

States on the 20th of January, 1969, black voters throughout the nation resignedly assumed a "wait and see" attitude. Since less than ten per cent of the Negro vote had gone to Nixon, blacks were pessimistic about the attitude the White House would take toward the black man.

Knowing that they had asked for, and got, rewards for electing the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy and supporting his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, they feared that President Nixon, owing them nothing politically, would slow down the progress of the black man and, perhaps, even turn back the pages of civil rights, particularly in desegregation of Southern schools.

Accustomed to the extremely partisan, dog-eat-dog politics of most local scenes, blacks expected punishment. Some of the more militant blacks, many of whom had urged Negroes to stay away from the polls, hoped for indications on punishment. They know that a federal slow down on civil rights will help solidify blacks on a more militant basis.

FORWARD TOGETHER

Early in his inaugural address, President Nixon talked about the proud achievements of this nation in the "second third of this century." He talked about the enormous strides in science and industry and agriculture. And then he said, "We have given freedom new reach, we have begun to make its promise real for black as well as for white." Later in the address he talked again of the freedom of the black man as he emphasized his inaugural theme of "Forward Together." "No man," he said, "can be fully free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all is to go forward together."

"This means black and white together, as one nation, not two. The laws have caught up with our conscience. What remains is to give life to what is in the law: to insure at last that as all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man."

The words were a promise of progress in civil rights and equality. But such was to be expected in an inaugural address.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

The true ability of a President cannot be assessed in a few months. Even at the end of a four year term, a President might still be of unproved quality. Looking back in history, one can only now see in perspective such Presidents as Herbert Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. Dwight D. Eisenhower, John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson served too recently to be judged at this time. But early in a President's term of office, there are straws in the wind that let one know what bent he is likely to take on certain issues. One hint as to President Nixon's handling of racial issues came even before Mr. Nixon was sworn in. And it came not from Mr. Nixon but from Robert H.

Finch, now Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare but then lieutenant governor of California and one of Mr. Nixon's closest advisors. In an interview with United Press International, Finch said that the Nixon administration could bring "a new kind of candor and realism" to the drive for racial equality because the administration owes no political debts to the "black establishment." Finch said that the administration would design practical programs to give both black and white youths "the same chance at the starting line" and that guaranteeing Negroes equal opportunities with whites is "chiefly a matter of education." Finch also said that minority militants would have very little influence on the Nixon administration. "I find," said Finch, "that many of these so-called militants have a very narrow constituency. I hope that our programs can be geared to the responsible members of these minority communities."

Shortly after Mr. Finch's UPI interview and a week before the Inauguration, Mr. Nixon invited six black leaders to meet with him in New York City. They were SCLC President Ralph Abernathy, Ebony Publisher John H. Johnson, Afro-American Publisher John Murphy, National Baptist Convention Vice President Rev. Sandy Ray, black Elks Grand Exalted Ruler Hobson Reynolds and Black Power Conference Chairman Dr. Nathan Wright. To these men, Mr. Nixon pledged that he would endeavor to surpass the efforts of his predecessors to improve the economic and social conditions of black Americans. He said that this meeting was the first of many meetings in which he hoped to develop communication between his Administration and black Americans. He said he was seeking advice from black leaders to give him "direction, advice and criticism" in affairs that affect black citizens. Declaring that he wanted to broaden the base of Presidential appointments to put qualified blacks in responsible positions serving the needs of all Americans, Nixon hinted at meaningful appointments to come.

THE GREAT DISTRUST

Despite all President Nixon has had to say on racial problems during his meetings with various black leaders both before and after his inauguration, black people seemed to have assumed an air of watchful distrust. The depth of this distrust became apparent to Mr. Nixon when he began seeking qualified Negroes for Presidential appointments. In several instances, his spokesmen were rebuffed by Negroes who would have been willing to accept the appointment but turned down the offers only because they did not want to be labeled "Uncle Tom" by other, more militant blacks.

The most highly publicized appointment to date, that of James Farmer, former national director of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), to assistant secretary

for administration in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, marked Mr. Nixon's first breakthrough to a nationally known black leader. And Farmer's statement about his acceptance should give other black leaders thought if they should also be approached for meaningful appointments. Admitting that some might have reason to protest some things that he might do, he added, "But there also is a great need for some people to get on the inside and try to have some influence."

Nixon early made history by appointing California's James Johnson as the first black man ever to serve as a U.S. Civil Service commissioner. Johnson is a Republican from California and formerly served as director of the State Dept. of Veterans Affairs under Gov. Ronald Reagan. But Farmer earned his first Republican support when he ran for Congress in Brooklyn on the liberal ticket with Republican backing and lost to Democrat Shirley Chisholm.

Nixon has appointed two assistant secretaries in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Samuel C. Jackson and Samuel J. Simmons. Both meaningful appointments, that of Jackson has been given special weight because it has been indicated that he actually has the status of an Under Secretary—Number 2 man in the Department.

Nixon seems determined, at least in number, to surpass President Johnson in the appointment of blacks to Washington jobs. In the White House, two black aides, Robert J. Browne and Michael Monroe, can look around at seven or eight black secretaries where during the Johnson administration there were only one or two. President Nixon has also urged his cabinet to employ as many Negroes as possible.

LET'S GIVE HIM A CHANCE

James Farmer might just be right when he says that black men need more influence from the inside. And black men who turn down meaningful and desirable appointments merely from fear of being labeled "Uncle Toms" could be doing their own people a great disservice. National Urban League Director Whitney Young recently said: "More Negroes should be encouraged to accept jobs in the Nixon Administration . . . It is to the benefit of every Negro in this country that we are ably represented."

The black man has been handicapped in the past because he did not have men "on the inside" in government. Now that he does have that opportunity, he should take every advantage of it. The very presence of a black man in an office or on a committee helps keep the white majority from forgetting us.

So far as serving under President Nixon is concerned, let's face it. He's the only President we have—Let's give him a chance to prove himself.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 22, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.—1 Corinthians 2: 9.

Almighty and everlasting God, from whom all thoughts of truth and love proceed; kindle in our hearts and in the hearts of all men a real love for the truth and a deep concern for peace.

Guide with Thy wisdom those who lead our Nation, our President, our Speaker, the Members of this House of Representatives, and all who work with

them under the dome of this Capitol, that in all good will Thy kingdom may go forward and Thy will be done on earth.

Make real in our hearts the spirit of Thy love; strengthen us by Thy power; draw us closer to Thee and, in so doing, bind us together in a firm and a faithful bond of unity, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

MAY 21, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep regret that I find I must resign my position on the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Conference.

I want to thank you for your kindness in appointing me to this conference. My participation on it during the last three years has been a most enriching experience. The United States and Canada have many common interests and goals. It was my privilege to have had the opportunity to work closely with this Conference which aims at fostering trust and cooperation between our two countries.

With best regards, I remain
Sincerely yours,

JAMES KEE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is agreed to.
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from New York, Mr. STRATTON, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As much as I hate to do so, I am going to have to resign from the House Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group because of the pressure of executive sessions in the Ways and Means Committee. As you know, we are dealing with extension of the surtax and tax reforms and the Committee is in constant session.

I want to express my appreciation for this appointment and I look forward to serving in this area in the future.

Sincerely,

SAM M. GIBBONS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is agreed to.
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PEPPER, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

AMVETS SILVER HELMET AWARDS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1969, AMVETS held its 12th annual Sil-

ver Helmet Awards banquet at the Statler Hilton Hotel here in Washington.

A distinctive silver replica of a GI helmet, appropriately engraved, was presented to the 1969 honorees, all of them outstanding Americans. These distinguished men join the honor roll of other great leaders who received the helmet in prior years. These include the late George C. Marshall, World War II Chief of Staff and later Secretary of State, President Richard Nixon, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and my warm friend and colleague, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of our House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to dwell on the distinguished careers of these great men who received the award this year, but I do commend to the attention of the Congress and the American people the citations presented to His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Mr. P. E. "Gene" Howard, and Mr. Henry Viscardi, Jr.:

AMERICANISM AWARD PRESENTED TO HIS EMINENCE RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING, ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON

"In gratitude for his personification of loyalty in deed and word to the principles of our American heritage."

Richard Cardinal Cushing was born in South Boston on August 24, 1895. He was ordained into the Priesthood in May, 1921; consecrated as Bishop on June 29, 1939, and elevated to the Sacred College of Cardinals on December 18, 1958.

During World War II more than a few GIs, serving in the Solomon Islands found that it was a good thing to come from "Father Cushing's place in America"—this assured a cordial reception from the natives and sometimes provided for safety or even life. This was so because the then Bishop Cushing increased his efforts on behalf of the missions of the Pacific, sponsoring the Solomon Islands Mission Fund. After the war the fund helped restore missions in the North and South Solomon Islands which had been ravaged by the conflict. Through the years His Eminence has continued his interest in the Armed Forces of our country.

Today the brilliant and vigorous leadership of Cardinal Cushing is known throughout the world. Many have benefitted from his concern—perhaps some of us.

In September, 1944, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, named him Archbishop of Boston. Immediately Archbishop Cushing began implementing his program. To him this meant the inauguration of many new religious, educational and charitable activities. As a result, hundreds of mentally and physically deficient children are annually cared for in institutions founded by His Eminence. A boarding school for orphans, or children temporarily homeless is another project supported by the Cardinal Cushing Charity Fund.

AMVETS is proud to present its Americanism Award to His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE WILBUR D. MILLS

"For his constant fidelity to the highest ideals of American leadership so important to the security of our changing world."

Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas entered the service of his nation as Representative of his state's second Congressional district thirty years ago. He became a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives three years later and, in 1958 became its Chairman.

Representative Mills is sometimes called the most powerful man in Congress because nearly every cent of federal funds disbursed fall within the purview of the Ways and Means Committee. He is also Chairman of the Committee on Committees for the House of Representatives, whose duty it is to assign committee memberships to all other Democratic Representatives in the Congress.

The devotion of Representative Mills to his country is exemplified by his distinguished service in its legislative halls. His outlook encompasses all of mankind. He seeks peace for America, not in narrow, parochial seclusion but in a position of world leadership. He has defined this country's goal as an establishment of institutions in which men can settle their differences with words, not weapons. He has said America should seek a world in which freedom flourishes and peace prevails.

Along with his epochal achievements in domestic issues and foreign relations, Representative Mills has also been a trustworthy friend to the veteran, his widow and orphan. His great influence is always on the side of the legitimate rights and entitlements of veterans.

Recognizing that his achievements in our legislature are reflections of his character as an individual, AMVETS presents its Congressional Award to a distinguished gentleman and patriot, United States Representative Wilbur D. Mills.

WORLD PEACE AWARD PRESENTED TO AMBASSADOR W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

"In recognition of one whose passion for peace again brought him the awesome responsibility of representing America's hopes at the conference table."

Few men in the history of our country have borne a range of duties of such great responsibility and diversity as W. Averell Harriman. He has been our spokesman in time of war and in the peaceful interludes. His knowledge of the sensitive relationship among countries and his great diplomacy have been called on again and again in the quest for peace.

W. Averell Harriman has vast experience in private business and in government service. He has served on key positions under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson.

In 1941 he was appointed Special Representative of the President in Great Britain with the rank of Minister.

In 1943 Mr. Harriman was Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., and in 1946 he was appointed Ambassador to Great Britain, later that year he was named Secretary of Commerce by President Truman.

In 1948 Mr. Harriman became United States Representative in Europe with the rank of Ambassador under the Economic Cooperation Act. In 1950 he was appointed Special Assistant to the President.

In April 1968 the President chose Ambassador Harriman to be his personal representative to the Viet Nam peace talks in Paris. Never was his patience more tested, never was his wisdom more challenged. Again, his influence was felt in our Nation's fervent pursuit of peace.

The citizens of the United States owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished diplomat from the State of New York. Thus it is with pride and with honor that AMVETS presents its World Peace Award to Ambassador W. Averell Harriman.

DEFENSE AWARD TO BE PRESENTED TO GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

"For his dedication in preserving the freedom of our country and his personal concern for the morale of our fighting men."

General William C. Westmoreland's achievements as Commander of Allied forces in Viet Nam belong to history and,

with his present position as Army Chief of Staff, his saga has just begun.

This award directs attention to the man behind the record. He is a tough, hard-hitting professional soldier, highly skilled in the military arts and sciences, dedicated to "Duty—Honor—Country." This trinity of values forms a structure of steel within his total character. He is a terrifying foe to the enemies of America, yet he is a sensitive and compassionate comrade to the men he leads. They respect him for what he is. They trust his commands.

The world, even as it has sometimes disagreed in principle with American soldiers fighting in Viet Nam, has marveled at their invincible will.

The citizens of this country have been divided and the streets of many towns have echoed to the chants of demonstrators denouncing Viet Nam. But still the American soldier stood firm and fought on, risking his life for "Duty—Honor—Country."

It was a clear case of a Commander infusing in the half million men of his command, his own set of values. He set the example by ignoring bad news from the home front and fighting on. The soldiers were proud of their commander and he was proud of them.

For his achievements on the field of battle and as one of the Nation's most trusted officials, AMVETS is proud to honor General William C. Westmoreland with its Silver Helmet Defense Award.

SPECIAL SILVER HELMET AWARD TO BE PRESENTED TO P. E. "GENE" HOWARD

"For the guidance he gave and the expert knowledge he shared in the ultimate success of the United States Veterans Advisory Commission."

Gene Howard has spent his time, energy and talents in the interest of veterans—much of it in the service of AMVETS.

For nine years in various positions he was instrumental in the growth of the organization. AMVETS benefitted from his astute judgment and administrative ability. His outstanding work was recognized many times by awards from AMVETS and AMVETS Auxillary.

In 1964 Gene Howard was appointed Special Assistant to William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans Affairs. In this position he continued to pursue his unswerving interest in veterans and their dependents. AMVETS is joined by all major veterans organizations in recognizing the personal devotion Gene Howard brought to his duties in the Veterans Administration. This was exemplified by his outstanding efforts in coordinating and implementing the staff research on information provided to the United States Veterans Advisory Commission.

Some 1400 recommendations were forthcoming from testimony received. Ultimately the Commission submitted 79 firm legislative proposals to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, and to the President of the United States.

The impact of the Commission's report will have a profound influence on veterans' legislation for many years to come. The contributions made by Gene Howard will always be remembered.

AMVETS, in grateful acknowledgement of his outstanding leadership and selfless service to veterans, present the Special Silver Helmet Award to P. E. "Gene" Howard.

REHABILITATION AWARD TO BE PRESENTED TO HENRY VISCARDI, JR.

"In recognition of his compassion, understanding and activities which give hope to the handicapped of all ages."

Albert Einstein once said: "Only a life lived for others is a life worthwhile." A multitude of people helped by Henry Viscardi, Jr., attest to the worthwhile existence of this unusual man.

Mr. Viscardi, though handicapped himself, founded and is president of the Human Resource Center in Albertson, New York. The Center is internationally known for its Educational Research and Training Institute and for its work in rehabilitation of the physically disabled and mentally retarded. It includes Abilities, Inc., where severely handicapped and mentally retarded persons are employed. The Center houses the Human Resources School which offers a fully accredited educational program for handicapped children from pre-school age through senior high school. The school is the first of its kind in the world.

Recently the establishment of INA MEND Institute was announced by Mr. Viscardi and Bradford Smith, Jr., chairman of Insurance Company of North America. The institute is a research and education center for studies in the field of rehabilitation and loss prevention. It will conduct research, seminars and vocational evaluation and will provide library services in the areas of rehabilitation accident prevention and the problems of the disabled worker.

The research of the INA MEND Institute at Human Resources Center can make a major contribution through its studies and can influence new developments in the rehabilitation of disabled persons.

In tribute to extraordinary courage and in gratitude for the abundant energies expended on behalf of others, AMVETS presents its Rehabilitation Award to Henry Viscardi, Jr.

UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRIAL-PEACE COMPLEX

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I repeat here excerpts of my remarks last night to a student assembly at Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, Va.

The moon orbit tonight of Apollo 10 is a result of the university-industrial-peace complex—a complex of the American academic community, industry, and Government cooperating in the cause of peace and human progress. This complex is pledged to making America first in space. Should the United States lead in the exploration of space, it will be for peace and the security of free peoples of the world. This complex is devoted to the future of mankind, it is dedicated to tomorrow. They hold the key that unlocks the door to a billion secrets. They will add 7 million miles of space to the free world's new frontier. It is a frontier without horizons and without limitations.

Two hundred American universities and colleges are today engaged in research for our space program. Thousands of men and women with Ph. D.'s are working on this project. Four hundred thousand skilled technicians are employed. From knowledge gained in space research have come computers, inflammable materials, electronics, and batteries which open up an entirely new era in the progress of mankind.

To remain first in space for peace will challenge the imagination, creative ability, and positive thinking of the university community as never before. A successful effort to eliminate poverty and disease will largely depend upon our success in space. The American people will not permit this fantastic achievement of the university industrial complex to be destroyed by a few who seek anarchy and chaos.

Those who resort to force and violence are inviting the military onto the campus. This is their objective. They want airborne troops, the National Guard, and law enforcement to occupy and patrol the campus. This militant minority, dedicated to anarchy, is seeking to destroy higher education. They seek to prevent the majority from a higher education in a highly competitive age. They know a resort to force will invite a counterforce. They are trained for this sinister job. This is the greatest stumbling block in America today, to peace, understanding, and brotherhood. The American people are anxiously hoping that this crisis can be solved by administrators and responsible student leaders. The Congress, and States legislative assemblies throughout the Nation, much prefer to see the academic community led by administrators, students, and academicians, trained and devoted and dedicated to higher education. But I must warn that the Congress and State assemblies, as a last resort, will not permit those who resort to force to destroy the academic community and jeopardize national security and that of the free nations of the world.

Every young American is entitled to a fair chance at education. That education cannot be maintained with book-burnings, rifles and clubs in the hands of those trained in the art of anarchy. As night follows the day, dictatorship will follow anarchy.

Our Bill of Rights should include an amendment guaranteeing not only freedom of the press and freedom of assembly, but the right to an education free of unlawful, illegal, and violent interference.

REMARKS OF POPE PAUL VI ON APOLLO 10 SPACE FLIGHT

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post there appeared a very short story on the remarks of Pope Paul VI, yesterday on the Apollo 10 space flight. His words are worth repeating here in this Record because they underscore the unlimited opportunity Apollo 10 has given to people of this country and to the free world to demonstrate the soaring spirit, courage, and intuitive sense of destiny of mankind. This could be, in our times of cynicism toward almost every moral value, the most important benefit of the future that we can derive from the national space program. His Holiness' remarks are as follows:

POPE MARVELS AT APOLLO FEAT BY MERE MAN
VATICAN CITY, May 21—Pope Paul VI praised the Apollo 10 space flight today and expressed his wonder how man, "so limited and vulnerable," could accomplish such feats.

The Pope, who spoke to thousands during his weekly general audience at St. Peter's Basilica, said: "More than the moon's face, man's face shines before us. No other being whom we know, no other animal, even stronger and most perfect in its vital instincts, can be compared with the prodigious being which we, men, are. There is something in man that surpasses man . . ."

RICHARD L. MAHER REPORTS ON VISITS TO FOUR SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. Speaker, Richard L. Maher, political editor of the Cleveland Press, is considered the most astute political analyst in the State of Ohio.

Mr. Maher recently completed a 2-week visit to four countries in South America; namely, Ecuador, Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil.

Mr. Maher has written four articles which appeared in the Cleveland Press, and under unanimous consent I am including the first article in my remarks. Later I will insert the other three articles. I commend most highly the reading of these articles by my colleagues and members of the Department of State.

[From the Cleveland Press, Apr. 7, 1969]
UNITED STATES SEEN "LOSING" SOUTH AMERICA

(By Richard L. Maher)

The United States is losing South America. The American image is at its lowest point of recent years in our neighboring countries to the south. American prestige and influence, heightened under the late President John F. Kennedy, sank to a deep low under President Johnson.

President Nixon faces an immediate and difficult job in re-establishing friendly relations with South American republics.

The United States is in trouble in Peru, Argentina, Venezuela and other Latin American nations.

That trouble is on a high diplomatic level. Despite billions of dollars in aid, despite the efforts of the Alliance for Progress, we have made few friends.

We have paid far less attention to South America than to Europe, given much less aid. But the result has been the same: You don't buy friendship with money, with hand-outs.

That antipathy to the United States exists only at the top level; not among the people, the average citizen. Generally speaking, the people in the streets, the shopkeepers, are friendly. They like the United States. They also like the American dollars that tourists spend.

A Kennedy half-dollar still is pretty good for smoothing the way. In most countries south of the border, Kennedy is well remembered, fondly revered. Streets have been named for him. Stamps have been issued in his honor.

These observations are the results of a two-week visit to South America during which I visited four countries—Ecuador, Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil. (A year ago I visited Mexico and earlier had been in Colombia and in Panama just before the 1964 trouble.)

If one can put a finger on the cause of declining U.S. influence in South America, it would be touch the State Department and, particularly, our embassies in the individual countries.

I found a certain aloof, chilly attitude in most of them. I gathered there is little respect for American diplomats—among South Americans or among American visitors.

I found a sort of "don't bother us and we won't bother you" attitude surrounding our diplomatic people. Only in Mexico City and in Ecuador did I find what I consider an understanding atmosphere.

I went to South America with a group that included 165 Northern Ohio residents and numbering some of this city's most prominent physicians. Among them was Dr. John

Grady, president of the Academy of Medicine; Dr. Gary Bassett, health commissioner of Lakewood; and Dr. John J. McCarthy, one of the best known West Side physicians and an inventor as well as a doctor.

In each country (excepting Uruguay), the doctors in the group held meetings with the nation's medical men, exchanging ideas, listening to papers on medical problems, then visiting local hospitals.

I had thought that the group was of sufficient importance and prominence to merit at least a courtesy call from the American embassies. They were ignored.

In Rio de Janeiro, I talked with an embassy aide, a career man in the service. He was a pleasant person, but entirely cold to the idea that any group of visitors from home should be given any attention by the embassy.

Americans go through every day, he explained. Also, he added, the embassy doesn't have the staff to contact visitors.

The Ohio group traveled by Trans International Airways charter.

On leaving Quito, Ecuador, the group was told by the tour leader that the plane could not land in Buenos Aires. It seems that the Argentine government has withdrawn landing privileges from certain American lines.

Such companies land their planes in Montevideo, Uruguay. Passengers then are transferred to smaller Argentine airlines planes for the 40-minute flight to Buenos Aires. Leaving Buenos Aires, the same procedure is followed.

The result is tremendous inconvenience to the tourists. Because of a hitch or a breakdown in communications as well as unavailability of the needed three Argentine planes, the group, of which I was part, didn't reach Buenos Aires until 3 a.m.

