work, mind you, that the national minorities "show little or no aspiration for political independence." If anyone seeks the acme of confusion on this subject, the cited works provide it. We can perhaps afford errors on a university campus, but we certainly can ill-afford them in the State Department. When fundamentals escape us, baseless higher judgments will offer us little escape from tragedy.

* * * * *

Andrei Sinyavsky, a Russian literary critic under the pen name Abram Tertz, has stated the problem succinctly: "In the name of the Purpose, we turned to the means that our enemies used: we glorified imperial Russia, we wrote lies in *Pravda*, we set a new Tsar on the now empty throne, we introduced officers' epaulettes and tortures." These and other basic issues would have to be sufficiently clarified by the Commission if we are to adopt those approaches to techniques, via understanding, that would incisively penetrate and weaken the present Soviet Russian empire.

* * * * *

One important result would be a general awareness that both out of ignorance as to the nature of the non-Russian revolution in the crumbling Tsarist Russian Empire and out of half-hearted determination, the United States failed to support the ideas and principles of our own tradition in concrete application to independent Georgia, Armenia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkestan and other non-Russian nations, which had determined themselves at the end of World War I. These nations, as we saw, were soon again individually subverted and subjugated by the imperialist successors to the White Tsar.

* * * * *

Kosygin furnishes powerful evidence of the fundamental continuity of Soviet Rus-

sian imperio-colonialist policy when he declares, "We proceed steadfastly on the road of developing each Soviet people's national culture to the point where the communist ideal, namely the merger of all nations into one (Russian) supernation will become reality." What should have been a second or third-rate power is today, largely on the basis of accumulated captive resources, a contender for the world. More ironical still is the fact that the sole real imperialist power in the world today, has actually stolen the American banner of the idea of national self-determination and freedom and successfully parades it in Asia and Africa. Plainly, then, the Freedom Commission in its positive concern for freedom everywhere would be morally obligated to launch some studies of this long neglected and yet vitally strategic non-Russian area in the Soviet Union.

* * * * *

Failing establishment of the Commission, one shouldn't be surprised by any future extension of the long list of captive nations. The Red imperio-colonialists maintain some 6,000 schools in political warfare, and some 150,000 professionals in this art are planted about the Free World. Eventual takeover is a full-time job with them. As of now, we have only amateurs to contest them. One major lesson we must learn in all of this is that Soviet Russian imperio-colonialist policy never changes in substance.

* * * * *

Before we turn to the second major means capable of preparing us for victory in the Cold War, we should recall how strange it was that only in the very recent period the State Department requested funds for the specific purpose of studying "communism." It is doubly strange that after a Gallup poll in 1962 had disclosed wide popular support for the Freedom Commission and Academy, the Department suddenly decided to conduct its own "courses" on communist techniques and strategy, and also set up a hollow decoy in a legislative measure to create a Foreign Service Academy. It appears that some people in the Department fear any popular checks on its known errors, omissions and shortcomings, much of this the result of overburdening routine operations. As we shall see, perhaps the most ridiculous mistake committed by the Secretary of State was in connection with a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, the second of America's indispensable media for victory in the Cold War.

Open Housing: A Fraud in Semantics

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I can sell my home or rent my apartment to anyone I want to—right now.

So can any American. At this time any American can refuse to sell or rent to anyone if he pleases not to.

But should the misnamed Fair Housing Act—Open Housing Act—become law none of us could sell or rent to anyone we desire.

The babbling that without fair housing some, because of the color of their skin, cannot buy or rent is not completely correct because if anyone wants to rent or sell their property to them, they can.

Then it must be concluded that the tear-jerking liberal is not merely interested in helping another secure a home or apartment; he is out to force anyone who does not bow down to his political philosophy to give up his freedom in disposing of property. Passage of the Open Housing Act will not give anything. It will take away.

Nothing but a misuse of words to force another unwanted intrusion on the individual rights of the masses.

Likewise shameful is the use of smears to blame riots on the poor man. To the contrary, reports from the battle of Washington show the majority of the looters seized have jobs—in fact a sizable number are Federal employees.