Incidentally, the plane, after leaving Quito, had to stop at Lima, Peru, to refuel. But during the two-hour layover, no one was allowed to leave the airport. Everyone had to remain in an isolated area.

There were there, however, plenty of stands selling things to attract American dollars. They did a thriving business. One didn't need Peruvian money. American dollars and travelers checks were gladly taken, even for stamps.

The Buenos Aires matter was purely a diplomatic caper. It was, an embassy aide told me, a matter between the airline and the Argentine government. It would, he said, be quickly adjusted when the transportation minister got back to his desk after an illness.

The embassy attitude was that this was none of their concern, although every day American planes were not allowed to land in the Argentine capital.

There was a bit more to it than this, I found. Involved was a request by the Argentine government to land a couple more of its planes weekly at Los Angeles. This had been refused by American officials on the grounds that the air above California was too crowded.

It seemed to me that the embassy regarded this as one of those problems that, if ignored long enough, it would eventually go away.

THE TRUTH ABOUT GREECE

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. Speaker, in its May 27 issue, Look magazine carries an article titled: "Greece: Government by Torture" which I believe does an injustice to the people of Greece and more seriously, presents a grave threat to relations between the United States and

Greece at a time when America needs all of her NATO allies to deal with the growing menace of Soviet influence in the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

The Look magazine article about alleged tortures in Greece approximates similar charges made by Amnesty International 2 years ago and subsequently totally demolished as untrue after on-site inspections by the International Red Cross and a British Inter-Party Committee conducted at the request of the caretaker government of Greece.

Shortly after the April 21, 1967, coup by the Greek military, Amnesty International made serious charges of tortures and brutality in Greece. The subsequent investigations conducted by the International Red Cross and by the British Inter-Party Committee concluded there was no basis for the accusations. I am today calling to the attention of my colleagues a report issued by the Greek caretaker government which summarizes the findings and conclusions of the two separate investigations.

I have recently visited Greece myself and have spoken to some of the most respected leaders of that country who are in no way affiliated with the caretaker government nor do they owe any particular allegiance to the present government. In not a single instance did these impartial observers report any such tortures and brutalities as reported in Look's article.

Furthermore, we have in Chicago thousands of American citizens of Greek ancestry who visit their native Greece frequently. Some visit the big cities while others visit the small villages widely scattered throughout Greece. I have talked to many of these people upon their return from Greece to see if any of their relatives have mentioned the alleged tortures or brutalities. In not a single instance have we received any evidence that would substantiate the Look magazine charges.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 6 months after the April 21 takeover, I personally visited the Island of Yaros—off the coast of Greece—where several thousand Greek political prisoners allegedly were suffering great tortures. Amnesty International—like the Look article—charged that political prisoners on this island were undergoing great tortures.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize, I personally visited Yaros and I took along my own Greek interpreter so there would be no chance for misinterpreting what the prisoners were telling me. After interviewing several hundred prisoners, it was my conclusion that charges of torture and brutality were totally untrue and a complete fabrication. Many of the prisoners frankly told me they were Communists and would refuse stubbornly to issue any assurance they would not conspire against the government in their efforts to overthrow the new regime.

I believe I am the only American ever permitted to visit Yaros. I insisted on visiting the prison island because I wanted to see for myself if the charges of tortures were true.

A few weeks ago I spoke here about progress made in Greece by the caretaker government and I said at that time that the United States must continue to

apply pressure for restoration of complete parliamentary government—selected freely by the Greek people. I said then that the Greek regime cannot postpone indefinitely return of complete constitutional rule to Greece. I shall continue to press for these reforms but I believe we do a disservice to the cause of freedom when we permit misleading articles about tortures in Greece to go unchallenged.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for *Look* magazine. It is one of the Nation's most respected publications. That is why I consider the *Look* article most unfortunate.

Look magazine could have performed a noble service by showing the progress that has been made in Greece during the past 2 years; by showing how Greece has been saved from a takeover by the Communists, and then join the rest of us in continuing to insist that the caretaker government's mission cannot be completed until parliamentary government is restored to Greece and her people have restored to them their historic right of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, the pamphlet prepared by the Greek Government summarizing the two investigations conducted into charges of tortures and brutality follows:

[A publication of the Press and Information Department of the Ministry to the Prime Minister]

THE TRUTH ABOUT GREECE—THE TRUTH REGARDING THE DEPORTED COMMUNISTS AND THE ALLEGED TORTURES

(Reports of the International Red Cross Committee and a statement of the Inter-Party Committee of British M.P.s)

(NOTE.—This statement has no other aim than to present Truth about Greece, as witnessed by authoritative, honest and objective investigators.

(It deals with organized slander about horrible tortures allegedly inflicted by the Greek government on arrested communists.

(The reply to this slander is not given by the Greek government, but the official reports of the International Red Cross and the statements of the British five-member, inter-party Parliamentary Committee.

(The reader of this pamphlet may draw his own conclusions objectively.)

International communism launched on the morrow of the Revolution of April 21, 1967 an unprecedented vile attack about alleged torturing of political prisoners and their inhuman living conditions. These communist charges were comprised in a report of Amnesty International whose two representatives, Messrs. Anthony Mareko and James Becket, visited Greece from December 30, 1967 to January 26, 1968, following permission of the Greek government.

Messrs. Mareko and Becket came into contact, freely, only with detained communists or their families. Their report contained two kinds of charges: (a) Torturing of prisoners and, (b) their inhuman living conditions. Having adopted the communist views without any investigation of the charges, Amnesty International drafted a report stressing the following inter alia:

"Use of tortures has been made deliberately and officially. The places where the most serious ones were reported were General Security on Bouvolinas street, Military Hospital 401 and the Camp at Dionysos. The usual initial torture is the so-called 'phalanga'. The prisoner is tied to a bench and the soles of his feet are beaten with a stick or pipe. Numerous incidents of sexually-oriented torture were reported. Very

often cases of gagging were reported, as well as beating on the head with sandbags and beating the naked flesh with a whip.

"Pulling-out nails and use of electric shock.

"The prisoners were hung for long periods. Rubbing sensitive parts of the body, with pepper. Jumping on the stomach."

In the face of these unprecedented and unfounded slanders of international communism and the fellow-travelers as well as of Amnesty International, the Greek government has accepted that successive missions of distinguished International Red Cross representatives visit Greece and ascertain whether the charges were founded or not. In fact, from May 1967 to March 1968 four visits of representatives of the International Committee of Red Cross were made. These representatives proceeded to a long and free investigation of the alleged torturing and living conditions of political prisoners at Yaros, Leros, the prisons, as well as the different hospitals where they were treated.

In parallel, on April 15, a British five-member inter-party committee composed of Messrs. Gordon Bagier (Labour Party), Russell Johnston (Liberal Party), Anthony Beck and David Webster (Conservative Party) and Ted Garret (Labour Party) visited Greece in order to ascertain the living conditions of political prisoners. On the other hand another objective investigator, Mr. Francis Noël Baker, Labour M.P., has not hesitated to stigmatise in the British Parliament the lying and slandering campaign against the Greek government as regards the question of political prisoners.

SMASHING REPLY

The reply to the vile falsehoods of Amnesty International which is influenced by communism, has been really smashing. The slander was of two kinds: (a) Tortures of satanic inspiration at the General Security in Bouvolinas street, at Military Hospital 401 and at Dionysos, and (b) inhuman living conditions of persons under administrative deportation.

1. Torturing

On the first score of the slanders, that is to say on torturing, there are three authoritative and serious investigators who reject the charges after a careful and completely free investigation. These are: (a) The Committee of the International Red Cross

(b) the report of the inter-party British Parliamentary Committee and

(c) the distinguished British politician of international prestige, the Labour M.P., Mr. Francis Noël Baker.

THE REPORTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS

The reports of the International Committee of Red Cross, in substance, rejected the charges about torturing prisoners. They refused to take a stand, but they also denied the testimonies about alleged torturing in the building of the General Security. The International Red Cross Committee composed of distinguished personalities, in order to reach their conclusions, reported only narratives of political prisoners, all communists, in the prison of Aegina. Those displaced in the islands made no charges about tortures. The prisoners claimed that the greatest part of the alleged tortures were inflicted on them on the terrace of the central police building in Bouvolinas street. This view is rejected by the International Red Cross in its report which says verbatim: "The roof and the entire building correspond with the description of the prisoners who, however, do not mention that it is surrounded on three sides by inhabited buildings which are higher by two or three storeys". All the prisoners, however, according to the International Red Cross report, have assured that they have heard no cry coming from the roof and that they ignored that torturing was being inflicted. Also the fact that the slander about tortures and the myths about inquisition

with the hair-raising descriptions of the famous Amnesty Committee are confined in some charges, made by some prisoners, to the torture of the "phalanga", even which is not proved, constitutes the most eloquent proof of truth.

The findings of the inter-party Committee of British MPs.

The report of British MPs on the subject of tortures is equally smashing for the slanders of Greece. On April 22, 1968 the five British MPs Messrs. Antony Beck and David Webster (Conservative Party), Ted Garret and Gordon Bagier (Labour Party) and Russell Johnston (Liberal Party) made an announcement to the Greek and foreign journalists at the Grande Bretagne Hotel, stressing: "The claims of the foreign press that tortures were inflicted on political prisoners at the police headquarters are ridiculous. No political detainees could be tortured in the police headquarters in Athens in full view of the people. Maybe there have been isolated cases but even here it is difficult to distinguish between facts and propaganda. At all events, we believe that no instructions from above have been given about brutality and torturing and we have assurances that any case of excessive zeal on the part of subaltern police members shall be punished severely." Similarly, two of the British MPs in question (Gordon Bagier and R. Johnston) in another interview with Greek and foreign journalists on April 26, 1968 stressed:

"No claim whatever about ill-treatment of prisoners on Leros has been made. Glezos is in excellent health and did not complain of brutality. It is true that one of the deportees, Mr. Abatiellos, had a scar on his foot but, we are not in a position to say categorically whether it was caused by ill-treatment. In no circle did we find anyone, even in the camp, who was ready to accuse the rulers of Greece of conducting any brutality or cruelty to deportees. Citizens accept the government positively and say that it is a good government. Part of the foreign press is not objective. We believe that presentation of things by the Western press has been biased in one direction."

Mr. Francis Noël Baker.

Finally, the slanders of Greece have received a heavy blow from the Labour M.P., Mr. Francis Noël Baker, as regards the alleged tortures.

In the course of a debate on Greece in the House of Commons on April 11, 1968, Mr. Francis Noël Baker gave the assurance that a friend of his, a former EDA deputy, had confided to him that the treatment he had while he was detained was exemplary. He said that the laws on the strength of which individuals are detained in Greece, had been voted by previous governments. Those who applied the law were the same persons as before. Everybody hates tortures. But it is indispensable to check facts so that there should be no doubt. The last report of Amnesty International does not fulfill these prerequisites. It appears that Mr. Mareko has strong political views and so restricted contacts in Greece that it is impossible for him to make an objective appreciation of things. He does not speak Greek and does not know the country. Finally, Mr. Baker in a statement to the press on April 6, 1968, stressed that reports about torturing of political prisoners in Greece had been inflated to a superlative degree. Also, in another statement, when he returned from Greece, Mr. Baker said characteristically: "In view of the conclusions reached by a really responsible organization, like the International Red Cross, I consider that the charges about brutal actions on the part of Greek police officers are being magnified in advance."

2. Living conditions in camps, hospitals, prisons

On the second score of the slanders, that is to say on the alleged inhuman living conditions of deportees on the islands of Leros

and Yaros as well as of political prisoners in hospitals, there are four reports from an equal number of visits made by representatives of the International Red Cross in Greece from May 1967 to March 1968. In all four reports and particularly in the third and fourth, the common finding is that political prisoners live under satisfactory conditions. In particular:

The first report refers to the findings of M. J. Collandon, who visited the islands of Yaros and Leros, the gendarmerie station of N. Heraklion and different hospitals in July 1967.

The second report refers to the findings of Messrs. de Chastonay and Chatillon, who, as representatives of the International Red Cross, visited the places where political prisoners were held, between October 16 and 31, 1967.

The third report refers to the findings of Mr. Charles Amman, Assistant director and Mr. Laurent Marti, representative of the International Committee of Red Cross, who visited the island of Yaros and several other places of detention in January and February 1968.

The fourth report, which is characterized as a general report on the visits of International Red Cross representatives, refers to the findings of all the missions of the International Committee of Red Cross.

An identity of findings in connection with the living conditions of the so-called political prisoners results, from the reports.

In particular, the following points are reported:

YAROS—LEROS

Sojourn

Third report—Tent camps have been abolished completely. Kerosine stoves have been installed in women's quarters.

Fourth report—The arrangements in the building suggested by the International Red Cross representatives at an earlier visit are already being made, a special credit having been approved for this purpose.

It is stressed in the report that the prisoners have numerous indoor and outdoor games. Bathing in the sea is allowed in the summer. A space of some 1500 square metres surrounded by barbed wire is at the disposal of prisoners at certain hours.

Latrines, shower baths, and wash basins are suitably arranged. Living conditions have improved since last summer.

Nourishment

Fourth report—The daily portion of food corresponds to 2800-3000 calories with sufficient proteins and vitamins. The International Red Cross Committee reports that none of the prisoners seemed undernourished. On the contrary, those suffering from diabetes were entitled to a special diet. An additional expenditure of 8 drachmas for those suffering from this disease is added to the usual 17 drachmas allotted daily per capita. Drinking water is no longer the object of complaints.

In addition, the report states that the prisoners may obtain cigarettes or various personal toilet articles at the canteen.

The money sent by their families amounts to drachmas 500 per month.

Medical care-hygiene

Third report—The medical personnel is composed of four doctors, three nurses (male), one Samaritan of the Greek Red Cross and three military nurses. A dispensary of thirty beds has been arranged in an independent building. The installations include 1 kitchen, 1 room for small operations, 1 room for X-rays and 1 small laboratory.

The laundry functions smoothly, soap is not scarce, the beds are generally comfortable.

Fourth report—Every evening, between 18 and 19.30 hours, a doctor visits the bedrooms.

Monday, Wednesday and Friday are medical visit days. On Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday medical visits in the dormitories are made. In case a patient is in a serious con-

dition the military doctor may order his transport to Athens. According to the International Red Cross doctors, the sick enjoy good care in most of the available installations.

Their nourishment and complexion are satisfactory in general. No patient seems seriously affected. The prisoners live in many large halls which have electric light and the sanitary installations have been considered as acceptable. The prisoners cook alone and, as in the other camps, receive an allowance of 17 drachmas per capita. Both medical equipment and medicines are sufficient. No epidemic has been marked among the prisoners at Yaros and Leros.

Hospitals

Third report—Referring to the living conditions of prisoners in the various hospitals, the report makes the following remarks:

(a) Luminous and well aired spaces. Prisoners under treatment receive the same food as the other patients.

(b) The doctors make no distinction between ordinary patients and prisoners. The latter express but praise.

(c) Convalescents may take small walks.

(d) International Red Cross representatives gathered the best impressions from the hospitals of Syros, the General Hospital of Athens and "Sotiria" Sanatorium.

Fourth report—Sick prisoners are treated in the following hospitals of Athens: General Hospital, Aghios Pavlos Hospital (Averoff prison), "Sotiria" Sanatorium, Aghios Savvas Hospital.

On visiting the hospitals in question, the International Red Cross representatives have ascertained that residence, hygiene, food as well as medical care were satisfactory and did not differ from what is offered to non-prisoner patients. In particular, the member of the International Red Cross Committee, Dr. Jacques Chatillon, says: "The general condition of all prisoners is satisfactory. The patients admitted that medical care was excellent. Recreation the same as for other patients."

Treatment

Third report—The camp commander did not complain about the attitude of prisoners. No disciplinary penalty has been imposed. The detention room has remained closed.

Fourth report—No complaint on the part of the authorities of the camp or of the prisoners has been formulated to the International Red Cross Committee. The report states that during their last visit on March 10, 1968, they talked in private and without witnesses with 95 prisoners, having devoted six minutes to each one of them on an average. The presence of an interpreter has been necessary. At all events it is stated that 13 prisoners speaking English or French have been heard on that day without witnesses.

CONCLUSIONS

There has been slander on two scores: A) Inquisition-like tortures of political prisoners and B) Inhuman living conditions of deportees on Yaros-Leros.

The charges had two sources: 1) Communist and fellow-travelling whispering propaganda and 2) The report of [Amnesty International] attempting to confirm communist slander.

On the other hand, there have been a) responsible statements by representatives of the Greek government at various times denying the slanders with concrete data, b) The reports of the International Red Cross, c) the statements of the British inter-party Committee of MPs who visited the places of detention of deportees, and d) the statement of the British Labour M.P., Mr. Francis Noël Baker, president of the British-Hellenic League.

The texts of the reports both of the British MPs and the International Red Cross Committee and particularly of the latter—owing to unquestionable prestige and well-known

objectivity—refuted the slanders one by one and proved:

(1) That no tortures have been inflicted.

(2) That living conditions of deportees are satisfactory.

Of course, during the first weeks of the Revolution, living conditions on Yaros were in no way comfortable. No one has maintained the contrary. The Revolution had to face urgent problems at that time. At all events, from the reports of the International Red Cross Committee, the clear conclusion may be drawn that the living conditions of deportees have never been as described by communist propaganda.

As regards tortures, it has been ascertained by objective investigators, but also by those who made the charges themselves that, in substance, there have been no tortures in any of the places where it has been denounced that these had been inflicted. In addition, it has been proved that, instead of the revolting details mentioned in the report of Amnesty International, the tortures were confined by the allegedly tortured, only to the torment of "phalanga," which has been proved in no case. Moreover, by curious coincidence, the few who have denounced to the International Red Cross that they have been tortured were all active communists with a heavy criminal past.

TRAGEDY AND VIOLENCE AT BERKELEY

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, fortunately the confrontations have begun to ease between demonstrators and authorities in Berkeley, Calif. Over the past week, this tragic episode has resulted in one death, injuring and gassing of many other persons. Martial law grips the city, and activities there and on the University of California campus are disrupted.

I am shocked that the predominant response by authorities in Berkeley—at both the State and local level—has been one of condoning extreme violence in attempting to halt demonstrations.

I do not condone the irresponsible acts undertaken by some demonstrators, but nevertheless I am appalled by the apparent lack of concern shown by authorities as evidenced by the means utilized to quell the turmoil.

As I understand the situation, I question any need to resort to firearms; yet, the initial move by authorities was to allow police to use shotguns to disperse the crowd. Indeed, police did more than just break up the gathering; one news story—which I shall place below in the RECORD—tells of police chasing one person and taking careful aim before firing.

Tuesday's indiscriminate tear-gassing of the university's central plaza by a National Guard helicopter commanded by the county sheriff also appears to be gross over-reaction as the gas later drifted over parts of the campus not involved in the disturbance and then into the city itself.

These type responses—shootings, gasings—do not seem to be effective in preventing further trouble and further alienation. Instead, force was being met with force, and some demonstrators, egged on by a very small contingent, began to assume guerrilla tactics against the authorities, the campus, and the city. I can only foresee a bloody final battle

in the streets if both sides continue ram-paging along these clashing paths.

Such a battle must be prevented, and progressive steps to strengthen the de-escalation undertaken at once. Only a relatively minor incident may trigger off mass killing and destruction, and the longer the situation festers and disintegrates, the more chances grow that such an incident might occur.

At present, actions initiated to cool the Berkeley violence are being done at the State and local level—and have not required Federal intervention.

But, I see no more than an uneasy truce at best, and I urge further sensible actions by both demonstrators and authorities. As one starter, I would recommend that Governor Reagan might temper the tone of his criticisms of demonstrators—as were reported in Wednesday's Los Angeles Times, and which I also insert below into the RECORD—and instead look for some effective way to ease the crisis. Up to now, Mr. Reagan appears more interested in reaping political hay by blaming only demonstrators for all the problems that have arisen this past week—a tactic not new for the Governor since it was his overtly slanted attacks on students and campus disorders which helped him get elected in 1966.

Again, I deplore the unjust and often silly moves by demonstrators who resort to equally authoritarian tactics against the city of Berkeley and the University of California. But these tactics are fanned on by statements such as those made this week by Governor Reagan. And while the extremists on both sides fight, those caught in the middle—Berkeley residents, the university community—suffer.

I am joining my colleague from the Berkeley area, Mr. COHELAN, in taking the following steps to help avert further disruption. I am asking the Attorney General to use his powers in title X of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to assist conciliation through the Community Relations Service, and I am requesting study of the Berkeley situation by the President's National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following articles describing the Berkeley disorders in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1969]
SHOTGUNS AND TEAR GAS DISPERSE RIOTERS
NEAR THE BERKELEY CAMPUS

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 15.—Policemen with shotguns and National Guardsmen with tear gas opened fire on rioters along Telegraph Avenue near the University of California here this afternoon, incapacitating dozens of persons. The rioting began in protest against the university's taking over "People's Park," a tract of land owned by the institution but improved in recent weeks by hippies, yuppies, nonstudents and others as a playground and gathering place. The seriousness of most of the injuries was not determined immediately although one hospital spokesman said a group of persons had been treated for buckshot wounds. At Herrick Hospital the nurses lost count of the numbers and an aide said most of the victims were immediately taken into surgery. The shooting started near the Sather Gate entrance of the Berkeley campus after a demonstration attended by 1,500 in Sproul Hall Plaza. At the end of the rally,

Dan Siegel, the student president-elect, shouted: "Let's go down and take over the park."

Shortly afterward a platoon of Alameda County sheriff's deputies opened fire into a crowd standing on a roof at Dwight Way and Telegraph Avenue, near the campus. National Guardsmen arrived soon afterward and they tried to control the rioters by firing tear gas.

Among those wounded early in the fracas were Don Wegers, a reporter for The San Francisco Chronicle, and Daryl Lembke, San Francisco bureau chief for The Los Angeles Times.

A state highway patrolman, whose name was not disclosed, was stabbed.

Gov. Ronald Reagan had never lifted a state of extreme emergency that he declared for the campus and its immediate environs on Feb. 5 while confrontations between the police and striking students led by members of the Third World Liberation Front were almost a daily occurrence.

The Governor's proclamation enabled the sheriff to call upon the National Guard and the state highway patrol to keep order on the campus.

A critical situation had been building for the last day or two since Dr. Roger W. Heyns, chancellor of the Berkeley campus, served formal notice that the university would evict the "people's park" patrons and place a steel mesh fence around the 445 by 275 foot area owned by the institution. It covers most of a square block at the corner of Haste and Bowditch, near the campus.

Several hundred policemen had appeared at the park before 5 a.m. and "dispossessed" a small group of "trespassers" in preparation for the start of the fence erection an hour later.

Squads of laughing, singing hippie types had been busy at the site for several weekends, transforming the \$1-million property—destined eventually for student housing and, more immediately, for playing fields—into a park.

They had spent a reported \$700 for turf, with which they covered part of the bare ground and had spread sawdust over some of the rest. They also brought in striped swings to delight children and installed benches and tables for picnics.

Someone dubbed the result "power to the people park," which was shortened on a sign to People's Park. A corner bulletin board carried a schedule of activities so that residents and nonresidents, students and nonstudents, who arrived with picnic baskets or sandwiches in brown bags could stop to read on their way to a picnic table.

There were three apple trees and colored balloons and a steel triangle like a chuck wagon dinner bell, which they called a "bulldozer alarm," to alert them when the police might be about to descend on the area.

The university purchased the property last year in accordance, according to Earl Cheit, executive vice chancellor, with an agreement with the city of Berkeley, the seller, several years ago. Within 10 years it was to be converted from a playing field into either student apartments or dormitories.

Art Goldberg, one of the leaders of the Free Speech Movement on the Berkeley campus more than four years ago, said recently that the university had purchased the land because the Berkeley police department had asked it to.

"They're trying to drive the students and the street people out," he asserted, a statement that has been denied by the administration.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 19, 1969]

SHOOTING OF BERKELEY PROTESTER: PHOTO STIRS NEW FUROR

The furor over police use of shotguns during the Berkeley People's Park disrup-

tions increased yesterday with the release of a photo shot the instant before a lawman shot a fleeing demonstrator last Thursday.

The remarkable picture was taken by Emmitt Wallace, a 26-year-old pre-law student who lives in a second-story Berkeley apartment at 2500 Dana street, on the corner of Dana and Dwight way.

"I was looking out the window Thursday afternoon and I saw some 50 people standing on the corner," he told The Chronicle.

"Then they all started to run. The cops came around the corner and one stood there like he was going to shoot.

"I never dreamed he would, but I picked up my camera and shot."

The lawman—garbed in what appeared to be the battle dress of the Alameda County Sheriff's Department—sighted along the barrel of his riot gun and suddenly fired at the back of a fleeing man in a flowing beard, Wallace said.

The cop "took his time aiming," and was only two car lengths from his victim when he fired, he added.

"The guy fell down in the street howling. The cop took off, and someone dragged the guy into a house. His right buttock and hip were bloody from birdshot wounds."

Wallace said no one has yet been able to identify the victim of the incident.

But University of California students hope he will come forward after he sees his picture, Wallace said.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1969]
FACULTY STAGES A BERKELEY VIGIL: THEY PROTEST POLICE TACTICS AS FRESH DEMONSTRATIONS ARE HALTED WITH CLUBS

(By Lawrence G. Davies)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 19.—A group of University of California faculty members shared a "protest vigil" today on the Berkeley campus while one of them made a qualified public call for Chancellor Roger W. Heyns to resign.

The vigil, in which some 100 members of the faculty, including Dr. Owen Chamberlain, a Nobel laureate in physics, took part, was one of a series of events over which hundreds of national guardsmen, policemen and sheriff's deputies kept watch or interfered with.

Dr. David Krech, professor of psychology, said the faculty members then assembled to "protest the bloodshed and the continued threat of bloodshed that was consequent upon university action" last week.

This action, which produced further protest today as far away as the university's Santa Cruz campus, 70 miles to the south, where an administration building was seized by students, followed violence that began last Thursday in the university district in Berkeley.

It followed the ejection of a group of "street people"—hippies, students and non-students—from a piece of university-owned land that they had transformed into a park of sorts through several weekends of work. Chancellor Heyns ordered a fence installed to keep interlopers out.

SEVENTY TREATED IN HOSPITALS

Almost 70 persons required hospital treatment last week from injuries received from pellets of various kinds fired at protesting crowd by law-enforcement agents. Police officers have insisted that the usual ammunition was light birdshot, but some wounds have indicated to hospital aides that in several instances buckshot or heavier pellets were used.

The Stanford University campus at Palo Alto also had continued demonstrations. Students picketed the institute to enforce a demand that university trustees integrate the institute with the university and ban all war-related research.

A half-dozen arrests were made, bringing the total for the weekend to 21. The Stan-

ford trustees decided last week to sever formal ties between the two institutions but refused to order the institute to give up such research as counterinsurgency.

At Berkeley a scheduled noon rally on Sproul Hall plaza drew about 1,000, who fell back without resistance in the face of squads of policemen.

GUARD REPELS PROTESTERS

Professor Kreh, explaining why faculty members were on hand, asserted that the vigil "is to indicate publicly our protest against Chancellor Heyns's actions that led to shooting by Sheriff Frank I. Madigan and his hoods."

Several times during the day National Guardsmen forced columns of demonstrators, as many as 2,000 at a time, back to the campus from downtown Berkeley, where they had vowed to close businesses. Several of the militants were clubbed when they refused to move from a position near International House.

Many businesses were closed and even employees of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, now working on a Berkeley subway line, removed their equipment and quit work, at least temporarily, at the demonstrators' demand. Paint in some cases was sprayed on store windows, cars and parking meters.

Representatives of a citizens' coalition group, at a campus news conference, demanded immediate discussions between the university and the "People's Park" negotiating committee, the removal of outside police forces and an investigation of the use of firearms for crowd control.

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1969]

HELICOPTER SPRAYS GAS ON BERKELEY "MOURNERS"

(By Rasa Gustaitis)

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 20.—Thousands of demonstrators fled the University of California campus this afternoon, sneezing and coughing after tear gas was sprayed repeatedly—from canisters, hoses and a low-flying military helicopter—to disperse about 1,000 people who roamed the campus in the sixth day of disorders over People's Park.

About 2,000 people had attempted to stage a march of mourning to the campus and downtown to commemorate the death late yesterday of James Rector, 25, who had been shot by .30 caliber bullets in last Thursday's riot.

Rector, from San Jose, died at Herrick Memorial Hospital of "acute heart failure" after undergoing surgery that removed his spleen, pancreas and a kidney.

In Sacramento, Gov. Ronald Reagan said Rector probably had been hit by police shots but said "it's very naive to assume that you should send anyone into that kind of conflict with a flyswatter."

The march began at noon in Sproul Plaza on the campus and was cut short on the campus edge by police backed by the National Guard. The demonstrators then received police permission to return to the Plaza for a vigil.

DAY OF MOURNING ASKED

Mark Pillsuk, a faculty member in the department of Social Welfare, urged the crowd to return "in keeping with the spirit of what we're trying to do." Others, however, wanted more militant action and greeted his words with shouts of "murder," referring to Rector's death.

William Mandel, a Russian scholar and long-time Berkeley militant, then addressed the crowd. He demanded that the city officially be shut down tomorrow in mourning for Rector. If that was not done, he said, "Nobody will be able to restrain those who want to express their sorrow and outrage."

Student body president Charles Palmer then urged the demonstrators to "keep cool"

and led them back into the campus. Some headed for Chancellor Roger W. Heyns' house where they chanted and shouted until police dispersed them with the day's first barrage of tear gas. A campus policeman was injured on the mouth by a flying rock.

The crowd then filtered back to Sproul Plaza and was surrounded by the police and National Guard. Several National Guard trucks stood at the entrance of the campus. One contained barbed wire to barricade the streets, if needed.

At 2 p.m. police ordered the Plaza cleared. "Chemical agents will be dropped in the next five minutes," an officer announced through a bullhorn. Five minutes later, a powdered form of tear gas, called "CS" gas, was sprayed from a helicopter.

The gas was used several times more during the afternoon on the campus. It drifted into classrooms, forcing students and faculty to emerge with stomach cramps and eyes watering and stinging. It also drifted into the campus hospital where at least one patient was evacuated into a sealed room.

GUARDSMAN LED AWAY

In Strawberry Canyon, a recreation area for faculty families, children felt the stinging gas as they swam in the pool. On nearby Telegraph Avenue people stood inside shops with damp handkerchiefs over their mouths and faces. University employees have taken to bringing masks to work with them.

At about 3 o'clock, a National Guardsman at the campus entrance dropped his rifle, helmet and mask, attempted to rip off his flak jacket and was led away by MPs. A public information officer explained he had become ill and MPs merely helped him away. He was too embarrassed, the officer said, to be interviewed.

But Rick Davis, a reporter for KNXT-TV in Los Angeles, said he saw the Guardsman throw down his rifle and helmet. "He looked mad. He didn't look sick," Davis said. Stephen Lighthill, a CBS cameraman, said he saw MPs put a handcuff on one of the Guardsman's wrists.

Moments before the incident, Berkeley police arrested a student of criminology who had been talking with Guardsmen and, according to witnesses, urging them to drop their guns. More than 20 persons were arrested today.

Just before noon, Dan Siegel, 24, the president-elect of the Associated Students, gave himself up to police. He said he had heard he was wanted on the misdemeanor charge of inciting a riot. Last Thursday, at a rally, Siegel urged a crowd to march on People's Park and reclaim it. That morning the University had put a fence around the lot which residents had developed into a park.

Meanwhile, the Berkeley City Council spent the morning discussing the crisis and expressing its repugnance of violence and desire for order.

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1969]

COPTER BREAKS UP BERKELEY CROWD: STINGING POWDER, DROPPED FROM AIR, ENDS "FUNERAL" FOR A GUNSHOT VICTIM

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 20.—A National Guard helicopter swooped over the University of California today and dropped a white, skin-stinging powder on several hundred students, faculty members and "people's park" demonstrators.

The powder dropped by the helicopter was identified by officials as "C.S.," a dry form of tear gas.

The action in Sproul Hall Plaza came 30 minutes after troops guarding the campus home of Chancellor Roger W. Heyns fired tear gas to disperse a crowd of 500, many of whom were shouting curses at the chancellor's wife.

The violence grew out of a silent "funeral march" led by demonstrators in memory of

a bystander who suffered buckshot wounds during the bloody riots last Thursday. The victim, James Rector of San Jose, died last night in a Berkeley hospital. The coroner's office ruled that the wounds were the cause of his death.

Mr. Rector, a carpenter, was reported to be visiting a friend. He had taken refuge on a rooftop when the trouble started Thursday. According to witnesses, an officer took aim with a shotgun and fired.

The police and national guardsmen broke up the crowd of more than 2,000 marchers and split it into smaller groups.

The new violence came in the fifth day of turmoil that followed the official closing of a plot of university-owned land that had been improved by students as a "people's park."

As tear gas and bayonets were used to stop the 500 marchers advancing on Mr. Heyns's residence, students shouted "Murderer! Murderer!"

Mrs. Heyns, protected by private security guards, was in the house.

SEVEN CLOUDS OF TEAR GAS

Clouds of gas floated across the campus and isolated skirmishes between dissidents and police were reported.

The silent funeral march, led by 25 to 30 faculty members, set off across the university at noon toward the downtown shopping district.

More than 2,000 sympathizers filed behind the leaders. They carried one large yellow placard that read: "Faculty Vigil."

At the edge of the campus, the march was met by a company of guardsmen and a line of Berkeley policemen.

After the crowd was broken up, one segment marched to the chancellor's home. Another part of the crowd marched to the campus administration building. A third group went to Sproul Hall Plaza, where a social welfare professor, Mark Pillsuk, said the National Guard had agreed to permit a funeral vigil.

However, they later were dispersed. A Berkeley policeman said that the order to drop gas from the helicopter had come from the Sheriff, Frank I. Madigan, who is field commander of the operation at the campus.

The Berkeley City Council voted today unanimously to request an investigation by the Alameda County Grand Jury.

It asked the jury to explore the circumstances surrounding the current street violence, the means used to repress the outbreak and the means used to incite the violence.

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1969]

"PEOPLE'S PARK"—NEWEST BATTLEFIELD IN WAR AT BERKELEY

(By Rasa Gustaitis)

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 18.—The "people's park" has become a National Guard encampment.

The muddy University-owned lot where "street people" had laid sod and placed benches and swings and sculpture is now surrounded by an eight-foot wire-mesh fence.

The University of California—backed by police in flak vests—shut the park down at dawn last Thursday. In the disorders that followed, 50 people were arrested and 100 injured, some by police birdshot. On Saturday, a downtown rally was broken up by 500 National Guardsmen.

Today, demonstrators tried to create a second "people's park" on vacant land, but National Guardsmen drove them away with little violence.

The story of this episode in the war between the University and its on-campus and off-campus dissidents goes back almost a year.

Until then the lot was a block of rundown off-campus rooming houses. The University bought the block for about \$1 million, tore down the houses and said it planned—some-time—to develop it for intramural sports fields and eventually for dormitories.

Meanwhile, it was an eyesore. During the winter it turned into a muddy swamp. Later it was used as an informal parking lot.

Four weeks ago, several people in the community—including some of the more radical businessmen, a Berkeley Barb reporter and some veteran activists—decided to turn the lot into a park.

Stu Albert of the Barb wrote an announcement in that paper inviting those interested to come to the lot Sunday, April 20, to dig and plant. About 500 people showed up, including students, faculty members and a lot of "street people"—the scraggly young people who hang out on nearby Telegraph Avenue.

A bulldozer was hired to grade the earth. About an acre of sod was laid. A "people's revolutionary corn garden" and a wide variety of flowers were planted. Walkways were built with bricks from a church being demolished nearby. Swings, a sandbox, benches, sculptures and bulletin boards appeared.

Some merchants on Telegraph Avenue gladly contributed money, hoping that "street people" would turn into "park people" and take their problems—drugs, juvenile runaways—off the sidewalks.

Nobody was in charge of the development. The park seemed to grow spontaneously and was used by hundreds daily. Theater groups and bands came to perform. There was usually a fire going in a pit and sometimes free food was cooked and distributed.

However, to some the park was a problem. Nearby residents complained about noise. Police saw the park as a haven for drug users. The University feared the reaction of the Board of Regents.

Two weeks ago, Chancellor Roger W. Heynes, announced he was willing to modify the design for the planned playing field to include some park facilities. Last week he announced that a fence would be built to reaffirm the University's ownership and stop unauthorized use of the lot.

The fence went up at dawn. The demonstration that followed quickly turned into a riot. Gov. Ronald Reagan called in the National Guard.

Saturday some 500 young people roamed through the downtown area in an effort to close down businesses, then gathered for a rally. More than 1000 National Guardsmen and policemen contained the crowd and it broke up.

Frank Bardacke, a Berkeley activist, told the rally to prepare for a week of peaceful disruption. "It's going to be up to us to stay in the streets longer than they can keep the Guard in the streets," he said. "The only chance we have is to make it so costly to Berkeley that the Regents and the University will have to give in and let us have the park."

Many Guardsmen were uncomfortable with their roles. "It feel s—y," said one, a student at San Jose State College, who sat slumped against the park fence. "The only thing I'd heard about this park was a story in the paper. It showed how nice it was that people were cleaning up an empty lot and planting flowers."

"It doesn't seem like this was necessary," said another Guardsman who was called to duty Friday morning after he had returned from a night job as a machine operator.

One possible way out of the siege is a proposal originating in the University's School of Environmental Design. It would allow the park to continue, under the school's supervision, as an experiment in spontaneous recreational development within a community—in other words, a "people's park."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 19, 1969]

ON THE TOWN: THERE'S TROUBLE COMIN' EVERY DAY

(Ralph J. Gleason)

"I am he as you are he, as you are me and we are all together . . . see how they run like pigs from a gun, see how they fly . . . I'm cryin' . . ." John Lennon and Paul McCartney wrote that in their classic "I Am the Walrus" and the heavy buzzing sound of the police helicopters grew in the sky. "Chicken Little, the sky is falling, the sky is falling," I thought and looked at the National Guard and the Highway Patrol and the rest of the police.

"Look out kid, don't matter what you did" Bob Dylan said it and another line of his comes to mind: "at midnight all the agents and their superhuman crew come out and round up everybody that knows more than they do!"

The smell of tear gas seeped under the door and from the back of the house you could hear the gunshots. "Well, I'm about to get sick from watchin' my TV, I been checkin' out the news until my eyeballs fall to see" Frank Zappa sang and ended his song with ". . . there's trouble comin' every day."

Down the street the ambulances were screaming, lights flashing. Jeeps with National Guard, station wagons with Highway Patrol. Flak suits and gas masks.

And guns. While we sat in our rooms and played records and listened to the magnificent broadcasts of KPFA and watched the TV, they shot people in Berkeley, not in self-defense even, but for standing on a corner. "It's a most distressful country . . . for they're hanging men and women for the wearin' of the green."

Can nobody stop the madness? Anywhere? There was no revolution in Berkeley. There was a muddy lot, let lie fallow by the University for months. Ordinary people, not any kind predominating, made it into a thing of beauty. Then in order to protect themselves from political attack, its legal owners erected a fence and called in the National Guard to play on the children's playthings. And they shot people in the street in Berkeley on Black Thursday in a test to see how far the society would go to enforce a technical right. Is it worth that man facing blindness in the Berkeley hospital? Even the Berkeley Gazette wonders editorially was the shooting necessary. An elected official on radio said "we'll fight them with guns" though God only knows what he was talking about.

There is crazy gas in the world today. In every country, in all the cities. The planet's in turmoil. This society has lost control of its senses. We are shooting people for building wooden benches on a vacant lot!

Nothing I have ever seen on TV or heard on radio or read in the papers has the horrifying effect of the eye witness broadcasts over KPFA.

"Can I use your phone?" the blonde lady with the child in her arms asked at my front door. "They wouldn't let me get back to my car and the tear gas drove me down here." Refugees in Berkeley. Refugees, not from revolutionaries, but from the forces of so-called law and order.

The trouble is, of course, that we insist on legalizing our prejudices. Our board of education wants to legislate morality. The Governor and the University want the troublemakers to go away, white or black. The provocations and the confrontations are all designed to let the munitions salesmen whom we saw in the film of the police chief's convention, make their profits selling their tear gas and their flight jackets and the rest of their riot equipment. Law and order means they can shoot you. That's what it meant in Berkeley on Black Thursday.

Catch-22 said that they can do anything we can't stop them from doing. Joseph Heller is a poetic visionary. So was George Orwell and

Bertolt Brecht. And Kafka. They saw the future in all of its mindless, ignorant brute force terror. Is it really upon us now?

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 21, 1969]

REAGAN CHARGES PARK RIOTS WERE PLANNED: SAYS WEAPONS, MISSILES WERE STOCKPILED FOR DELIBERATE CONFRONTATION IN BERKELEY

(By Tom Goff)

SACRAMENTO.—Gov. Reagan said Tuesday that the Berkeley "people's park" riots were caused by "a well-prepared and well-armed mass of people who had stockpiled all kinds of weapons and missiles."

Police intelligence and other information available to him showed the upheaval was "a deliberate and planned attempt at confrontation" and not a spontaneous reaction to a cause, he said.

Rioting started in Berkeley last Thursday when the University of California moved to clear and fence in a parcel of university-owned land that had been taken over by so-called "street people" as a hangout and a park.

The university said the land was needed for development as a soccer field.

One youth was fatally wounded in the rioting and scores, including about 50 police officers, were injured.

Reagan sent units of the California National Guard to the area and imposed a 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew after local officials said they could not contain the uprising.

Reagan said he assumed the dead youth—James Rector, 25, of San Jose—was shot by a law enforcement officer.

He told a Capitol news conference such things were part of the tragedy of "this entire attempt at revolution."

In the current school year, he said, four persons have died violently at or near California college and university campuses.

"How much farther do we have to go to realize that this is not just another party raid?" he asked.

NOT YOUNGSTERS' WORK

Reagan said none of the disturbances which have been occurring at Berkeley and elsewhere could be considered "simply the acts of youngsters sowing their wild oats or seriously and legitimately questioning our society and its values."

Preceding the most recent Berkeley outbursts, he said, campus officials had announced repeatedly that the property in question was scheduled for conversion to a soccer field at this time.

"But despite these warnings," he said, "those who wanted a confrontation sought to convert that property for their own use."

The governor insisted that the university timetable calls for the use of the disputed land now. He indicated, however, that action to fence it in last week may have been prompted by a petition from adjacent residents.

He said the petition was signed by 48 residents who asked for "prompt and decisive action" to clear the property.

It made seven points, the governor said: Activities in the "park" were causing "great distress" in the neighborhood.

Drums, shouting and other crowd noises lasted nightly until 2 or 3 a.m.

"Garbage and human faces" littered the area and the neighborhood.

Bonfires were burned day and night without permits.

"Drug pushers and addicts" were "seen" in the area.

Residents had been stopped for handouts and were threatened if they did not comply.

Water and bricks were stolen from nearby sources.

Reagan referred to those who used the park as street gangs, "most not directly associated with the university but who have the support of 'a few campus radicals.'"

He said threats were made that if the university closed off the area, retaliations would occur, including \$5 million damage to campus buildings.

The university decided to clear the park and fence it last Thursday. It sent workmen accompanied by some 250 police officers to do the job "in the early hours of dawn," Reagan said.

"After the property was cleared, mob violence erupted and additional police were called to the scene," the governor added.

"On that day, police took a tremendous and unprovoked beating from a well-prepared and well-armed mass of people who had stockpiled all kinds of weapons and missiles.

"They included pieces of steel rods as well as bricks, large rocks, chunks of cement, iron pipes, etc."

At one point, Reagan said, a can of gasoline was thrown at a group of officers.

"Dissidents stood on fire escapes and roof tops and showered officers with steel bars, rocks and chunks of cement. One officer was stabbed in the chest with a thrown dagger," he added.

The governor said the police responded with tear gas and shotguns loaded with bird-shot.

"This was done only to protect life and property and in response to felonious assaults with deadly weapons," he said.

He responded to a plea from local officials for National Guard help when local agencies, including mutual-aid police forces, could not contain the situation, the governor said.

"I want to make it clear now that the National Guard, or whatever resources they can provide, must and will be made available to local officials when they ask for it," he added.

Reagan said he was "opposed to proposals that the police be forbidden to use firearms in dealing with civil disturbances."

The governor indicated he was convinced of the conspiracy aspects of the case because of the presence at Berkeley of people associated with student and similar disturbances at Berkeley earlier and elsewhere in the country.

When pressed for names he said the list would include Tom Hayden, a leader in the Students for a Democratic Society movement, and Mario Savio, a leader in earlier student outbursts at Berkeley.

ANTISMOKING PRESSURE DANGEROUS TO HEALTH OF CONGRESS

(Mr. STUBBLEFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished committee of the House of Representatives is now deliberating the difficult and controversial question of whether cigarette smoking is dangerous to health. But I have made up my mind. I am convinced that antismoking pressure is dangerous to the health of this Congress.