I ask that two reports from the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., for April 8 follow:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 8, 1968]

A PROFILE: MANY SEIZED IN LOOTING HAVE JOBS

A random survey of 100 persons charged with looting and other serious crimes during disorders here indicates the typical defendant is male, in his 20's, employed in a low- or medium-income job and without a prior arrest record.

Case records of the D.C. Bail Agency at the Court of General Sessions show 27 of 100 defendants had prior records. Only about half involved serious crimes.

Seventy-eight of the group of 100 studied were men. Of these 23 or over one-fourth, had police records.

Of the group, 10 were teenagers, 37 in their 20's, 20 in their 30's, 7 in their 40's and 2 in their 50's. One was 60 and another 62.

Only five were unemployed. Although the group contained two Howard University students, a computer operator and a gas station manager, the records show that most had low-paying jobs.

There were several warehousemen, printers, a butcher, a dozen construction laborers, two mailmen, a variety of clerks and eight janitors.

Only four of the 22 women studied had prior records. Two were teen-agers, 11 were in their 20's, 2 in their 30's, 6 in their 40's and one was 52.

Half of the women were housewives or unemployed. The group also included four maids, a presser, a seamstress, a Post Office mail handler, a secretary and a clerk at the Bureau of the Census.

Nearly all of the persons in the group face a minimum sentence of two years to a maximum of 15 years if convicted of second-degree burglary, the charge commonly used in looting cases.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 8, 1968]

ACLU FILES APPEAL—LAWYERS HIT HIGH RIOT BAIL

(By William Basham)

Some lawyers have expressed indignation over what they regard as a crude suspension of legal safeguards by the District's judges aimed at keeping masses of persons charged in the rioting off the streets.

Negro lawyers were particularly critical of the judge's practices.

The American Civil Liberties Union today asked the U.S. District Court for an injunction to free all persons held in jail more than 24 hours without counsel or arraignment, but was refused. The group was appealing later today.

At issue is the application of the 1966 Bail Reform Act, signed into law to prevent the lengthy detention of individuals who cannot raise money for bail set by the court. The act calls for pretrial release of the accused on personal bond, if justified by consideration of employment, length of residence and family ties.

Under the act, a judge is not specifically empowered to take into consideration whether a suspect might prove to be a "danger to the community" if released. The law tells the judge to decide whether a suspect is likely to flee the District to avoid prosecution.

BOND POLICY SHIFTED

Hundreds of individuals arrested in the rioting began to appear in the Court of General Sessions on Friday morning on charges of second-degree burglarly (looting). The judges there generally began to release on personal bond anyone who could satisfy the act's requirements of community ties.

By Friday afternoon, it was learned, some judges of the U.S. District Court had quietly conferred and agreed that suspects released on their personal word to return to court when summoned possibly would return to riot-struck areas in the meantime and take part in looting. They reached a decision based on what they regarded as a requirement for the safety of the community.

Some judges of the Court of General Sessions privately admitted that word had come down from the District Court to ignore the Bail Reform Act except in rare cases, and to start setting money bonds. By Friday evening, it was apparent that the "danger to the community" consideration was coming into play, and bail averaging about $1,000 was set in the felony cases.

HIT BY NEGRO LAWYERS

Most Negro lawyers, already upset because only the predominantly white D.C. Bar Association had been solicited for help in providing defense attorneys, refused to take part in the proceedings on Friday and Saturday because of the alleged predetermined policy of requiring high money bonds.

By early yesterday, however, the Negro lawyers chose to end their boycott and take cases.

Increase in Pension Enrollment

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the March 1968 edition of Finance Facts, a monthly publication on consumer financial behavior, printed by the National Consumer Finance Association, contained the following article regarding information of immense importance to all concerned with the healthy development of retirement programs in America:

INCREASE IN PENSION ENROLLMENT

Number of active and retired workers under private and government pension plans in 1966 (the latest year for which figures are available) jumped more than 1.9 million—by far the biggest increase in over 10 years. Figures do not include Social Security. Private plans of all types accounted for more than 70% of the 1966 gain.

Estimates by the Institute of Life Insurance indicate that about 42 million persons, or about half of the nation's civilian work force, are now enrolled. This would mean the number of persons covered has doubled since the early 1950s.