I am not being flippant. The threat of the constitutional lawmaking function of this body is real. It is particularly galling that it comes from two regulatory agencies which are the very creatures of Congress itself.

Not content to wait for the House to complete its decisionmaking, the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission have served notice that they will act against cigarette advertising. The FCC intends to ban all cigarette advertising from

radio and television. The FTC proposes to force every cigarette advertisement to carry a warning far harsher than any yet put forward.

Mr. Speaker, the two regulatory agencies are in effect holding a gun to Congress and saying, "Do it our way, or else." The overwhelming majority of Members denounce the violent tactics and non-negotiable demands of student radicals on campuses across the Nation. But I ask, are the FTC and FCC pressure tactics any different? I submit they are not. I submit that the breakdown of constitutional processes and traditional practices is not confined to the college campus or the ghetto streets.

I submit that the two regulatory agencies are behaving with the same disregard for lawful and orderly processes as student radicals and street corner militants. It is unseemly behavior for a group of beardless, middle-aged commissioners. And I think it is high time for this Congress to exercise some parental discipline on its offspring. A trip to the woodshed may be definitely in order.

MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING AND ENFORCING TITLE VI OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), chairman of the Democratic study group task force on civil rights and minority affairs, brought to the attention of the Members of Congress the shocking failures of the Department of Agriculture to enforce laws against discrimination in Federal programs. I await with great interest the response to his letter to Secretary Hardin in which he asks what steps will be taken to implement the recommendations of the Attorney General to end the racially segregated and unequal services provided by the USDA.

In fact, it is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture has now begun to study the recommendations of the Attorney General. Within a day of receipt of Mr. EDWARDS letter, the Department scheduled a meeting to consider this matter.

Because of the vital importance of this issue to so many of our citizens and because the report to which Mr. EDWARDS referred, "The Mechanism for Implementing and Enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," has not been available to the Members of Congress and the public, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING AND ENFORCING TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

In the Winter of 1967-68, staff of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights conducted interviews with officials of the Office of Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, the Office of Inspector General, the Office of General Counsel, the Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation and ten agencies of the Department of Agriculture who administer programs subject to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The purpose of this effort was to review

the mechanism for implementing Title VI as it had been established within the Department.

The following report is based upon these interviews and an analysis of materials developed by the Department pertaining to their Title VI enforcement program. It is intended as an internal working document for the information and use of the agency concerned.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The organization, staffing, and assignment of the equal opportunity function in the Department of Agriculture as presently constructed does not provide the most effective implementation and enforcement of Federal and Departmental equal opportunity policies and regulations. An Office of Equal Opportunity should be established under the Secretary with responsibility for and authority to coordinate, implement and enforce Federal and Departmental equal opportunity policy, including the power to command agency performance.

The Department of Agriculture does not uniformly conduct evaluations which meaningfully measure the relative impact and benefits of agriculture programs and services upon potential and actual minority group program participants. Agencies of USDA should be required to collect racial and ethnic participation data in their programs and a program evaluation unit should be established within the Office of Equal Opportunity to provide independent analysis of such data.

No effective program for civil rights training of agency program staffs and employees of agriculture programs at the state and local level exists in the Department of Agriculture. As a result, agency administrators and program personnel are not sufficiently informed of equal opportunity policies and are not equipped to implement and enforce these policies. As a further result, communication with minority group beneficiaries is poor or non-existent. A civil rights training unit should be established within the Office of Equal Opportunity to develop programs for sensitizing agriculture officials to minority group problems and providing them with the techniques and knowledge necessary for conducting meaningful equal opportunity enforcement.

Compliance reporting and review methods presently in use do not adequately inform the Department of Agriculture of the status of equal opportunity compliance in its programs. Under the direction of the Office of Equal Opportunity, adequate methods for assessing equal opportunity compliance, including quantitative measurements of minority group participation in agricultural programs, and field reviews incorporating "across the board" program measurements, must be developed. In addition to agency compliance reporting and review efforts, the Office of Equal Opportunity should have sufficient staff to monitor agency reporting and review activity and to perform independent compliance reviews in the field.

Although the most significant activity in equal opportunity compliance within the Department of Agriculture is currently being conducted by the Office of Inspector General, the effectiveness of this activity is limited by the failure of agency administrators to respond adequately to OIG audit and report findings. The Office of Equal Opportunity must have the authority to direct that necessary corrective action, based on OIG findings, be implemented within agencies of the Department. Furthermore, the activity of the Inspector General does not relieve the Office of Equal Opportunity or the agencies of the Department of their own compliance reporting and review and program evaluation responsibilities.

ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

Responsibility for Title VI implementation and enforcement in the Department of Agriculture resides in agencies of the Department

administering programs subject to that title.³ Coordination of the Department's Title VI efforts is the responsibility of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights and a staff of eight persons.

A. Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights

The position of Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights was created on January 22, 1965, and is filled by Mr. William M. Seabron. Mr. Seabron is responsible for (1) assisting agency heads to develop and promulgate policies which will result in compliance with Title VI; (2) aiding in the implementation of civil rights policies and (3) interpreting Federal policy, counseling and rendering assistance and guidance to achieve reasonable and consistent action.⁴

Mr. Seabron is the Secretary's staff representative who coordinates and directs day-to-day activities relating to the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁵ While agency administrators are responsible for implementing and enforcing the Department's civil rights policies and for measuring the effectiveness of providing equal opportunity, Mr. Seabron maintains review authority over all proposed agency actions with civil rights impact so as to provide the Department uniform efficient and coordinated implementation.⁴

Mr. Seabron has been delegated the authority to make determinations that compliance cannot be achieved by voluntary means and for taking or authorizing action to achieve compliance by other means authorized by law as stated in 7 CFR 15.8 (a) and (d).⁶ He is further delegated the authority to issue orders giving notice of opportunity for hearing and to arrange for the designation of hearing examiners to preside over proceedings.⁶ He may also order proceedings and hearings in the Department of Agriculture . . . consolidated for hearing with proceedings of other Federal departments and agencies.⁷

Mr. Seabron views his role as that of a coordinator but not as an implementer or enforcer of Department policy. Department guidance is unclear on this point. Although agency administrators are said to be responsible for implementing and enforcing the Department's civil rights policy, Mr. Seabron has responsibility to coordinate and *direct* (emphasis supplied) the day-to-day activities relating to the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁸ Where agency administrators fail to perform their duties relative to Title VI, as has been documented both by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the USDA Office of Inspector General,⁹ it is clear that the Secretary must provide the implementing and enforcing power for the Department. This responsibility should be combined in the Secretary's chief responsible official for the administration of Title VI matters.

Whereas execution and performance ultimately must be expected from agency administrators, the Secretary must have clear authority to command that performance. The present arrangement, whereby the Secretary's representative for civil rights matters lacks the authority to command agency performance, permits agency administrators to weaken Department efforts to achieve a unified and consistent approach to compliance. As evidence of this, Mr. Seabron's staff cited occasions when their requests for action by an agency have been ignored altogether.

An example of how one agency was able to effectively thwart attempts to carry out an equal opportunity matter concerns the efforts of Mr. Seabron to secure an equal employment opportunity procedure for employees of the Cooperative Extension Service. Acting in response to issues first raised by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its 1965 report which demonstrated inequality and segregation in salaries, assignments, facilities, and services for Negro extension

agents, in July 1966 Mr. Seabron initiated, staffed, and received approval for a Departmental complaint procedure for extension workers who felt they had been denied equal employment opportunity because of racial discrimination. The procedure, although signed by the Assistant Secretary for Administration, was withdrawn by Department officials upon the report of the Administrator of the Federal Extension Service, who met with the State officials in August, that the procedure would be resisted by the States. Thereafter it was agreed that a committee of the Association of Land-Grant College Presidents would work cooperatively with the Department of Agriculture to develop a procedure which the States would agree to. Such a procedure was anticipated by January 1967. It was not until January 1968, following an opinion by the Department of Justice supportive of Mr. Seabron's efforts, that it was determined to push ahead on the promulgation of a regulation establishing procedures which, in the main, were first suggested by Mr. Seabron 18 months before. In May, a proposed regulation was published in the Federal Register.

Not only is Mr. Seabron limited by the arbitrary response of agency administrators, he is limited, in practice, by the interposition of other staff advisors to the Secretary.¹⁰ This is illustrated by a remark of Mr. Seabron during Commission staff interviews to the effect that the only way he could be sure that the Secretary sees something he (Mr. Seabron) thinks is important is to hand-carry it to the Secretary's office because if he sent it through the Department's mail system, "somebody else usually decides if the Secretary should see it."

These forces combine to isolate Mr. Seabron and insulate the Secretary from dealing effectively with the pressing problems of civil rights in the Department of Agriculture.

B. Staff of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights

The Deputy to the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, Mr. William W. Layton, is responsible primarily for equal employment opportunity and contract compliance matters. In the Title VI areas, there is a civil rights compliance officer, Mr. John W. Slusser, who directs the activity of a three-man liaison office, staffed by equal opportunity specialists and a four-man field office of field civil rights specialists (based in Washington). At the time of Commission staff interviews, the liaison office was completely staffed and the field office had three of its four authorized positions filled.

The liaison office maintains contact with the various agencies of the Department. Each staff member is responsible for two or more agencies. The liaison office follows up on complaints involving the agencies and may conduct reviews of the agency compliance review procedures. They do not perform any program evaluation function. The field office maintains informal liaison with minority groups, arranges for informational meetings at the local level, and attempts to resolve conflicts or misunderstandings involving agency programs. They do not perform complaint investigations or compliance reviews. They are not authorized to negotiate instances of noncompliance uncovered in the course of their activities.

The Commission questions if the most efficient use is being made of the civil rights compliance staff members. While granting the desirability of liaison and good public relations, the limits placed upon the authority of these staff members (as detailed above) also limit their effectiveness in achieving compliance in agency programs.

C. Budgeting for Civil Rights Compliance Activity

One measure of the priority assigned to civil rights enforcement is the amount of money Federal agencies allocate for that purpose. The Department of Agriculture has no identifiable budget line item for civil

rights enforcement as does the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All funds for this activity come from the Secretary's contingency budget.

In July 1966, the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights submitted a proposed budget for civil rights compliance and enforcement activity. Coupled with the proposed activity of the Office of Plant and Operations, the Office of Inspector General, and the Office of Personnel (and not including the compliance activity of the various agencies), the total need was estimated by the Office of Budget and Finance to be \$493,600—a 67 percent increase over the amount then expended for civil rights in the Department. In a September 30, 1966, memorandum from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, the following was stated:¹¹

"I believe that we are making a sad factual error to ask for any additional funds in the Secretary's Office above the existing \$295,000 for civil rights work in 1968. . . . It is my firm opinion that if we attempt to secure additional funds for this work at this time we will not only prevail, but that we will cause ourselves added miseries in other areas."

One can only speculate as to the specifics in the mind of the Assistant Secretary for Administration although it may be surmised that his position was undoubtedly related to the well-known antipathy of certain Congressional committee chairmen toward civil rights matters. Commission staff received the impression that this memorandum was sufficient to deter any future requests for funding sufficient to staff an adequate compliance program in the Department of Agriculture. No attempt was made by Mr. Seabron to reintroduce a request for expanded civil rights compliance activity for FY 1968 or FY 1969.

D. Agency civil rights staffing

Only one agency, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, had a full-time civil rights staff position at the time of Commission staff interviews. Two other agencies, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Federal Extension Service, were considering hiring full-time civil rights specialists. A table reflecting USDA Agency Title VI staffing is at Appendix C.

Every agency has designated a "civil rights coordinator" who serves as a contact point between the agency and the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights but routine work in civil rights matters is usually delegated to program staff having other duties. This arrangement often makes the adequacy of an agency's civil rights compliance effort dependent on the time staff assigned additional civil rights duties can devote to civil rights matters. For example, the staff person for civil rights in the Forest Service, Mr. W. D. Giffen, impressed the Commission staff as exceptionally diligent in carrying out his duties. To a large degree the same opinion was obtained regarding the staff person for civil rights compliance in the Rural Electrification Administration, Mr. Richard M. Hausler.

Three agencies with programs of significant equal opportunity impact but without full-time civil rights staff, the Federal Extension Service, the Consumer and Marketing Service, and the Farmers Home Administration, require the establishment of full-time staffs for equal opportunity matters.¹²

E. The Office of the Inspector General

The Office of Inspector General has responsibility for the audit and complaint investigation function in the Department.¹³ (The activity of this Office is discussed in greater detail under "Complaints" and "Audits.")

F. The Office of General Counsel

The Director of the Research and Operations Division of the Office of General Counsel, Mr. Merwin W. Kaye, has primary responsibility for legal review and advice regarding Departmental civil rights matters. In addition to providing advice on the legal

Footnotes at end of article.

sufficiency of Departmental policy and regulations relating to Title VI, Mr. Kaye also handles all legal aspects where noncompliance results in notices of hearings.

Mr. Kaye has a staff attorney who spends approximately three-fourths of his time on Title VI matters.

G. Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation

The Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation has responsibility for assisting the agencies of the Department in developing adequate systems of program evaluation relating to minority group participation in programs administered by the Department. (The activity of this committee is discussed in greater detail under "Program Evaluation.")

H. Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights

The Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights was established in April 1965 to (1) review Department policies and practices which promote equality of opportunity; (2) advise the Secretary as to the effectiveness of program directives designed to achieve compliance with Title VI; and (3) recommend changes in Department regulations to assure that Department practices are free of racial discrimination.²⁴

Commission staff did not interview any Committee member but did review minutes of several Committee meetings. The review indicated that the Committee has made a considerable number of recommendations to the Secretary for a more effective Department policy regarding civil rights.

I. Organization at field level

No civil rights specialists are assigned at the field level of Department agencies. Program staff with other full time duties are assigned to compliance review and liaison with State and local entities for the implementation and enforcement of Title VI. While the number and variety of agricultural programs to be monitored undoubtedly necessitates the use of program people at the field level for this function, the degree to which this arrangement provides accurate and meaningful information on the state of civil rights compliance in the program is subject to question. First, the structure of compliance reporting and review mechanisms does not provide a complete picture of compliance or the lack of compliance. Second, the competence of program people who are untrained in reporting and review procedures and who may be insensitive to the complexities of minority group problems to perform this activity is far from acceptable. Third, the practice of using program people who may have little interest in finding fault with their own or other programs to engage in self-criticism is one whose results may be suspect.

An alternative to depending upon local level program people for civil rights compliance review is to employ civil rights specialists, working under the direction of the Department's Office of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights and possibly located at the regional offices of the Office of Inspector General, who would have general responsibility for monitoring and directing the Department's civil rights implementation responsibilities in agricultural programs within the region.

TRAINING

The Department of Agriculture has no overall formal training program for civil rights. Furthermore, with the single exception of the Office of Inspector General, no agency of the Department has a civil rights training program.²⁵ Aside from the training activity of the Office of Inspector General, an estimated 336 agricultural personnel are reported to have received training in civil rights, almost all of which was conducted by

the Civil Service Commission.²⁶ There was little evidence that this latter training experience had filtered down to other agency personnel and no evidence that it had inspired the development of an in-house civil rights training program within the agencies. Reaction to the Civil Service training was mixed with a common complaint being that such training rarely addressed itself to the specific problems encountered in agricultural programs.

Two officials interviewed stated they felt that civil rights training would be more effective if the background and duties of persons attending were more similar. One agency official (Farmers Home Administration) stated he saw no need for civil rights training in his agency.

On several occasions, officials indicated that they considered meetings with staff and State and local program people as training. An examination of the content of such meetings indicates that they were used primarily to communicate policy but did not provide training that would equip program people to relate to minority group problems or to perform investigations and compliance reviews. (In this latter regard, Commission staff found that the use of the Commission's *Compliance Officer's Manual* had been uneven. At least two agencies claimed that they had never seen the manual.)

Only one agency's instructions implementing Title VI specifically call for being informed of State plans for providing staff training in civil rights.²⁷ A review of the plans for compliance submitted by three Southern States (selected at random by the agency at the request of Commission staff) indicated that only one of the State plans was responsive to this requirement.²⁸

Mr. Seabron indicated that the Department has a training officer and that the matter of a civil rights training program had been discussed but that no training program had been developed as a result. He stated that he would prefer that there be centralized responsibility for civil rights training but that "you just don't get to things like 'training' when you operate on a shoe string."

ASSURANCES

Assurance forms used by the Department of Agriculture generally follow the pattern established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Form 441B). Of over 7,500 assurances required, 165 incidences of refusal to file were still under negotiation and 33 filed but unacceptable assurances were still under negotiations as of the close of the third quarter of 1967.²⁹ Just why so many cases are still considered "under negotiation" is probably a function of the fact that the Department of Agriculture has developed no policy guidelines specifying time limits for attempting to obtain voluntary compliance before enforcement action is begun. It is notable that only one agency, the Rural Electrification Administration, established target dates for assurances to be filed.³⁰ Also, there is an undoubted reluctance on the part of the Department to proceed against noncompliance to the point of cutting off funds. This is illustrated by the fact that the Department has issued only six cut-off orders, all in the Forest Service and all pursuant to the lead of HEW.³¹

PLANS FOR COMPLIANCE

In accordance with 7 CFR 15.4 (b), the Department of Agriculture Title VI regulations, the Federal Extension Service required plans for compliance from 15 Southern States. This was the only agency to classify its program as a "continuing State program" subject to the requirement of a plan for compliance. This approach resulted in long, drawn out negotiations with the States. The review and acceptance procedure for compliance plans in the Federal Extension Service did not call for review by the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights. One State's plan, Louisiana, was still not

accepted at the time of Commission staff interviews. No enforcement procedures against Louisiana had been undertaken, although the target date for compliance had been established by the Administrator of FES as December 31, 1965.³² Furthermore, an examination of a random selection of State plans for compliance revealed that the Federal Extension Service accepted plans which, in the opinion of Commission staff, were patently inadequate. Plans which were accepted lacked the degree of specificity that might reasonably assure that compliance was possible. That such compliance was not achieved was documented in an open meeting conducted by the Georgia State Advisory Commission in Macon, Georgia, in May 1966.³³ Thus, the "plans for compliance" method for implementing Title VI has been rendered virtually useless because it was not used effectively, there was no consultation with the chief civil rights officer of the Department, and no meaningful followup action on non-compliance was instituted.

COMPLAINTS

The Departmental complaint procedure on matters regarding civil rights calls for all complaints to be referred to the Office of Inspector General for investigation in a manner determined by the Inspector General.³⁴ Investigation reports are forwarded to the head of the agency concerned for determination whether further proceedings are warranted. An information copy of the report goes to the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights. If differences of interpretation of the findings occur between the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights and the agency concerned, an attempt to resolve the difference is made in a joint meeting with the agency head, the Assistant Secretary responsible for that agency, and the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights.

Commission staff reviewed a sampling of OIG complaint investigation files and found that, in general, complaints were thoroughly investigated by Office of Inspector General staff. The complaint system fails, however, when agency heads do not take appropriate action based on the findings of the investigation report.

Investigation report T-603-20 was reviewed by Commission staff. The complaint was received in June 1966 alleging extensive noncompliance in the Texas State Cooperative Extension Service. A 35 page investigation report, containing 16 exhibits, and involving 322½ man-hours of investigation and preparation, was completed in August 1966. An additional report involving 92¼ man-hours of investigation and preparation was completed in October 1966. The Federal Extension Service was not ready to advise the complainant until June 1967, almost nine months after the investigation was completed, that no Title VI violations had been found (although the investigation report clearly indicated that, among other findings, segregation in 4-H Clubs was determined) and that allegations involving discrimination in employment practices (also substantiated by the investigation report) were being referred to the State Extension Director for resolution. The Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights took exception to the proposed FES response, noting in particular the finding of segregated 4-H clubs. In October, FES correspondence to the complainant admitted that segregated 4-H Clubs were found but rationalized that such segregation merely reflected the racial composition of the community. The employment issues were completely avoided.

The failure of the agency of jurisdiction to act upon findings of investigation reports, as noted in this example, supports the need for the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights to have final review authority as to findings in complaint investigations and the determination as to necessary action to be taken.

That complaints have effected change in

²⁵Footnotes at end of article.

USDA agency policies is demonstrated by at least two known examples. In the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service a response to a complaint, outlining specific procedures regarding community committeemen elections, was considered by the Commission to be so informative that ASCS was persuaded to publish a pamphlet on the subject specifically directed to minority group farm operators. Another complaint, initiated in part by the Commission's field staff in Memphis, Tennessee, regarding the fact that the Farmers Home Administration insures recreation loans to segregated facilities resulted in a Department of Justice advisory opinion that such loans are covered by the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI.

While the process of reacting to individual complaints is useful, this is not to say that an agency's compliance program should be based on a complaint-oriented procedure. Far too often agency staff who were interviewed indicated that their programs must be in compliance "because we have not received any complaints." Reacting solely to complaints is no substitute for effective compliance review and program evaluation.

COMPLIANCE REPORTS

The Department of Agriculture Title VI Regulations state:

"Each recipient shall keep such records and submit to the agency timely, complete and accurate compliance reports at such times, and in such form and containing information, as the Agency may determine to be necessary to ascertain whether the recipient has complied or is complying with the regulations in this part."²⁵

A variety of reporting mechanisms are in use by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Four agencies—Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Farmers Cooperative Service, and the Soil Conservation Service—have no compliance reporting requirements whatsoever. The compliance activity of ARS is ostensibly covered under the HEW coordination plan for higher education. Programs of SCS have significant equal opportunity impact. FCS programs have significant implications for self-help development programs for low-income rural residents. Programs of CSRS have no major civil rights impact.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service reports on the number of agreements made and the number of recipients refusing to sign an agreement in the Cropland Conservation Program. There is also a quarterly report of field reviews made which includes the number of agreements, any complaints received and any instances of noncompliance. These reports are obtained to fulfill Department requirements as part of a quarterly Title VI status report made to the Department of Justice.

The Rural Electrification Administration requires an annual compliance report from its borrowers (cooperatives) consisting of eleven "yes-no" questions with explanations required on all "no" answers.²⁶ The report form includes items on services, facilities, applications for membership and the communication by borrowers of a statement of a nondiscrimination policy to all members. Reports are filed with area offices and reviewed by REA field officials who conduct normal liaison activity with borrower cooperatives. Any report indicating noncompliance is automatically forwarded to Washington. In addition, reports are randomly spot checked by the directors of the electric and telephone divisions of REA. The usefulness of this report was doubted by REA officials interviewed by Commission staff but subsequent to this a request was made by REA to the Bureau of the Budget to extend use of the form for another year.