About one out of every eight covered by private and government plans at the beginning of 1967 was already retired and receiving a pension. Rolls of retired workers have been growing at a faster rate than coverage of active workers.

Mr. Speaker, we must fully recognize that Americans, in contrast to people

in other developed countries, have a broadly based tripartite system of retirement. As I pointed out in my supplemental views to the Social Security Amendments of 1967, House Report No. 544, that Government social security is only one of these three parts, and is not, as the Social Security Administration alleges without substantiating data, "the major reliance for almost all beneficiaries."

The primary and historical part of our tripartite retirement system consists of the person's own savings, insurance, annuity, homeownership, and so forth. The third part consists of the funded employment pension plans which meet the standards set by the Congress in the Internal Revenue Code.

Today social security is certainly an important part of the retirement plans of most Americans. But it is only a part, and should never be viewed as replacing funded retirement programs. I am, therefore, very pleased to note in the Finance Facts that funded retirement programs are expanding as they should be to benefit more Americans.

There are three basic reasons why funded retirement programs are better than pay-as-you-go Government retirement programs such as social security. I have set forth these reasons in my concurring views to the 1967 Social Security Amendments previously referred to, and I would like to reaffirm them at this point:

1. Funded retirement programs can pay larger benefits than a pay-as-you-go system, because over 50 percent of the benefits paid out to the retiree come from the earnings on the investment of the fund. Our private pension plans today have over $90 billion in their funds. The annual earnings run over $4.5 billion. These funded plans are being extended to cover more and more people. About 25 million workers are presently covered in a program which was effectively started almost 10 years after social security. It wasn't until last year that the Congress effectively extended the tax treatment for corporate pension plans to self-employed and their employees. In a few years 50 million or 75 percent of the workers should be covered and the funds should be well over $200 million.

The social security system, on the other hand, is a pay-as-you-go system which does not contemplate paying benefits out of the earnings of the trust fund. The social security trusts consist of only $22 billion and is called a contingent fund—to protect the system against unanticipated contingencies such as serious recession. It barely equals the benefits paid out in 1 year, yet it covers over 65 million workers. If the social security system were funded in the same sense that corporate and other private pension plans are required to be funded by your tax and insurance laws, the fund would have to have $350 billion in it.

In other words, instead of increasing the payroll tax by say $200 a year—$100 from the employee and $100 from the employer by increasing the wage base on which the social security tax is paid from $6,800 to $7,800 and increasing the rate of tax, that same $200 a year if paid into a funded pension plan, the benefits could be increased two to three times the increases provided in the social security pay-as-you-go system.

The second reason which requires us to be cautious about increasing the social security system by having it compete for the same funds which finance private retirement plans is the economic limitations of the payroll tax, which is the method of financing not only social security but unemployment insurance and, in reality, workmen's compensation. Many economists have argued that getting the social security tax above 10 percent of payroll endangers the basic system. It is certainly true that all taxes have a point of diminishing returns. Without the increases in this bill, the payroll tax is already scheduled to go up to 11.3 percent of payroll.

The third reason for increasing the retirement benefits for our people through the funded systems rather than through pay-as-you-go systems lies in the need of any society for capital to finance its economic growth and increased standard of living. The Western European countries, particularly the ones that have been acclaimed for paying higher social security benefits than does the U.S. social security system, constantly look with envious eyes to the great U.S. capital market, because they do not have the capital to finance their growth. Americans through their tripartite retirement systems have much greater retirement benefits per person than these same countries because Americans do rely heavily on funded retirement systems in addition to social security. In the process, Americans have created great savings which are available through the savings and loan institutions ($150 billion), through the pension plans ($90 billion), through the insurance companies ($200 billion) and savings in banks ($100 billion) to finance the expansion of industry and their own living standards. If a society does not finance a large part of the retirement of its people through savings, it creates serious difficulties for itself.

So when we cut in on the funded systems by increasing the pay-as-you-go system as is done to some degree in H.R. 12080, we cut back on the amount of benefits that otherwise might be paid to our retirees as well as cut back on the capital that otherwise would be available to finance the Nation's growth which provides the jobs and living standards for our people.

I think it is important that we understand our great society so that in our endeavor to improve and better it, we do not unwittingly damage it.