The Forest Service provides in its Manual that compliance reports may be required but

the only form universally used is one to ascertain the information on assurances, reports, reviews, complaints and noncompliance action required in the Department of Justice Quarterly Title VI Report.²⁷

The Farmers Home Administration requires a monthly report on compliance to be compiled by area supervisors, consolidated by the State Director and forwarded to the Washington office. The report consists of a standardized form listing by race the number of borrowers by category of loan, the number of applications made and the number of loans made by category of loan.²⁸

The Consumer and Marketing Service requires a seven-item compliance report covering summer camps participating in commodity programs. This questionnaire obtains racial breakdowns of attendance at the camps. Ten of these questionnaires, selected at random by C&MS officials at the request of Commission staff, were reviewed. Seven of the ten indicated varying degrees of bi-racial attendance. C&MS does not have any compliance reporting requirements on its major programs with equal opportunity implications: School Lunch, Special Milk, Direct Distribution and Food Stamps.

The Federal Extension Service has no compliance reporting system currently in use. Quarterly progress reports on action taken in States submitting plans for compliance were formerly required but were abandoned in 1966 in favor of a supplement to the State's annual statistical report which would indicate the number of minority group persons participating in extension programs. This supplement provides no information which could be used to ascertain compliance.

Given the fact that the compliance reporting systems in use by USDA agencies provide such little information on the state of compliance in programs and the fact that there is no systematic method for verifying the information provided, either the reporting systems must be upgraded to the point that they can serve as a useful tool for assessing compliance or they should be abandoned all together. Quite likely a considerable saving of time, money and effort could be realized by dropping the requirement for compliance reporting and concentrating on establishing successful program statistical reports to be used in the program evaluation function. The latter approach, in conjunction with an expanded compliance review system, would likely provide a more meaningful approach to measuring compliance in USDA programs.

COMPLIANCE REVIEW

The Department of Agriculture Title VI Regulations provide:

As a normal part of the administration of programs covered by the regulations in this part, designated personnel will in their program reviews and other activities or as specifically directed by the agency, review the activities of the recipient to determine whether they are complying with the regulations in this part.²⁹

The compliance review function, if adequately constructed and properly carried out, should be the chief method whereby an agency informs itself as to the state of compliance in its programs. As conducted by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, compliance reviews do not provide such information.

Compliance reviews are generally conducted by program staff (or in some cases, State officials) who have not been trained in compliance review techniques. On-site observation and interviews, usually with other program staff of the recipient (but seldom with minority group beneficiaries) are the chief methods for carrying out this function. Compliance review instruments are usually "yes-no" questionnaires lacking the specificity required for an accurate assessment of compliance. Records are seldom examined by reviewers.

Of 14,360 compliance reviews reported to have been accomplished by USDA agencies

in the third quarter of calendar year 1967, only 14 instances of noncompliance were identified.³⁰ This ratio of noncompliance found to compliance reviews conducted does not square with reports of investigation and audits conducted by the Office of Inspector General (see "Audits" later in this section on compliance procedures) or with information developed by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights during its investigations and State Advisory Committee meetings and thus raises serious doubts as to the adequacy of the compliance review effort in the Department.

All Title VI agencies of the Department of Agriculture, except the Agricultural Research Service, whose reviews are conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the HEW Coordination Plan, have some sort of program of compliance review.

The Cooperative State Research Service has developed an eight-item compliance checklist³¹ for use by its Program Review Directors. The checklist covers such items as facilities, minority group participation, mailing lists, and information to minority groups. Four of these checklists, selected at random, were provided Commission staff for review. No noncompliance was indicated in any of the checklists.

The Rural Electrification Administration provides a checklist of nondiscrimination practices to be completed by its operations field representatives during their first visit of the year made to each borrower.³² The checklist consists of eleven "yes-no" questions covering such areas as applications for membership, services rendered, facilities, and attendance at meetings. These checklists are reviewed in the area offices and forwarded to Washington only if noncompliance is indicated. Ten of these checklists were randomly selected for Commission staff review. None of the checklists indicated any noncompliance.

The Farmer Cooperative Service has a six-item "yes-no" checklist³³ which is completed by the branch chief or project leader whenever advisory service to a cooperative is provided. The checklist covers such items as applications, services, and meetings. Eight of the checklists, randomly selected at the request of Commission staff were reviewed with negative results recorded on all eight. A review of the FCS staff instruction No. 66, December 10, 1965, indicates that information on minority group membership, complaints, and notification to all members is required in these reviews but these questions do not appear on the FCS form currently in use.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service has an eleven question compliance review form on its Title VI program agreements.³⁴ The questions are generally "yes-no" but explanations for "no" answers are required. Eleven of these forms were reviewed by Commission staff with no indication of noncompliance found. On one form there was an indication that the reviewer had interviewed persons in addition to the primary recipient. On two forms Negroes were referred to in the lower case (negroes).

ASCS instructions also provide for an annual review of cooperative marketing associations.³⁵ There is no form in use but the guidelines indicate that reviewers are to observe the facilities, examine records and question employees and patrons. Seventeen items are covered in the guidelines of which five relate to matters with equal opportunity implications.

The Forest Service incorporates compliance review into its elaborate inspection system.³⁶ The inspection guide covers such items as assurances, equal employment opportunity, general Title VI compliance, complaints, facilities, and minority group contracts. Five narrative reports covering general program reviews as well as reports from four reviews of the cooperative forestry program and three

Footnotes at end of article.

land use permit reviews were reviewed by Commission staff. No noncompliance was indicated in any of the reports reviewed.

The Soil Conservation Service provides for only a minor amount of program review in accordance with its inspection guide. The only reference to civil rights compliance review in the Soil Conservation Service is listed under the heading of "productivity" and asks for a reference to "work with low income groups."³⁶

The Farmers Home Administration provides for an annual compliance review of loan activity to be conducted by county supervisors.³⁷ No format is specified however. Reports of these reviews in three States were provided Commission staff for review but the reports were found to list only the case numbers reviewed with the simple notation that no noncompliance was indicated.

In the major programs of the Consumer and Marketing Service subject to Title VI, compliance review activity is largely performed by personnel of the State agency administering consumer food programs. A compliance review checklist of seven questions was suggested by C&MS for State use but the States have generally incorporated the questions into their overall program reviews as they saw fit. This situation caused the Office of Inspector General, in its Phase II audit, to recommend that C&MS require the performance of more uniform and comprehensive NSL (National School Lunch) compliance reviews by State agencies by requiring CEPDO's (Commodity Food Program District Offices) to review and approve review guidelines developed by the State agencies.³⁸

In the details of the OIG Audit the conclusion was reached that "management and operating officials of Consumer and Marketing Service (C&MS) did not have an adequate means for determining whether discrimination was taking place in the conduct of the National School Lunch (NSL) Program." While the observations above relate only to the School Lunch Program, Commission staff believe the same is equally true for the other consumer food programs administered by C&MS. The OIG audit went on to say that "information contained in the State agency compliance reviews lacked depth in coverage and were not uniform in scope" and that C&MS guidelines did not prescribe techniques that would provide management officials with needed civil rights information.³⁹

The Federal Extension Service has no system for overall continuing compliance review. A random sampling review of approximately 60 counties each was performed by FES Washington staff in 1965 and 1966. Although the review was rather extensive, the Office of Inspector General Audit of the Federal Extension Service remarked of the Fiscal Year 1966 reports "... the reviews were not as meaningful as they could have been because information was obtained principally through interviews with CES (Cooperative Extension Service) employees. The reviews did not contain independent verifications of the information received through interviews, and no independent evaluation was made of the extent of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964."⁴⁰

The Administrator of the Federal Extension Service, when interviewed by Commission staff, stated that no return visits had been made to counties where noncompliance was indicated to see if conditions found in the reviews had been corrected. He also stated that the Office of Inspector General audits now contained reviews of civil rights matters and that "this is our method of seeing how progress is getting along."⁴¹

The lack of adequate compliance review machinery in the ASCS, FHA, and SCS is partially offset by procedures for obtaining statistical data regarding minority group participation. ASCS obtains information on

minority group participation in its programs for 580 counties in 24 States where minorities constitute ten percent or more of the farm operators. SCS also obtains information on minority group participation but only for Southeastern States and only for Negroes. FHA makes extensive analysis of its loan programs by race of loan recipient, type of loan received, and amount of loan. The FHA analyses have not yet compared such data by economic class or net worth, as was done in the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1965 report, *Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs*, but the FHA guidelines for loan analyses for this year will include such comparisons.

The compliance review systems in use by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture are not serving the purpose of providing a meaningful measurement of compliance. Part of this failure stems from the fact that untrained program staff (and in some cases state program staff) are used to perform these reviews. Another failing of the compliance review function results from the inadequacy of the instruments used and the inadequacy of methods used. Meaningful measurement of compliance cannot, as a rule, be obtained by asking questions that can be checked either "yes" or "no" on a form. Questions of "how," "why," "where," "who" "when" and "how many" must be asked as follow-up. Similarly, objective assessments of compliance cannot be obtained by limiting the review to interviews of program staff. Interviews of minority group employees and beneficiaries must be conducted. Visual observations must be made. Economic and social data must be collected. Program records must be examined. Finally, the quantitative and qualitative level of compliance review desired cannot be obtained unless overall agency guidelines for compliance review are developed and Departmental policy is coordinated. Especially needed are guidelines specifying the use of compliance reviews and the enforcement actions that will flow from situations where noncompliance is indicated.

AUDITS

The Office of Inspector General performs all audit and investigative activities of the Department. The purpose of this activity is to provide the Secretary with independent and objective examinations of the Department's programs to assure him that existing laws, policies, and programs are effectively complied with.

Audit findings are referred to agency officials responsible for the agency's civil rights functions. They are discussed with the agency and the agency's response is usually noted in the audit report. The agency's actions in response are also reported to the Office of Inspector General. Discrepancies noted in an audit become items for special review in the next scheduled audit.

The term "audit" may be considered synonymous with "compliance review" when considered as a function except that in practice the audits conducted by the Office of Inspector General are more thorough than the compliance reviews performed by the USDA agencies. The Inspector General, Mr. Lester P. Condon, stated very forcefully to Commission staff his belief that the investigative and auditing (review) functions should be separated from the interpretative and enforcement functions. This was interpreted by Commission staff as referring to the specific activities of the OIG. But as a general principle, unless there are large increases in the civil rights staffing within the Department of Agriculture—a doubtful prospect—compliance reviews will probably continue to be performed in large part by the agencies themselves. The inadequacy of the present system of compliance review used by the agencies has already been commented on in the previous section.

Civil rights audits conducted so far by OIG have demonstrated extensive noncompliance and overall program weaknesses in

several agencies.⁴² These findings are in sharp contrast to the picture of compliance represented in other reporting activities of the Department.

The degree to which OIG audit findings have been used by the Department of Agriculture to reorient its civil rights policies is questionable, since many of the findings of Phase I were found to be uncorrected in Phase II, a year later.⁴³ This fact notwithstanding, however, it is apparent that the Office of Inspector General, through its complaint investigation and audit activities, is the single most influential factor, both actually and potentially, in effecting change in the civil rights record of the Department. Their methodology may well serve as an example for other government agencies in testing the effectiveness of Federal government civil rights policies and procedures.

In 1965, a small unit within the Office of Inspector General initiated a three phase, long range program, to assess the status of equal opportunity in Departmental programs. Phases I (Title VI and contract compliance activities in eight agencies and offices at the Washington level) and II (Title VI and contract compliance activities and equal employment opportunity in approximately 135 offices of seven to eight agencies at the field level) have been completed, Phase III, to be completed in calendar year 1968, involves the preparation of a civil rights guide for audits which are performed at field levels. The guide is being incorporated into regular program audits to insure that equal opportunity matters are covered in each of some 5,000 program audits performed annually. A preliminary review of the audit guide by Commission staff indicates that the audit guide will be a significant step in assessing the status of equal opportunity in Department programs.

In addition to the phased audits of civil rights mentioned above, the Office of Inspector General has completed a special audit of the activities of six of the State Cooperative Extension Services. This audit, covering 77 counties, revealed substantial noncompliance in extension programs.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

As interpreted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 places a special obligation upon Federal program administrators to be informed about the continuing impact of their programs upon minority group recipients. This may be referred to as "program evaluation."

In its 1965 report, *Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs*, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recommended that the Department of Agriculture "establish methods for review and evaluation of the implementation of equal opportunity policy."

Departmental committee on program review and evaluation

As a partial response to the Commission recommendation a five-man Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation was established in April 1965 to provide continuing review and evaluation of Department programs to assure that these programs are efficiently accomplishing the objectives of Congress on a completely nondiscriminatory basis.⁴⁴

Membership of the Committee was drawn from Departmental staff already having other full time duties. Thus the capacity of the Committee to fulfill its responsibilities was severely limited from the outset. Furthermore, as viewed by the chairman, the Committee was not in a position to direct action by the agencies but could only serve to educate and stimulate the agencies as to the kinds of data that should be obtained for effective program evaluation.

Despite these limitations, the Committee was able to meet on 40 occasions with the agencies of the Department and review the existing data collection systems. The Committee neither devised agency systems or

Footnotes at end of article.

evaluated the information obtained through them other than to comment on the adequacy of the measurements used.

Program evaluation in Department of Agriculture agencies

The Department of Agriculture has no overall policy on the collection of racial data. Program statistics are not shared on a routine basis with the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights.

The state of racial data collection for purposes of program evaluation varies among agencies of the Department. The Chairman of the Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation stated that the systems developed by the Soil Conservation Service and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (a non-Title VI agency) were considered to be the most effective that had been developed to date.⁴⁵ Conversely, the data collection systems of two Title VI agencies, the Consumer and Marketing Service and the Federal Extension Service, were considered the ones which required the most improvement. This judgment was shared by the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights.

The Consumer and Marketing Service, which administers the consumer food programs of the Department subject to Title VI (School Lunch, Special Milk, Food Stamps, and Direct Distribution), collects no racial participation data whatsoever. This has prevented any program evaluation from being accomplished in the past. At the time of Commission staff interviews, there were plans to conduct a School Lunch survey in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census but subsequent inquiry by Commission staff determined that no racial participation data was originally contemplated for the survey. At the urging of the Commission and the Bureau of the Budget racial data reporting requirements were added to survey. Also during Commission interviews it was learned that a requirement for racial participation data was being considered as an addition to annual reports on food programs made to C&MS by the States. As of this date, however, no reporting form incorporating these requirements, has been approved for use.

The Federal Extension Service has collected certain racial data in the past but it was in such form as to make meaningful program evaluation extremely difficult. The data collection system in use, which was not approved by the Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation or the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, does not permit any determinations of non-discriminatory service or provide information on a county basis. In short, it cannot serve as an effective tool for pinpointing program deficiencies.

A divergence of opinion exists among USDA officials as to who should be responsible for the overall control and direction of the program evaluation function within the Department. Up to now, the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights has depended on the Departmental Committee for assessing the character of agency program evaluation efforts. The Departmental Committee does not, however, conduct program evaluation. What little program evaluation is accomplished is done within the agencies. The Office of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights conducts no systematic program evaluation of its own. One agency official, the Administrator of the Federal Extension Service, indicated his preference for retaining program evaluation responsibility within the agencies, stating, "you can't separate program administration from civil rights evaluation." The Chairman of the Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation stated that he did not consider the Committee system as being satisfactory, especially with relation to Title VI, and that he hoped another method could be devised.

Footnotes at end of article.

Whether program evaluation is conducted entirely by the agencies themselves, by the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, or by both together, the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights must have some mechanism to inform himself regarding the impact of agency programs on minority groups.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding.—The organization, staffing, and assignment of the equal opportunity function in the Department of Agriculture as presently constructed does not provide the most effective implementation and enforcement of Federal and departmental equal opportunity policies and regulations.

Recommendations.—Establish an Office of Equal Opportunity¹ under the Secretary with responsibility for and authority to coordinate, implement and enforce Federal and Departmental equal opportunity policies and regulations. Such responsibility and authority should include the power to command agency performance in the areas of:

- a. Program review and evaluation.
- b. Resolution of complaint investigation findings and corrective action.
- c. Compliance reporting and review.
- d. Training to accomplish Departmental equal opportunity responsibilities.

The Office of Equal Opportunity should combine within it the functions of:

- a. Title VI.
- b. Direct Federal Programs.
- c. Federal Employment.
- d. Federal Contract Compliance.

The Office of Equal Opportunity should direct and coordinate the following functions:

- a. Program evaluation.
- b. Compliance reporting.
- c. Compliance review.
- d. Follow up on complaint investigations and audits to insure that corrective action is taken.
- e. Equal opportunity training.

A full-time equal opportunity staff should be allocated to each of the following agencies:

- a. Federal Extension Service.
- b. Consumer and Marketing Service.
- c. Farmers Home Administration.
- d. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

A full time staff person should be allocated to the following agencies:

- a. Forest Service.
- b. Soil Conservation Service.
- c. Rural Electrification Administration.
- d. Farmers Cooperative Service.

Finding.—The Department of Agriculture does not uniformly conduct evaluations which meaningfully measure the relative impact and benefits of agriculture programs and services upon potential and actual minority group program participants.

Recommendations.—Establish a program evaluation unit in the Office of Equal Opportunity to provide independent measurements of equal opportunity.

Require all agencies to collect racial and ethnic program participation data sufficient to measure:

- a. Federal and non-Federal employment in agriculture programs down to and including county units.
- b. Minority group membership and characteristics of members on elected and appointive committees and other bodies which govern, administer or serve in an advisory capacity to agricultural and agriculture-related programs.
- c. Minority group participation and the basis of their participation in the services and benefits of agricultural and agriculture-related programs.
- d. Socio-economic characteristics of minority groups who are recipients or potential recipients of benefits (so as to relate relative need for services to services provided).
- e. Rates of progress and relative impact of programs on minority groups.

Integrate equal opportunity program evaluation with the overall programming and planning function of the Department.

Integrate equal opportunity program evaluation with the overall programming and planning function of the Department.

Finding.—No effective program for civil rights training of agency program staffs and employees of agriculture programs at the state and local level exists in the Department of Agriculture. As a result, agency administrators and program personnel are not sufficiently informed of equal opportunity policies and are not equipped to implement and enforce these policies. As a further result, communication with minority group recipients is poor or non-existent.

Recommendation.—Establish a unit in the Office of Equal Opportunity to develop training programs in equal opportunity to be implemented in the Department of Agriculture and at the State and local levels. Adequate training programs must include:

- a. full understanding of Federal equal opportunity laws and policies,
- b. techniques for implementing and enforcing equal opportunity functions.
- c. intergroup relations training to enable program staff to communicate with and understand the problems and needs of minority groups.

Finding.—Compliance reporting and review methods presently in use do not adequately inform the Department of Agriculture as to the state of equal opportunity compliance in its programs.

Recommendations.—Develop adequate methods for assessing equal opportunity compliance. Adequate methods include:

- a. quantitative measurements of minority group participation in program benefits. This requires that "yes-no" questionnaires for compliance reporting be replaced where possible with measurements of "how many," "where," "when" and "how."
- b. on-the-spot field reviews incorporating thorough "across the board" program measurements and contacts with minority group recipients.
- c. independent field reviews by the staff of the Office of Equal Opportunity.

Finding.—Although the most significant activity in equal opportunity compliance within the Department of Agriculture is currently being conducted by the office of Inspector General, the effectiveness of this activity is limited by the failure of agency administrators to respond adequately to OIG audit and report findings.

Recommendations.—Require that adequate corrective action be taken in response to OIG findings. The Office for Equal Opportunity should be given authority to determine the sufficiency of action taken. In no event should OIG activities be deemed to relieve the Office of Equal Opportunity or the agencies concerned from their compliance reporting, compliance review or program evaluation responsibilities.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAMS OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SUBJECT TO TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 *

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Grants for Research.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

- Cropland Conversion Program.
- Cropland Adjustment Program.
- Appalachian Land Stabilization & Conservation Program.
- Price Support—Gum Naval Stores.
- Price Support—Peanuts.
- Price Support—Tobacco.
- Price Support—Tung Oil.
- Cooperative Marketing Associations (tung oil, dry beans, honey, rice, soy beans, and cotton).

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

- Hatch Act.
- Cooperative Forestry Research.
- Research Facilities.
- Basic Research.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

School Lunch.
Special Milk.
Director Distribution.
Food Stamp.
Matching Funds.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Cooperatives.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Soil and Water Loans.
Senior Citizens' Rental Housing Loans.
Farm Ownership Loans—Recreation.
Operating Loans—Recreation.
Rural Renewal Loans.
Watershed Loans.
Economic Opportunity Loans to Cooperatives.
Resource Conservation and Development Loans.
Labor Housing Grants.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

State Extension Services.

FOREST SERVICE

Revenue Sharing Payments.
Cooperative State Forestry.
Research.
National Forest Administration.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Loans to Telephone and Electric Companies.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Soil & Water Conservation Districts.
Sponsoring Organization—Watershed Protection.
Watershed Project Agreements.
Work Plan Agreements.
Work Plan Amendments.
Sponsoring Organizations—Sub-watershed Projects.
Work Plan Agreements.
Work Plan Amendments.
Sponsoring Organizations—Resource Conservation and Development.
Work Plan Agreements.

APPENDIX B

MAJOR TITLE VI PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS OF AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND THEIR PRINCIPAL PROBLEM AREAS REGARDING EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

The Federal Extension Service administers the program of cooperative extension work whereby funds, matched by State and local contributions, are distributed to the States to assist in providing out-of-school education in the fields of agriculture, home economics, and related subjects to farm and rural residents. Funds are used primarily for the employment of approximately 15,000 State and county extension workers who work with rural families by providing them information and assistance in the application of methods in production, marketing, and family living.

The Fiscal Year 1968 appropriation for extension work was nearly \$97 million. Of this figure, \$90 million was apportioned to the States. This latter amount accounts for approximately 36 percent of all funds expended for extension work.

Of all agricultural programs, discrimination is most prevalent in extension work. Segregated service and work assignments, segregated 4-H and home economic clubs, and unequal employment opportunities are still widespread. For example, the Commission's Georgia State Advisory Committee in a 1967 report entitled *Equal Opportunity in Federally Assisted Agricultural Programs in Georgia*, determined that Negro extension workers are generally limited to working only with Negro rural residents and are universally subordinated to white workers. The Committee found that of over 150,000 rural youth enrolled in 4-H Clubs in Georgia, less

than 9,000 of these youth attended clubs with members of another race and that of the latter number, only 406 were Negro.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Farmers Home Administration provides loans, grants, and management assistance to farmers to operate, purchase and develop farms and to farmers and rural residents and groups to build, buy and improve homes, to develop recreational facilities and community water systems, and to develop and carry out rural conservation and development projects. The Farmers Home Administration also administers an OEO-delegated program of small loans to low-income farmers and rural residents for the development of enterprises to increase their income.

Not all FHA loan programs, especially those having the greatest impact on the economic standing of farmers and rural residents, are covered by Title VI since they involve direct loans to individuals. In all, 11 programs, involving a FY 1968 appropriation of over \$155 million, of the Farmers Home Administration are subject to Title VI. The total FHA loan disbursements for FY 1969 are estimated to be \$1.4 billion alone, thus it can be seen that the major funding programs of FHA are not covered by Title VI.

Major FHA programs covered by Title VI include:

- loans for soil and water conservation and the development of recreational facilities;
- loans for senior citizen rental housing in rural areas;
- loans to public bodies for the redevelopment of rural areas; and
- loans to cooperatives.

The chief opportunities for discrimination in FHA Title VI programs are in the types and amounts of loans made to minority group borrowers and in the level of technical assistance which they receive. Furthermore, loans for facilities may go to segregated groups for segregated services or where there are limited opportunities for minority group participation.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

The Consumer and Marketing Service administers four consumer food programs (Special Milk, School Lunch, Food Stamps and Direct Distribution) and one matching fund program (for State departments to carry out marketing service programs) which are subject to Title VI. The FY 1969 request for the consumer food programs is approximately \$750 million and the request for the matching fund program is \$1.7 million.

Fiscal Year 1969 obligation for the Special Milk program are estimated to be \$104 million to reimburse States for over 3 billion half pints of milk to be provided to schools, camps, and institutions. Fiscal Year 1969 obligations for the School Lunch program are estimated to be \$249 million to assist States in providing approximately 3.5 billion lunches to an estimated 20 million school children in approximately 74,000 schools participating in the program. For Fiscal Year 1969 \$225 million in obligations is estimated for the Food Stamp Program and \$168 million in obligations is estimated for the Direct Distribution Program. Together, these two programs reached an estimated 6.1 million persons in approximately 2,400 counties in July 1968.

Opportunities for discrimination in these programs include service to segregated schools,⁴⁶ camps and institutions and failure to include all eligible minority recipients. In addition, available evidence indicates differentials exist in program benefits. For example, many counties who do not have commodity distribution and Food Stamp programs have high minority group populations. In the fall of 1966, 26 of the 35 counties in Alabama which had no food programs had Negro populations above the State average. In schools with lunch programs, Negroes do

not participate proportionately to white children. A 1964 USDA survey of the School Lunch program in Cambridge, Maryland, revealed that 46 percent of white children but only 19 percent of the Negro children were participating in the lunch program.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service administers the price support and production adjustment programs of the Department of Agriculture. Price support programs alone account for an estimated \$3.2 billion (Fiscal Year 1969), the major portion of the Department's budget. Programs under these categories are not covered by Title VI, however. Only four relatively minor programs, with an estimated net expenditure in Fiscal Year 1968 of \$161 million are covered by Title VI. These are:

- loans to producer associations (21 primary recipients);
- loans to cooperative marketing associations (25 recipients);
- cropland conversion and cropland adjustment (by which landowners are encouraged to convert their land to other uses. There is no money for these programs this year); and
- disaster assistance (whereby surplus feed may be made available to relieve acute distress in disaster areas. This is not an active program).

There are few opportunities for noncompliance in any of these programs.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Rural Electrification Administration provides low interest rate (2 percent), long term (up to 35 years) loans to cooperatives to finance and improve electric and telephone service in rural areas. The Fiscal Year 1968 estimated expenditure for these programs was \$435 million. The electrification program, begun in 1935, has enabled the provision of electric service to 98 percent of the farms in America with approximately 6.6 million consumers being served. The telephone program, begun in 1949, has enabled the extension of telephone service to 79 percent of the farms in America with over 2¼ million subscribers being served.

Opportunities for discrimination in service and cooperative memberships are present in these programs but REA officials indicated that this does not seem to be a problem at present. Their main concern is the low level of minority group employment and minority group representation among cooperative boards of directors. This, however, is not reached by Title VI requirements.

FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Service conducts four major programs subject to Title VI:

- National Forestry Administration—land use permits to States and public and private organizations for recreational and other purposes;
- Cooperative Forestry—matching funds and technical assistance to States for fire control, seeding and tree planting;
- Research grants—to institutions of higher learning for cooperative research in forestry; and
- Revenue Sharing—25 percent of the gross receipts from national forests are returned to States and counties for use on schools and roads.

These programs had an appropriation of over \$66 million in Fiscal Year 1968. Opportunities for noncompliance are limited mainly to the revenue sharing program where school recipients are not in compliance with HEW desegregation requirements and the national forest program where land use permits may go to segregated groups or organizations. As of the third quarter of calendar year 1967 there had been seven refusals to file an assurance and 30 unacceptable as-

surance forms in the revenue sharing program received by the Forest Service. In the National Forest program there had been 18 refusals to file an assurance. All such recipients had been noticed for hearing. With the exception of the Consumer and Marketing Service, no other agency of the Department had advanced as far in the enforcement stage.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service administers the national soil and water conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture. Technical assistance in the form of soil surveys and planning is provided to land owners and operators in nearly 3,000 soil conservation districts in the United States and territories.

Four programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service are subject to Title VI coverage. They are:

- a. Watershed Protection—financial and other assistance to States and local organizations for the installation of works of improvement in flood prevention;
- b. Flood Prevention—the same, except work is accomplished through Federal contracts;
- c. Resource Conservation and Development—planning and technical assistance to States and public bodies for developing programs of land conservation and utilization; and

d. Conservation Technical Assistance—technical assistance, other than surveys, for the installation of practices to conserve and develop soil and water resources.

A total of \$193 million was appropriated for these programs in Fiscal Year 1968.

Opportunities for discrimination in Soil Conservation Service programs reside mainly in the amount and quality of technical assistance provided to minority group operating units, equality of benefits derived from projects, and minority group representation on decision-making bodies (soil conservation district boards).

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Farmer Cooperative Service, one of the smaller agencies in the Department of Agriculture, provides technical assistance for the development and operation of rural cooperatives. It also conducts research and publishes its results as a service to cooperatives. The fiscal year 1968 appropriation for these activities was \$1.3 million.

Very little opportunity for discrimination exists in the Farmer Cooperative Service program except as regards the amount and quality of technical assistance provided to developing cooperatives with significant minority group memberships.

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH SERVICE

The Agriculture Research Service provides grants to colleges and nonprofit institutions

for conducting basic scientific research. Compliance review for colleges and universities is covered by the HEW Title VI Coordination Plan for Higher Education.

Obligated expenditures for Fiscal Year 1967 amounted to \$3 million.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

The Cooperative State Research Service administers four grant programs for research in agriculture, agricultural marketing, rural life, and cooperative forestry research. Research is conducted at State agricultural experiment stations.

The Fiscal Year 1968 appropriation for these programs was \$62 million.

Opportunity for discrimination occurs regarding access to facilities on field days when groups meet at the experiment stations for demonstrations of research results. Composition of visiting groups is usually determined by the county extension agent.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

The Foreign Agricultural Service conducts one program, Foreign Market Development projects, subject to Title VI. This program attempts to develop new markets for United States agricultural commodities by making available foreign currencies derived from sales of United States surplus commodities abroad.

This program was not included in the Title VI survey.

APPENDIX C.—USDA AGENCY STAFFING FOR TITLE VI MATTERS, FISCAL YEAR 1968

[Key: (a) full time; (b) less than full time but more than 1/2 time; (c) less than 1/2 time but more than 1/4 time]

Agency ¹	Washington			Total	Field			Total
	(a)	(b)	(c)		(a)	(b)	(c)	
ARS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASCS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. & M.S.....	0	0	(2)	(2)	0	0	0	0
CSRS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FCS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FHA.....	0	0	(2)	(2)	0	0	0	0
FES.....	4	0	2	6	0	0	0	0
FS.....	0	1	0	1	0	0	(1)	(1)
REA.....	0	0	(2)	(2)	0	0	0	0
SCS.....	0	1	0	1	0	0	(2)	(2)
Total.....	4	2	2	8	0	0	0	0

¹ Does not include Office of Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, Office of Inspector General, Office of General Counsel, or Departmental Committee on Program Review and Evaluation.
² C. & M.S. states that there is no separate staff for title VI work but estimates 33 man-years are spent on title VI responsibilities with no person spending more than 1/4 their time.
³ FHA states that no employee spends more than 1/4 of his time on title VI at either level.
⁴ Forest Service states that none of their employees in the field spend more than one quarter of his time on title VI.
⁵ REA reports that no individual in REA spends more than 1/4 of his time on title VI.
⁶ SCS states that all expenditures of time on title VI matters at the State level is less than 1/4 time. 1 person spent more than 1/2 on title VI in fiscal year 1967.

APPENDIX D.—NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL PERSONNEL RECEIVING CIVIL RIGHTS TRAINING THROUGH DEC. 31 1967

	Washington	Field
ARS.....	0	0
ASCS.....	7	13
C. & M.S.....	6	5
CSRS.....	0	4
FCS.....	1	0
FHA.....	3	13
FES.....	3	0
FS.....	18	32
REA.....	² 56	² 186
SCS.....	(2)	(2)
Total.....	93	243

¹ Civil rights sensitizing training to an undetermined number of regional personnel conducted by ASCS officials.
² 50 of District of Columbia staff and 180 of field staff participated in administrative conference for field employees in 3 different sessions conducted by REA officials.
³ Soil Conservation Service reports attending various CSC training sessions but they were unable to provide any specific information on numbers of staff involved.

APPENDIX E.—USDA AGENCY TITLE VI COMPLAINTS AND RESULTANT ACTION, JAN. 1, 1965-JUNE 30, 1967

Agency	Jan. 1, 1965-June 30, 1966						July 1, 1966-June 30, 1967					
	Complaints	Found in compliance	Found out of compliance	Still negotiating	Hearing noticed	Compliance achieved	Complaints	Found in compliance	Found out of compliance	Still negotiating	Hearing noticed	Compliance achieved
ARS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASCS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C. & M.S.....	54	41	13	0	0	13	18	16	2	0	0	2
CSRS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FCS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FHA.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FES.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FS.....	26	18	1	7	0	6	6	2	0	4	0	0
REA.....	4	(1)	0	0	0	0	2	(1)	0	0	0	1
SCS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total.....	84	59	14	7	0	13	26	18	2	4	0	3

¹ Complainant did not respond to request for further information. No investigation performed.

APPENDIX F

A MODEL OFFICE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The following is a model for an Office of Equal Opportunity in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It is intended solely as a

discussion piece to suggest the size and funding for an office necessary to carry out the equal opportunity requirements of the Department.

The model envisages an Office of Equal Opportunity of approximately 107 personnel—

68 professional and 39 clerical. (See Table 1; figure 1 not printed in RECORD). The estimated cost for personnel, travel, and operations and maintenance of \$1.48 million (See Table 2).

The model envisages three sections: Fed-

eral employment contract compliance, and equal opportunity compliance. The equal opportunity compliance section envisages four branches: training, evaluation, liaison and review, and field offices.

Seven field offices are projected. The purpose of such field offices would be to coordinate the equal opportunity compliance program of all Department of Agriculture programs in the States within the regions. Such offices could be located in the same space as the present Office of Inspector General regional offices for convenience and to facilitate access to OIG investigation and audit findings. Larger staffs would be assigned to regions where greater equal opportunity problems exist.

The liaison and review branch would have specialists assigned to work with agencies having major equal opportunity impact in their programs. Staff in this branch would be combined with evaluation staff as necessary to accomplish team reviews.

The program evaluation branch would have specialists who examine program statistics to measure the impact of agricultural programs on minority group participants. Staff in this branch would be combined with liaison and review staff to accomplish team reviews.

The training branch would have specialists who develop and conduct equal opportunity training programs in the Department.

E. Marshall Newton, Assistant Administrator (Management).

Claude Prichard, Chief, Employee Relations and Development Branch.

Donald D. Oberle, Program Analysis Officer.

FOREST SERVICE

E. M. Bacon, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry.

Arthur R. Spillers, Associate Deputy, State and Private Forestry.

W. Duncan Giffen, Directives Management.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Richard M. Hausler, Deputy Administrator.

Gordon R. Messmer, Chief, Distribution Engineering Branch, Electric Program.

Raymond W. Lynn, Director, Telephone Engineering and Operations Division, Telephone Program.

Arnold Winokur, Office of General Counsel.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

William R. Van Dersal, Deputy Administrator (Management).

Ralph C. Wright, Assistant Director, Administrative Service Division.

Verna C. Mohagen, Director, Personnel Division.

Carl A. Lindstrom, Assistant Director, Personnel Division.

FOOTNOTES

* NOTE: This is a listing of USDA programs subject to Title VI for which quarterly compliance status reports are made to the Department of Justice. For a complete listing of all programs subject to Title VI, see 7 CFR 15.

¹ Eleven agencies of the Department of Agriculture administer more than 35 programs subject to Title VI. (See Appendix A for list of programs covered.) Officials from ten of these agencies were interviewed during the course of this survey. The major programs of these agencies as well as the principal problem areas regarding equality of opportunity are discussed in Appendix B.

² Introduction to job description for position 8412, Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights.

³ Secretary's Memorandum No. 1560, July 10, 1964.

⁴ Secretary's Memorandum No. 1560, Supplement 4, January 17, 1966.

⁵ 32 Federal Register 11895, August 17, 1967. 7 CFR 15, December 4, 1964, as amended, is the basic Title VI regulation of the Department of Agriculture. Section 15.8, paragraphs (a) and (d) refer to the termination of Federal financial assistance and other means authorized by law to effect compliance with the regulation.

⁶ 32 Federal Register 11711, August 12, 1967.

⁷ 32 Federal Register 690, January 20, 1967.

⁸ See footnote 2, *supra*.

⁹ See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1965; Georgia State Advisory Committee to U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Equal Opportunity in Federally Assisted Agriculture Programs in Georgia*, August, 1967; Alabama State Advisory Committee to U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in the Alabama Black Belt*, April, 1968; Transcript and staff reports (unpublished) on Hearings by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Montgomery, Alabama, April 27-May 2, 1968; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General, Audit of Civil Rights Activities in the Federal Extension Service, 6041-6-H, Forest Service, 6041-7-H, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, 6041-4-H, Consumer and Marketing Service, 6041-5-H, and six Cooperative State Extension Services (6065-17-T; 6065-17-A; 6065-1-T; 6065-1-A; 6065-26-T; and 6065-20-W).

TABLE 1.—OFFICE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—STAFF SUMMARY

	Clerical		Professional	
	Grade	Number	Grade	Number
Director, Office of Equal Opportunity.....	GS-11	1	GS-18	1
Deputy Director.....	GS-11	1	GS-17	1
	GS-5	1		
Assistant Director, Equal Opportunity Compliance.....	GS-8	1	GS-16	1
Assistant Director, Federal Employment.....	GS-7	1	GS-15	1
Assistant Director, Contract Compliance.....	GS-7	1	GS-15	1
Deputy Assistant Director, Equal Opportunity Compliance.....	GS-7	1	GS-15	1
Chief, Program Evaluation.....	GS-7	1	GS-15	1
Chief, Liaison and Review.....	GS-6	1	GS-14	1
Chief, Training.....	GS-6	1	GS-13	1
Chiefs, regional offices.....	GS-6	7	GS-13	7
Employment specialists.....	GS-5	1	GS-11	1
			GS-9	2
Contract compliance specialists.....	GS-6	1	GS-11	10
	GS-5	1	GS-9	5
	GS-4	3		
Program evaluation staff specialists.....	GS-6	2	GS-13	2
	GS-5	3	GS-11	5
	GS-4	2	GS-9	5
Regional equal opportunity specialists.....	GS-5	3	GS-11	5
Liaison and review specialists.....	GS-5	2	GS-11	6
Total.....		39		68

Office of Equal Opportunity, U.S. Department of Agriculture—Funding summary

Personnel:	
Salaries and benefits.....	1,096,500
Consultants and benefits.....	10,000
Travel.....	270,000
Advisory committee.....	10,000
Staff training.....	20,000
Operations and maintenance:	
Office rental.....	30,000
Communications.....	10,000
Conferences.....	10,000
Supplies and publications.....	30,000
Total.....	1,486,500

APPENDIX G

LIST OF INTERVIEWERS

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

William M. Seabron, Assistant to the Secretary; John W. Slusser, Fergulise Mayronne, Judith Phillips.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Lester P. Condon, Inspector General.
Richard W. Fitch, Jr., Assistant to Inspector General.

Frank J. Brechensher, Deputy Assistant Inspector General (Investigation).

Norman S. Smith, Supervisor (Investigation).

Charles B. Bremer, Deputy Assistant Inspector General (Marketing, Consumer Research and Education).

Leland F. Marland, Deputy Assistant Inspector General (Departmental Administration).

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

Mervin W. Kaye, Director, Research and Operations Division; Robert C. Reid.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Harry C. Telogan, Chairman, Administrator, Statistical Reporting Service.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

John P. McAuley, Assistant Deputy Administrator (Management).

Raymond W. Sooy, Director, Administrative Services Division.

Henry C. Bauer, Chief, Research Agreements and Patents Management Branch.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

Victor B. Phillips, Assistant to the Administrator.

Jesse F. Moore, Deputy Director, Producer Associations Division.

Donald D. Mowat, Agricultural Marketing Specialist.

Allan T. Arnason, Chief, Compliance Branch, Farmer Programs Division.

Charlie B. Robbins, Program Specialist.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

Haward P. Davis, Deputy Administrator, Consumer Food Programs.

George C. Knapp, Deputy Administrator (Management).

Samuel C. Vanneman, Assistant Deputy Administrator.

Mildred L. Sykes.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

T. S. Ronningen, Assistant Administrator (Formula Funds).

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Martin A. Abrahamsen, Deputy Administrator.

Job K. Savage, Assistant Administrator, (Cooperative Development Program).

John J. Smirardo, Administrative Assistant.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Lloyd H. Davis, Administrator.

Ralph E. Groening, Deputy Assistant Administrator.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Floyd F. Higbee, Deputy Administrator.

¹⁰ See footnote 11 *infra*.

¹¹ Memorandum, Joseph M. Robertson to Mr. Schnitker, Mr. Birkhead, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Seabron, September 30, 1966.

¹² Subsequent to Commission staff interviews, the Federal Extension Service employed a full-time civil rights specialist.

¹³ Secretary's Memorandums No. 1560, July 10, 1964; No. 1572, April 22, 1965; and No. 1595, February 28, 1966 (revised June 17, 1966).

¹⁴ Secretary's Memorandum No. 1575, April 29, 1965.

¹⁵ In the Spring of 1966, the Office of Inspector General conducted one day formal training seminars for all professional staff in the Washington, D.C. and regional offices. Beginning in the Summer of 1966 and for every quarter thereafter, civil rights training, consisting of a case study in alleged discrimination using lectures, handouts, role playing, and the preparation of investigation reports has been given as part of in-service and orientation training at Front Royal, Virginia. A total of 477 professionals had received this training through September 1967.

¹⁶ See Appendix D for a list of civil rights training received by Department of Agriculture agency personnel.

¹⁷ Federal Extension Service, "Supplemental Instructions for the Administration of Title VI," July 2, 1965 (as amended), paragraph I B 2.

¹⁸ Arkansas, South Carolina, and Texas. Only the Arkansas plan specifically referred to staff training and it merely indicated that conferences had been held to inform staff of Title VI requirements.

¹⁹ Department of Justice, "Quarterly Title VI Status Report for the Department of Agriculture," Third Quarter 1967.

²⁰ REA Bulletin 20-19: 320-19, January 8, 1965.

²¹ There have been a small number of recipients who have voluntarily dropped out of USDA programs rather than comply with Title VI. The Consumer and Marketing Service estimates at least one school district and approximately 200 summer camps fall into this category. Yet, even in C&MS, where there have been 140 instances of refusals to sign an assurance, in only six cases have recipients been noticed for hearings.

²² Federal Extension Service, "Supplemental Instructions for Administrations of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," July 2, 1965, Section B, subsection B.

²³ Georgia State Advisory Commission report, "Equal Opportunity in Federally Assisted Agricultural Programs in Georgia," August 1967. The Committee's report documented instances of segregated office facilities, segregated work assignments and segregated 4-H and home economics clubs. These findings led to a Committee recommendation that funds for the Georgia State Cooperative Extension Service be deferred until the Department of Agriculture conducted an investigation to ascertain the complete status of compliance in the State. Similar noncompliance was documented in staff reports prepared for Commission hearings on rural economic security in Montgomery, Alabama, April 27-May 2, 1968.

²⁴ Secretary's Memorandum No. 1595, February 28, 1966 (as amended June 17, 1966). As of December 31, 1967, the Office of Inspector General has processed 298 investigation reports, 14 of which were still in the reporting stage. Agencies of the Department of Agriculture were asked by the Commission to enumerate the Title VI complaints they had received. A table reflecting their responses is at Appendix E. It will be noted that all complaints of longstanding said to be still negotiating involves the Federal Extension Service.

²⁵ 7 CFR 15.5(b).

²⁶ REA Form 268.

²⁷ Forest Service Manual 1564.22. The Forest Service report in use is form 1500-3.

²⁸ 7 CFR 15.5(a).

²⁹ Department of Justice, "Quarterly Title VI Status Report, Department of Agriculture, Third Quarter 1967." Thirteen of the fourteen instances of noncompliance came from one agency—the Consumer and Marketing Service.

³⁰ Form 139.

³¹ REA Form 267.

³² PCS Form 38.

³³ ASCS Form 540.

³⁴ ASCS 1-PS(FP), August 24, 1966.

³⁵ Forest Service Manual, Title 1400.

³⁶ Soil Conservation Service Management Memorandum No. 19, January 13, 1967.

³⁷ Farmers Home Administration, Administrative Letter 837(400), January 13, 1965.

³⁸ Office of the Inspector General Audit Report 6041-5-H "Audit of the Civil Rights Activities in the Consumer and Marketing Service, July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966."

³⁹ *Ibid*.

⁴⁰ Office of Inspector General Audit Report No. 6041-6-H, "Audit Report of Civil Rights Activities in the Federal Extension Service, July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1966."

⁴¹ In addition to plans to include civil rights reviews in their regular program audits, the Office of Inspector General had completed special audits of extension activity in six Southern States, totaling a review of 77 counties. A review of these audits indicated that widespread noncompliance continues in the Cooperative Extension Service.

⁴² Commission staff reviewed several OIG civil rights audits. Audit Report No. 6041-6-H, covering the civil rights activities of the Federal Extension Service for the period July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1966 found (in part):

1. "... no independent evaluation (of compliance reviews) was made of the extent of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

2. "the use of segregated mailing lists . . . as late as June 1966."

3. "no system or procedure . . . for review of assignments and promotions . . . to insure against discrimination."

4. "statistical data was not being received . . . which could be evaluated to determine whether personnel assignments and services to clientele were being handled in a nondiscriminatory manner."

⁴³ OIG Audit Report No. 5003-1-H, dated January 4, 1965 recommended that the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights:

Establish written guidelines within the Department for evaluating analyses, conclusions and corrective actions related thereto, and which will require (a) agencies to perform racial data analyses, and document conclusions and actions taken or promised to correct inequities cited.

This, and three other recommendations regarding this office were found not to have been acted on in Audit Report No. P3H6-H-3, covering the period January 22, 1965 to June 30, 1966.

⁴⁴ Secretary's Memorandum No. 1574, April 26, 1965. Note: Since the Commission survey was conducted, this memorandum has been revised. A new chairman and two additional members have been added. The committee's responsibilities have been clarified and expanded to:

(1) provide assistance in developing statistical systems measuring minority group participation and the extent to which services are furnished across racial lines;

(2) provide for an annual review of racial data systems for adequacy; and

(3) provide for a semiannual reporting to the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights on the status and activities of agency programs in this area.

In addition, the revised memorandum calls upon agency administrators to establish on-

going statistical systems sufficient to enable the measurement of progress in meeting Departmental civil rights objectives. Agency administrators are to make, at least annually, comprehensive reports on the status and activities of their programs.

⁴⁵ Following the Commission's 1965 Report, the Soil Conservation Service adjusted its data collection system to reflect service provided to numbers of cooperators by race and color. Previously, service provided had been measured on the basis of numbers of acres in plans and thus many smaller operators had not been served as effectively as possible. This was a significant adjustment in program emphasis, a fact which was affirmed in interviews with Soil Conservation Service officials.

⁴⁶ A model staffing and funding proposal for an Office of Equal Opportunity in the Department of Agriculture is at Appendix F.

⁴⁷ By way of interpretation of the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, school lunches may be provided to public schools, even though they are segregated. This exemption does not apply, however, to private schools, camps, and institutions.

MARITIME DAY

(Mr. KARTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to salute the American merchant marine on this Maritime Day, it might be well to review briefly the many benefits to be derived from a healthy, active merchant fleet.

Our domestic economy will benefit because new ships will be built—employing American shipyard workers and utilizing American steel, American engines, American fixtures. And these new ships will provide continuing, and perhaps even additional, jobs for American seamen and the assurance of profitable business operations for American shipowners.

Our international economy will benefit because new, fast, efficient ships will be in a better position to compete with foreign-flag shipping. This will mean an enormous assist to the Government's efforts to correct the imbalance in our international payments account.

Our defense posture will benefit because our merchant marine is our fourth arm of defense. It has always served this Nation well, and it is performing yeoman service, right now, keeping the lifeline open to Vietnam. Two-thirds of the fighting men and some 98 percent of the war materiel used in Southeast Asia travel there by ship.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we should move beyond the annual tradition of paying just lipservice to our merchant marine. We should move ahead with legislation that will make a viable fleet a reality.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JUDGE WARREN BURGER

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States last night announced his selection of Judge Warren

Earl Burger for nomination as the 15th Chief Justice of the United States.

As a former judge, I note with pleasure that President Nixon indicated he was naming a man with previous judicial experience as well as a man of unquestioned integrity.

I join with my fellow Americans without partisan distinction in congratulating Judge Burger and wishing him well in the tremendous task and heavy burden he must assume in restoring the confidence and respect of the American people in their highest court.

PROPAGANDA CONFUSED WITH FREEDOM OF PRESS

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the communications intellectuals continue only to communicate with each other, and as usual their news releases reflect only their opinions and their personal desires.

The American people have recently been saturated with a calculated mental conditioning that somehow the Bolsheviks of Russia were progressively "mellowing" and becoming more American like.

But again, their bubble burst; for while the "mellowing" of communism is being swallowed hook, line, and sinker by many Americans who are desperately hopeful for peace, it is resented by the Kremlin where it is considered as anti-Bolshevik propaganda.

The latest evidence of the Soviet displeasure at the suggestion that they are "softening" is the expulsion of a Washington Post news correspondent whose father was an early revolutionary terrorist against the Christian Czar and later the author of a standard biography of Lenin.

The U.S. State Department, of all things, is considering retaliation. It would seem that the greatest retaliation would be merely to ask that American newsmen in Russia write the full truth.

This policy would seem to apply even to the Washington, D.C., area—where the vice chairman of a revolutionary group has threatened to burn down the newspaper's building for suppressing the truth—by calling existing conditions a "nonexistent rebellion."

And the same Post, through its Newsweek magazine, is banned in Malaysia for "distortion of facts"—which probably boils down to inflaming racial fires—a common technique by which they have exploited the news market in the United States over the past several years.

Someday news sellers will learn that freedom of the press means the right of a free people to learn the truth—not the misuse of press vehicles to impose their personal prejudices upon a trusting audience by distortions.

Mr. Speaker, several news releases follow my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 22, 1969]

POST'S MOSCOW CORRESPONDENT EXPELLED FOR HIS REPORTING

Moscow, May 21.—The Soviet Foreign Ministry today ordered Anatole Shub, The Wash-

ington Post correspondent in Moscow, to leave the country within 48 hours.

A Ministry official, Fyodor Simonov, informed Shub this morning that he was being expelled for having continued to write in an allegedly anti-Soviet manner after a warning last month. At that time, officials made plain their particular displeasure with reports on difficulties within the Kremlin leadership and on criticism by Soviet dissidents of Kremlin policies.

Shub was the second American correspondent expelled since the Kremlin proclaimed what it called a "vigilance" campaign shortly before last summer's invasion of Czechoslovakia. Raymond H. Anderson of The New York Times was ordered to leave last October.

TRAVEL BARRED

Last April 28, Shub and another New York Times correspondent, Henry Kamm, were prohibited from traveling outside Moscow because of their writings. The U.S. State Department retaliated by imposing similar restrictions on the Pravda correspondent in Washington and the Novosti press agency representative in New York.

The vigilance campaign directed by Soviet security agencies against Russian dissidents and resident foreigners appears to have escalated sharply in recent weeks. In the past two weeks, at least two leading Russian civil libertarians, Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko and Ilya Gabay, are known to have been arrested, while the apartments of other Moscow dissidents have been searched. There have been reports, impossible to confirm, of similar reprisals in Leningrad and Kiev.

At the same time, although Western diplomats here have refused to disclose details, there have been secret police attempts to intimidate and compromise diplomats from at least three Western embassies as well as scholars here under cultural exchange programs.

CAMPAIGN GOAL

One apparent aim of the intensified vigilance campaign has been to break the links by which independent-minded Soviet citizens have succeeded in making their dissenting views known at home and abroad.

Protests and petitions reported by Western newsmen have been rebroadcast to Russia by Western radio stations—many of whose broadcasts have gotten through despite the Soviet resumption of jamming since the August invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Shub, who is 41, reported for the Post from Belgrade and Bonn before his Moscow assignment in April, 1967, and was scheduled to transfer to Paris this summer. His successor in Moscow, Anthony Astrachan, had been selected at the time the transfer was decided upon.

Shub is the son of David Shub, 81, who as a Russian democratic revolutionary against the Czarist regime escaped from Siberia in 1908 to the United States, where he has produced, among other writings, a standard biography of Lenin.

[Shub's predecessor for the Post in Moscow, Stephen S. Rosenfeld, was expelled from the Soviet Union in November, 1965. Soviet officials said Rosenfeld was expelled because The Washington Post published "The Penkovsky Papers," the purported memoirs of a Soviet officer who spied for the CIA.]

[Washington Post Executive Editor Benjamin C. Bradlee issued the following statement:

"We are very proud of Tony Shub's dispatches from Moscow. We think his expulsion is a deplorable mistake, contrary to all the principles of a free press and to the goal of increased understanding between our two countries."

STATE CONSIDERING APPROPRIATE ACTION

The State Department said yesterday it was "considering what appropriate action might be taken" in light of the expulsion of

Anatole Shub of The Washington Post from Moscow.

State Department spokesman Carl Bartch, saying he had received questions about Shub's expulsion, read the following statement:

"As I said here on April 30, we believe in the widest exchange of information between our two countries, and accordingly we are opposed to any kind of censorship of reporting by either side. As we have told the Soviets many times, we assume that the philosophical differences which divide us on many issues will also be reflected in the reporting of our respective correspondents.

"If the favorite Soviet words of 'peaceful coexistence' mean anything, it should mean some tolerance of these philosophical differences.

"We cannot be indifferent to the practice of restricting or harassing American correspondents at will while expecting us to treat Soviet correspondents with the tolerance and hospitality which we regard as traditional and accepted in most countries of the world."

April 30 was the date on which the State Department announced that two Soviet correspondents—Boris Strelnikov of Pravda and Genrikh Borovik of the Novosti news agency—would be restricted to a 25-mile radius of Washington and New York, respectively, in response to the Soviet refusal to permit Shub and New York Times correspondent Henry Kamm to make a joint tour of the Ukraine.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1969]

AN EXAMINATION OF "NONEXISTENT REBELLION"

(By Chuck Stone, vice chairman, National Conference on Black Power)

One of the tyrannies we Black people must suffer in the dungeon of this white racist society is the oppression by a putatively "free press," conceived in the womb of white supremacy and nurtured by the umbilical cord of Nordic self-righteousness. Consistency has never been a virtue of white elitism and *The Washington Post*, a leading exponent, eloquently exemplified this characteristic in three editorials week before last.

The Post began its journalistic venture into the land of editorial schizophrenia with another in the series of vindictive attacks on Julius Hobson. (You and the New York Times ought to get together when they write editorials on Adam Clayton Powell so that you can switch yours on Hobson. The venom is so perfectly identical.)

It is the measure of *The Post's* intelligence that it was necessary to sink to the lowest form of debate—*argumentum ad hominem*—in its attack: "What a bold, dashing and intrepid radical he is! In a pirate costume with a cutlass in his hand, he would be irresistible." That's really debating the merits of Mr. Hobson's remarks, isn't it?

The original *Post* story incorrectly quoted Mr. Hobson—a fact which *The Post* subsequently verified. While you may consider it caviling, Mr. Hobson never used the term "free enterprise system" in that famed speech, but the word "capitalism."

But that is a minor point. What is at issue here is the tenacity with which *The Post* cleaves to the white man's compulsion for double standards in dealing with Black people. You would condemn Julius Hobson for advocating "force and violence," but in other editorials, on the same day and the next day, you refuse to condemn violence in one situation ("Toward Civil War in Ulster") and actually encourage violence in another ("Two Cheers for the Counter-Insurgents").

So how come "force and violence" is censurable when it is advocated by Mr. Hobson but tacitly accepted when it is utilized by the Irish Catholics and praiseworthy when it is employed by the American University "counter-insurgents"?

The difference in the logic of *The Post* editorial posture is easily explainable. Mr. Hobson is a nigger. The Irish Catholics and the A. U. kids are white.

How dare a Black man stand up and assert his manhood! How dare you, Julius Hobson, nigger, believe in the historical and inherent right to revolution which was exercised by the white colonialists in 1775 and the Southern bourbons in 1861! Revolution is not to be discussed or exercised by Black people, is it?

Finally, *The Post* suffers from an acute case of historical amnesia when it orders Mr. Hobson to "quit his high school dramatics as the leader of a nonexistent rebellion."

It was a "nonexistent rebellion" that burned Watts in 1965.

It was a "nonexistent rebellion" that destroyed large sections of Newark and Detroit in 1967.

It was a "nonexistent rebellion," that devastated Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1968.

It is a glorious "nonexistent rebellion" that is sweeping college campuses led by Black students and so magnificently orchestrated at Cornell University.

Typically arrogant and forgetful, *The Washington Post* seems to have forgotten what has been transpiring in Black communities during the last four years. The polarization between the races is widening, not narrowing.

Does *The Post* believe it contributes to Black-white understanding with its hysterical attacks on Julius Hobson?

Let me conclude with one thought. There are many indications that Washington will explode in another holocaust. It is simply a matter of time, just as many of us knew back in the summer of 1967 it was a matter of time and publicly said so while Black people in 181 cities were "doing their thing."

The next time Washington does detonate and the flames are licking the side of the *Washington Post* building, I will call you good people and ask just one question: "Hey, baby, how do you like our 'nonexistent rebellion'?"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 22, 1969]

MALAYSIA BANS TWO U.S. MAGAZINES

KUALA LUMPUR.—Malaysia emergency government banned two American news magazines today in a crackdown on publications which it said are seeking to stir communal strife.

In announcing that current issues of *Time* and *Newsweek* would not be distributed, a government spokesman said the magazines' articles on the week-long bloody riots in Malaysia contained "distortion of facts" and were "not in the public or security interest."

OUR MERCHANT MARINE: A RAY OF HOPE

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today is National Maritime Day, an appropriate time to reflect on our ailing merchant marine and look to the future.

On this commemorative day 1 year ago, there was far less reason to celebrate as the United States was continuing on a course that had been pursued far too long with the result that our merchant fleet carries only 5 percent of our cargo.

But, now there is a ray of hope under the new administration as indications

increase that a firm and rejuvenating program is forthcoming that will remove our merchant marine from the "step-child" status under which it has suffered in recent years.

My colleagues are well aware of the troubles facing the merchant marine, as evidenced by the passage recently of a greatly increased maritime authorization bill here in the House.

Let us now hope, as we observe National Maritime Day, that our "fourth arm of defense," our merchant marine, will soon receive the critically needed program from the President and that never again will our merchant fleet be allowed to deteriorate to the condition in which it rests today.

KIDNEY VICTIM HOPES FOR HELP FROM STATE

(Mr. BIESTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Bucks County Courier Times regarding one of my constituents who is a victim of kidney disease.

It is a sorry situation when we have people dying in America solely because they cannot gain the use of a kidney machine. One of the major problems facing medicine and the public health and welfare is the lack of trained personnel, available facilities, research, and equipment for the diagnosis evaluation, treatment, and prevention of kidney disease. No parallel situation exists in medicine where techniques have been developed for the diagnosis and prevention of diseases.

We must do something about this state of affairs or forfeit our public conscience. The article follows:

KIDNEY VICTIM HOPES FOR HELP FROM STATE (By Bob Martin)

State funds are needed to provide financial assistance for victims of kidney diseases.

This was the conclusion today of Eugene Sauers, a medical supervisor at the Bucks County Board of Assistance.

He was approached recently by Robert Rink of 294 Allen Lane, Warminster, whose son, Robert Jr., 21, was stricken by kidney disease in February 1968.

The young man has been in and out of hospitals ever since, including Abington Memorial and Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital.

FUNDS FOR MACHINE

Through a continuing effort on the part of various organizations and individuals last year, enough money was raised to buy Robert a kidney machine.

But treatments three times a week at \$55 each cannot continue much longer on what his father earns as a bricklayer, and donations from residents and organizations in the area.

Thus, the visit by his dad to the county board of assistance.

Sauers said the board can give very little financial assistance to the young man.

"State funds are needed," he said. "There must be many other kidney victims in the state. They must be in the same predicament as Robert."

FOUR SENATE BILLS

He said there are four bills pending in the State Senate that pertain to kidney disease assistance. "Perhaps one of them will go through. We must urge that they be considered most carefully," he declared.

Meanwhile, Robert's dad is giving his son the dialysis treatments three times a week. He was trained to do this at Hahnemann while Robert was a patient there.

"Supplies run about \$500 a month," he said. They are high priced and they can be used only once. They cannot be re-used."

THREE OTHER CHILDREN

Mrs. Rink died several years ago, and Rink has three other children to care for—Richard, 17, a senior at Archbishop Wood High School for Boys; Regina, 13, and Ronald, 7, both students at St. John Bosco School.

Robert, after graduating from William Tennent High School, became a bricklayer with his father. On weekends, he played electric guitar with his group, The Roulettes, at the Ha'penny Inn. With continued treatment his condition should improve, and he hopes to return to work—not as a bricklayer—but with his group.

Meanwhile, he's confined to his home, hoping for the best. And at times he wonders how long he'll live if the money stops coming in.

CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, none but the most extreme will challenge the wisdom of President Nixon's appointment of Judge Burger. The conservative will find him compassionate and humane but strict in his construction of the law and stern in its application. The liberal will find him cautious and deliberate but never arbitrary or doctrinaire.

Judge Burger's entire service shows him to be a man of balance and restraint, a man who is realistic as well as idealistic, foresighted more than visionary, and judicious rather than legalistic.

No one will approve every decision he renders, but everyone will approve the ingredients of compassion, conviction, commonsense, and integrity which he will mix into every decision.

Chief Justice Burger will strengthen the cause of justice for the people of the United States as individuals and as a society.

CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff), in commending the President on his choice of Judge Burger, for in the nomination of Judge Warren E. Burger he has once again demonstrated his ability to pick the right man, at the right time, for the right position.

Even a cursory examination of Judge Burger's career reveals his outstanding qualities as a jurist. He enjoys the respect of his fellow judges for those qual-

ities of judicial demeanor and deportment so necessary to fortify public confidence in one of the three great branches of our Government.

He does not represent any throwback to an antediluvian past. His progressive views in the field of civil rights show that he is dedicated to the proposition that all men should be equal under the law.

In the field of criminal jurisprudence, his remarks indicate that he represents that balanced view of order and liberty so badly needed today.

In selecting a few sentences from his writings to suggest his philosophy, he himself pointed to an address 2 years ago at Ripon College, in which he said that a nation "which has no rules and no laws is not a society but an anarchy in which no rights, either individual or collective, can survive."

He went on:

To maintain this ordered liberty, we must maintain a reasonable balance between the collective need and the individual right, and this requires periodic examination of the balancing process as an engineer checks the pressure gauges of his boilers.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these are the words and these are the views of a man from whom we can confidently expect a distinguished career on the Supreme Court of the United States.

CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation enthusiastically applauds President Nixon's selection of U.S. Circuit Judge Warren Burger to be the next Chief Justice of our Supreme Court. This appointment will do much to restore the American people's waning confidence in our Supreme Court and our courts generally.

In making this appointment President Nixon is promoting to Chief Justice one of our most distinguished jurists of proven judicial merit. I have many times expressed the wish that our Presidents would, as President Nixon has done, look first in the judicial system itself in seeking qualified men to sit on the Supreme Court. There can be no better measure as to the quality of the man, his legal knowledge and habits of mind, and his philosophy of Government, than is to be found in the record of judicial decisions already made.

Judge Burger is neither a "conservative" nor a "liberal," as we often, and often mistakenly, classify judges. It can perhaps be said that he is a "strict constructionist," if one insists upon labels. I believe it would be more accurate to say that he has proven himself to be one who has great respect for the precedents by which the law evolved over the centuries and great respect for our Constitution, and whose perspective of the present and vision of the future is tempered by the lessons of the past.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is to be congratulated on the wisdom of his

choice. And I do so for myself personally and in behalf of the people I am privileged to represent.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

(Mr. DENNIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's vote, in which only 49 Members of the House, including myself, stood up to be counted against the recent 41-percent increase in congressional salaries, settles that controversy as a practical matter and makes further discussion of the subject largely unprofitable.

It seems to me, however, that there may be some legitimate purpose to be served in stating again, briefly and for the RECORD, the reasons which impelled some of us to oppose this increase; and perhaps the fact that I am new in this body—a fact which makes me reluctant to speak on this subject at all—may also give my views a certain value, for the reason that I can, perhaps, reflect with some accuracy the thinking of the general public, of which I have so recently been a part.

From that background I can say, and I do say to you, my colleagues, that the general public—comprising the people who elect us—does not approve of our raising our own salaries by \$12,500 per year, or 41 percent. The public does not understand how this can be done without a rollcall vote, nor does it approve this; nor does it excuse us because some past legislation of our own has made this course of conduct possible. It is not possible to explain to an average American making \$5,000 to \$10,000 per year how it is that we cannot live on \$30,000 or at any rate on some moderate increase in that amount. You simply cannot explain to a man who goes on strike for a 10-percent raise, or to a social security recipient who hopes for 7 percent, or even to an executive who may on occasion get a 15-percent increase, why we are entitled at one step to an increase of 41 percent. We cannot hold the line here in the House against civil servants and lobby groups who come asking for more moneys from the Treasury, when we have been so openhanded—or what, at any rate, appears to most people to be so openhanded, on our own account.

The congressional salary increases, of course, play only a comparatively small part in the overall financial and budgetary picture; but they are a dramatic, easily understood part of the picture; and surely, the example of needed fiscal restraint ought to be set by us.

It is perfectly true that a Congressman's expenses are heavy—a truth which this ex-member of the general public appreciates more keenly every day—but I ran for this office, as most of us did—certainly as almost all of us did on my side of the aisle—on a platform which called for governmental fiscal responsibility and financial restraint, as the single most important factor in the fight against inflation.

Some increase in congressional salaries was and is justified; but there ought to be a rule of reason. I could wish that we had been presented here in the House with a program laying out a middle course, and providing for a more modest and more defensible salary increase. This did not happen and the House has had no chance to vote on such a plan—nor have we had an opportunity for a rollcall vote at all.

Neither political wisdom nor the national interest, I believe, favor the course which we have adopted, and it is for these reasons that I wish to register, once again, my respectful but vigorous dissent.

CASE FOR THE ABM BY THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the American Security Council issued a very timely report this month, in which they document why the United States should wait no longer to proceed with the ABM. The report is entitled "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance: U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A." In my view, it should be read by all my colleagues. Therefore, in order to convey some idea of the importance and quality of this study, I am inserting in the RECORD the following short news release issued by the American Security Council, which summarizes the highlights of their 64-page study:

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Union has "jumped into the lead in overall strategic missile strength" by making optimum use "of a much smaller economic base than the United States" and is "operating on a war economy basis." Therefore, "an American ABM system is the soundest insurance for peace and against war that the United States can buy in 1969, for the 1970's.

"Far from being an offensive weapon, the ABM is in reality insurance against war. It may well be, in fact, the single most important step the United States can take toward a real and lasting peace at this moment in history."

This was reported today in a 64-page study entitled "The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance: U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A." prepared for the American Security Council by a special subcommittee of the Council's National Strategy Committee.

The subcommittee was headed by co-chairman Dr. Willard F. Libby (Nobel Prize for Chemistry, 1960), Director of the Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, UCLA; Dr. William J. Thaler, Physics Department, Georgetown University, developer of the "over-the-horizon" radar; and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Nathan F. Twining, USAF (ret.).

The subcommittee declared "it is no longer necessary to suppose . . . that the Soviets will aim for strategic military superiority. Reality now conforms to theory. We now know that the Soviet's military objective is strategic superiority because they have passed 'parity' and are still building." The study showed that the "combined total of ICBMs, IR/MRBMs (Intermediate and Medium Range Missiles) and SLMs (Sea-Launched Missiles) is now estimated as 2,750 for the U.S.S.R. to 1,710 for the U.S.A."

The 31-man subcommittee panel included

specialists of many fields of expertise. Among these were Dr. Harold M. Agnew, Director of the Weapons Division of the Atomic Energy Commission's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory; Dr. Eugene P. Wigner (Nobel Prize for Physics, 1963) of Princeton University; Dr. Edward Teller, nuclear physicist, Lawrence Radiation Laboratories, University of California at Livermore; retired career Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow; Peter Bruce Clark, publisher of the Detroit News; Robert W. Galvin, Chairman of the Board of Motorola, Inc.; General Bernard A. Schriever, USAF (Ret.), who headed the development of America's ICBMs; and Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Clear evidence of the "war economy" which the Soviet Union maintains, the subcommittee pointed out, is provided by the fact that:

"... The overall military budget of the U.S.S.R. is already essentially equal to or greater than the U.S. budget, especially when costs peculiar to Vietnam are excluded from the U.S. figures . . .

"Although the gross national product of the United States runs almost twice that of the gross in the U.S.S.R., the U.S.S.R. is investing 2 to 3 times more in strategic military forces annually . . .

"The U.S.S.R. may invest at least \$50 to \$100 billion more in strategic forces between now and 1975, than the United States, unless the relative trends change substantially."

As a consequence of this greater effort, "not only has the military power of the Soviet Union grown more rapidly than that of the U.S.A., but it has rapidly overtaken the forces of the United States in new concepts and new weapons systems.

"The U.S.S.R. now has whole families of military (and naval) weapons systems that the United States does not have in its inventory."

The U.S.S.R. has adopted what the subcommittee described as "innovative policies" to take advantage of both offensive and defensive opportunities.

For example—the Soviets: "presently enjoy a clear lead in space orbital weapons . . . Properly deployed, a significant number, let us say 100, could be in a position to attack the United States in a matter of seconds after the button was pushed in the Kremlin . . ."

Have an estimated 1,000 Intermediate and Medium Range missiles which are "primarily aimed at Europe and now completely pin Europe down . . ."

Have "very large—50-100 megaton nuclear weapons which were tested in 1961-62 . . . adapted for missile delivery."

Have "the Bear Bomber. It is the world's longest range, highest endurance bomber . . . an effective anti-shiping and anti-submarine attack aircraft with air-to-surface attack missiles on board."

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has been developing a sophisticated ABM defense system for ten years and now has anti-ballistic missiles deployed around Moscow and in a "Blue Belt" defense line described by Marshal Malinovsky as being "for the defense of the entire territory of the Soviet Union."

In connection with their missile defense program, "the Soviets are developing a comprehensive civil defense program . . . spending about 10 times as much effort as is the United States in providing the Soviet society an adequate civil defense. Moreover, civil defense in the Soviet Union is related directly to overall Soviet military strategy."

These findings become most significant when considered against the background of announced Soviet objectives and the continuing assertions of Soviet leaders that they are preparing for any eventuality that might trigger a nuclear war in their determination to achieve long-stated Communist goals, worldwide.

The Council study concludes that "in both word and deed, the Soviets have shown that they regard the world struggle as a fight to the finish between two diametrically opposed social systems. Moreover, it is a fight the Soviets intend to win."

In the face of this Soviet drive for strategic superiority, coupled with announced Communist aims and the "war economy" atmosphere prevailing in the Soviet Union, the special subcommittee agreed that the United States must "create a missile defense system to protect our nuclear deterrent."

"An ABM system, said the subcommittee, "is not a cure-all for the security of the United States . . . but (it) is an essential component in the network of military systems designed to give the American people a seamless garment of security in an age of acute danger."

In its Foreword, the panel said:

"We have emphasized the trend in strategic military capabilities of the U.S.S.R. versus the U.S.A. This criterion is more important than one based upon intentions because one can easily be deceived by intentions but not as readily by capabilities.

"If one finds an increasing capability for warfare on the part of a self-declared enemy, it is only common sense and prudence to prepare an adequate defense."

Said the subcommittee:

"On March 14, 1969, President Nixon announced that his Administration planned to modify the Sentinel missile defense system approved by Congress under the Johnson Administration by using it first to defend some U.S. retaliatory missiles rather than to defend cities. This modification was named the 'Safeguard' system. . . .

"Safeguard is a modest, limited proposal. It is subject to constant review, as conditions change.

"Nevertheless, the Safeguard ABM has become the focus of a major national debate. It has become a symbolic issue with many. Some of those who oppose the emphasis given to national defense expenditures have clearly chosen Safeguard as the issue on which to join in opposition.

"The Safeguard debate has thus assumed such importance that all major defense decisions in the future will very likely be prejudiced if Safeguard is rejected."

The Council's National Strategy subcommittee summed up its findings this way:

"ABM is a method of deterrence which will save lives and not destroy them.

"It is more consistent with the moral objectives of the United States for this country to provide more effective ways of protecting people than to base our deterrent power wholly upon our ability to kill people in other countries or 'accept' heavy casualties at home.

"On balance, Safeguard makes sense:

It makes sense to defend our retaliatory missile sites;

It makes sense to defend our air bases;

It makes sense to defend our national command centers in the nation's capital;

It makes sense because the cost is relatively low and the program is subject to yearly review;

It makes sense to defend against the Chinese threat of the mid-70s;

It makes sense because we are not foreclosing the future.

"We are leaving our options open."

PROBLEMS FACING SOVIET JEWS

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, today in the U.S.S.R. there is a substantial group of

Soviet citizens denied even fundamental religious and cultural rights guaranteed them by Soviet law. I refer to the 3 million Jews of that nation who comprise the second largest Jewish community in the world. This discriminatory treatment by the Soviet Union of its Jewish citizens stands in contrasts to the equality accorded them in other parts of the world, including even some nations of Eastern Europe such as Rumania and Yugoslavia.

The Soviets can ill afford to broadcast to the world their devotion to the rights of man when they continue to deny fundamental religious and cultural rights to a substantial number of her own citizens at home. Just as Americans expressed abhorrence of the treatment of Russia's Jews during the czarist regime, so do we express our concern regarding the slow strangulation of an ancient faith in a land where once it flourished and prospered.

The Washington Board of Rabbis has presented to me with an eloquent statement regarding anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R. I commend it to my colleagues and include it as part of my remarks herewith:

STATEMENT

We condemn the Soviet Union for its anti-Semitism in sanctioning Trofim Kichko's slanderous book, "Judaism and Zionism"; and, for its inhumane policy of educational, cultural and religious persecution of Soviet Jewry. We are deeply concerned by reports of brutal suppression of Jewish students in Latvia for protesting Soviet persecution. We are appalled that the Soviet Government has approved the publication of a second libelous book by the notorious anti-Semite, Kichko.

As a signatory of the United Nations Human Rights Convention, the Soviet Union has violated its solemn pledge not to discriminate against any racial, ethnic or religious group. We urge the Secretary General of the United Nations to investigate the Soviet Union's flagrant bigotry.

Because the Kremlin cruelly discriminates against Jews, denying them the elementary human rights the Soviet Constitution guarantees' to all other ethnic groups, Soviet Jewry has been driven to the abyss of despair. Jews are deprived of the cultural and educational rights enjoyed by all other nationality groups. The Hebrew language is suppressed, Jews and Judaism constantly vilified on the Government controlled television, radio and in the press. Since 1956 four-hundred synagogues have been ruthlessly closed down by the Kremlin.

In the name of humanity we demand that the Soviet regime halt its strangulation of Jewry. We call upon the Kremlin to cease discriminating against Jews and Judaism and live up to both the promises of the Soviet Constitution and to Premier Kosygin's public assurance that the Soviet Union would permit Jewish emigration for the purpose of family reunification.

FINANCIAL GYMNASTICS OF ASSOCIATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, I urged the House Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full investigation of

the extracurricular affair of Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court.

As everyone knows, Mr. Douglas has been paid more than \$85,000 over the last 7 years by the Albert Parvin Foundation, an organization with close ties to Las Vegas gambling casinos.

One member of the gambling fraternity, Edward Levinson, has been convicted of helping to falsify the tax records of the Fremont, a hotel-casino owned by the Parvin-Dohrmann Co., Parvin-Dohrmann stock, until very recently, helped to finance the Parvin Foundation.

Parvin himself, it will be recalled, has been accused of conspiring with convicted stock manipulator Louis Wolfson, whose close connection with Abe Fortas is now well known.

Since I first called for an investigation of the Douglas matter, numerous press accounts have revealed, bit by bit, other facets of this affair.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers today carried a story concerning a \$4.2 million claim by the Government against the Fremont hotel-casino for tax deficiencies and fraud penalties.

The Daily Calumet, a Chicago newspaper, has reported on certain other figures involved with Parvin and the Las Vegas crowd.

The Daily Calumet article, as well as other published information concerning Parvin, raises the question of whether his foundation is actually a front for underworld activities and whether the underworld has actually been helping to support Justice Douglas.

These questions should be answered. Mr. Speaker, there is too much similarity between the Fortas and Douglas cases to be sheer coincidence. If Fortas was guilty of gross misconduct, which he most certainly was, Justice Douglas is equally guilty.

I again urge most strongly that the Committee on the Judiciary begin an immediate investigation and I suggest that the committee seek the assistance of the Justice Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation in carrying it out.

I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point several recent newspaper articles dealing with this subject:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 22, 1969]

FOUNDATION'S HOTEL—DOUGLAS LINKED TO TAX ACTION

(By Dan Thomasson)

The Nixon Administration has initiated a \$4.2 million claim for tax deficiencies and fraud penalties against a Las Vegas hotel-casino whose earnings in part have supported the tax-exempt Albert Parvin Foundation headed by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

The Government claims the Fremont Hotel Corp. owes most of the extra money because it skimmed off part of its crap table earnings before reporting them to the IRS.

The Fremont is owned by the Parvin-Dohrmann Co., whose stock until recently made up a portion of the Parvin Foundation's portfolio. The foundation recently announced it had sold its Parvin-Dohrmann stock. The foundation also has derived income from an interest in the Flamingo Hotel, another Las Vegas gambling establishment.

THREE-YEAR PERIOD

The Internal Revenue Service claim against the Fremont is for the years 1962, 1963 and 1964—before it was acquired by Parvin-Dohrmann. It was filed on March 7 and states that for those years the casino failed to report more than \$5.3 million from its gambling operations.

"It is determined that the omitted income is the result of an underestimate of gross income from craps," the Government claim states. (Such alleged withholding of part of the profits of gambling is known as "skimming.")

In addition, IRS contends that several tax deductions, including those for real estate depreciation and interest, should be disallowed. At one point, the IRS states, deductions claimed by Fremont Hotel Corp. for interest actually were distributions to stockholders.

The Fremont's attorneys, however, have contested the deficiency and penalty claims on grounds they are inaccurate and that the company's books are correct. They have filed a petition for redetermination in U.S. Tax Court here.

The IRS civil action against the Fremont follows a Federal criminal charge of income tax evasion thru "skimming" against Edward Levinson, a former Fremont owner who was retained as an executive of the hotel when it was bought by the Parvin-Dohrmann Co. in 1966.

Levinson, who had been a business partner of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats in a corporation once represented by resigned Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, entered a no contest plea in Federal court in Las Vegas to charges of having helped file a false tax return. Levinson was fined \$5,000 March 28, 1967.

The Government then moved to dismiss other charges against Levinson and against five others, three of whom were former employe-stockholders of the Fremont.

SUIT DROPPED

Two days later Levinson dropped his \$2 million invasion-of-privacy suit, filed three years earlier against four FBI agents whom he had accused of electronic bugging of his hotel office. The Justice Department admitted having installed the electronic device which had picked up conversations between Baker and Levinson in 1962. The bugging incident had been used by Baker to support claims he was the victim of massive Federal eavesdropping in his present appeal from convictions handed down in 1967.

The mild penalty given Levinson and his decision thereafter to drop the suit against the FBI brought immediate charges in Congress of a deal.

But Mitchell Rogovin, then assistant attorney general in charge of the tax division, denied any deal had been made with Levinson. Mr. Rogovin since has gone into private practice with Mr. Fortas' old law firm, Arnold and Porter.

[From the Washington Star, May 21, 1969]

FOUNDATION-AIDED UNIT PAID FEES TO DOUGLAS

(By James R. Polk)

Justice William O. Douglas has been paid \$500-a-day fees by a California study center which gets part of its money from the controversial foundation he heads.

The payments to Douglas by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., totaled about \$4,000 for 1968 and this year, a center official said.

Douglas has come under fire for his outside salary as president and only paid official of the Albert Parvin Foundation, which has had stock ties with Las Vegas gambling casinos.

Congressmen have called for an investigation of Douglas' income in the wake of Justice Abe Fortas' resignation from the Supreme Court in the dispute over a \$20,000 check from the family foundation of jailed financier Louis E. Wolfson.

BAR'S OPINION SOUGHT

The American Bar Association's Ethics Committee said yesterday Fortas had violated its canons of ethics. Sen. John J. Williams, R-Del., who requested the opinion, told the Senate he is also seeking an ABA committee ruling on Douglas' role in the Parvin Foundation.

Douglas is chairman of the board of directors of the Santa Barbara center as well as Parvin Foundation head.

The center has been the second highest recipient of payments from the Parvin Foundation in recent years. However, the contributions represent only a small portion of the center's financing.

The center encourages study of civil liberties and seminars on international politics.

Harry S. Ashmore, executive vice president of the center, said Douglas received \$1,000 for two days in attendance at a seminar, \$100 for an article and \$132 in travel expenses last year.

TRAVEL EXPENSES, \$865

Ashmore said Douglas got \$865 in travel expenses for another seminar earlier this year. He said the justice attended for four days and added, "I presume he was compensated again at the rate of \$500 a day."

Ashmore said, however, he found no record that this \$2,000 fee has been paid yet.

Also taking part in the Japanese-American political studies seminar at Santa Barbara in January were four senators, one congressman, and two former ambassadors.

Ashmore said they were Sens. J. William Fulbright, D-Ark.; John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky.; Mark O. Hatfield, R-Ore., and Alan Cranston, D-Calif.; Rep. Don Edwards, D-Calif.; former U.N. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, and former Asian diplomat Edwin O. Reischauer.

Ashmore said he thought the others, who attended from one to three days, also received \$500 daily.

"That's the usual rate," he said. "We bring them here and work them all day. We work their tails off."

THE 1962-63 FEES LISTED

The payments to Douglas were made through the Fund for the Republic, Inc., a non-profit foundation which is identical with the center.

The Fund for the Republic's tax returns for 1962 and 1963 also list fees and expenses for Douglas totaling \$4,104 for those two years. Starting in 1964, the tax records stopped listing payments for directors.

Ashmore said the justice does not receive any salary as chairman of the board for the center, a position that Douglas has held for several years.

The Santa Barbara payments have been small compared with the \$12,000-plus salary paid to Douglas by the Parvin Foundation.

Ashmore and the center's president, Dr. Robert Hutchins, are directors of the Parvin Foundation along with Douglas.

FOUNDATION GRANTS

Tax records show the Parvin Foundation gave the center \$70,000 in the period from 1965 to 1967. Last year's returns have not been made public yet.

Princeton University received twice that amount at nearly \$142,000 over the three years for foreign fellowships. UCLA got about \$40,000.

The two universities and the center were the only recipients of Parvin Foundation grants in the three years.

In the same period Douglas was paid \$36,-765 as Parvin Foundation president. Over a 7-year period, Douglas received more than \$85,000, records show.

Supreme Court justices receive salaries of \$60,000 a year under a pay raise enacted this year.

It was disclosed yesterday that the Parvin Foundation in March sold its stock in a firm owning three Las Vegas gambling casinos for \$2 million.

The firm, Parvin-Dohrmann Co., is now headed by Delbert W. Coleman, a director of the Atlanta Braves, Baseball Commissioner Bowie Kuhn has begun an investigation of stock holdings in the firm by top officials of the Braves and the Oakland Athletics.

Harvey Silbert, secretary and treasurer of the Parvin Foundation said the foundation's remaining holdings of 21,791 shares were sold in early March.

In a telephone interview Monday from Los Angeles, where the foundation is based, Silbert said the stock was sold through a broker at \$91.75 a share. This would result in a total purchase price of \$1,999,324 for the stock.

Justice Douglas, reached Monday in Bellingham, Wash., said he had no comment regarding the foundation's past links with Las Vegas holdings or criticism of his role with the foundation.

The foundation was formed in 1960 by Los Angeles businessman Albert B. Parvin, who sold his stock in Parvin-Dohrmann Co. last fall.

Parvin, named by the government as an alleged conspirator in stock charges against Wolfson, is still listed as vice president of the foundation that bears his name.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 21, 1969]

FORTAS QUIT; WHAT ABOUT DOUGLAS?

Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas was embarrassed out of his \$60,000-a-year position because it was revealed that he once had accepted a \$20,000 fee from a foundation set up by Louis Wolfson, the stock manipulator now in prison.

Mr. Fortas eventually returned the \$20,000 fee.

Justice William O. Douglas has been getting \$12,000 a year as president of the Albert Parvin Foundation. The foundation made news this week when the secretary revealed that a mortgage the foundation held on a Las Vegas hotel and casino had been paid off and that the foundation had sold its shares in a company which owned three other Las Vegas hotel-casino properties.

In 1966, when the Internal Revenue Service was checking up on the Albert Parvin Foundation, and while Justice Douglas was president, the foundation hired Mrs. Abe Fortas (a tax lawyer) to help with the case. IRS apparently was satisfied with what it found in its inquiry—and took no more action.

Albert Parvin, who set up the foundation, at one time was involved with Louis Wolfson in a stock operation.

The Parvin Foundation primarily sponsors fellowships for youths from "under-developed" countries. Whether a Supreme Court justice is needed to direct such an activity may be debated, but his salary has accounted for up to one-fourth of the annual total disbursements of the foundation.

In a statement furnished Sen. Williams of Delaware this week, the American Bar Association Committee on Professional Ethics described former Justice Fortas' connections with the Wolfson foundation as "clearly contrary to the canons of judicial ethics, even if he did not and never intended to interfere or take part in any legal, administrative or judicial matters, affecting Mr. Wolfson."

The committee said there are eight separate canons of the bar association which would bear on the Fortas question.

What fit the Fortas case surely would in the Douglas case.

The bar committee said it was not talking about the lawfulness of Mr. Fortas, conduct—but about the ethics of it. And the ethical precepts of the bar association require that judges "act not only in a manner that is lawful and proper, but in a manner that gives the impression and appearance that it is proper."

Mr. Fortas, in resigning from the court, tried to explain his conduct. Justice Douglas simply goes on drawing his foundation salary.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 21, 1969]

DOUGLAS PROBE URGED

(By Dan Thomasson)

Sen. John J. Williams, R-Del. today asked the American Bar Association to determine whether Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas has violated the ABA's code of judicial ethics by accepting a \$12,000-a-year fee from a California foundation with former Las Vegas gambling connections.

Sen. Williams posed the question in a letter to ABA President William T. Gossett of Chicago within hours after the association's committee on professional ethics concluded that former Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas had violated its canons of conduct in his relationship with the family foundation of jailed financier Louis E. Wolfson.

The ABA committee, emphasizing that it was not dealing with the lawfulness of the Fortas involvement with the Wolfson foundation, cited eight separate canons as bearing on the activities of Mr. Fortas in accepting—and much later rejecting—an arrangement for a \$20,000-a-year lifetime payment by the foundation. The canons included several which stress the duty of a judge to avoid both improprieties and the appearance of improprieties in his official conduct.

The committee made its statement in answer to an earlier letter from Sen. Williams.

Sen. Williams, in his letter today asking the ABA also to take a stand on the relations of Justice Douglas with the Parvin Foundation, cited several of the same canons and then stated:

"It is also a matter of public record that Justice Douglas has been on the payroll of the Parvin Foundation at a salary of \$12,000 a year and the principals behind this tax-exempt foundation have likewise been subjects of investigation by various agencies of the government, including the Department of Justice.

"I am sure the ABA is familiar with Justice Douglas' arrangements for accepting these fees from this foundation, whose members have close relationship with the Las Vegas gambling industry.

"Therefore, I am asking the question: Does Justice Douglas' acceptance of this \$12,000 annual retainer from the Parvin Foundation violate the canons of judicial ethics of the ABA?"

The furor over outside activities of members of the Supreme Court which resulted in Mr. Fortas' resignation last week continued as Sen. Carl Curtis, R-Neb., took the Senate floor to criticize Justice Douglas and charge that "his conduct is not befitting that of a man on the Supreme Court."

There also was speculation that Chief Justice Earl Warren may call a meeting of the Judicial Conference to look into both the Fortas and Douglas cases and the question of whether judges should accept fees from foundations.

The conference normally meets twice a year—in the spring and fall—and there is

precedent for concerning itself with such matters. Several years ago the conference made a ruling barring Federal judges from sitting on boards of companies.

There was no indication today that the ABA committee's comments on Mr. Fortas' activities would lead to any disciplinary proceedings.

An ABA spokesman in Washington, Harry Swegle, said the only action the association could initiate in connection with its conclusion that Mr. Fortas has violated judicial ethics was to expel him from the ABA.

PREVIOUSLY DROPPED

But he then disclosed that Mr. Fortas already had been dropped from membership for non-payment of dues. He said Mr. Fortas dropped out about the time he was named to the Supreme Court in 1965.

The ABA also came under criticism today from several Senators, including Curtis and Williams, for having made a "hasty" decision in backing Mr. Fortas for chief justice last year when he was nominated by former President Johnson.

Sen. Williams' reference to the Las Vegas gambling connections of the Albert Parvin Foundation, which Justice Douglas heads as the only paid officer, came as foundation officials were announcing that it has sold its stock holdings in a company that owns three casinos.

ROBERT W. GOODMAN

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, not quite 5 years ago Andrew Goodman and two other civil rights workers were brutally murdered near Philadelphia, Miss. During the period of anguished waiting for word of their son's fate I came to know the courage and dedication of his parents, Carolyn and Robert W. Goodman. Their firm commitment to the principles of democracy was an inspiration.

Today, I am profoundly saddened to inform the House that Robert Goodman died on Tuesday, May 20.

Robert Goodman's expression of dedication to "the values Andy held dear" moved the Nation at the time of his son's death in 1964. His first response in his grief was "pride in our son's commitment." He pledged that he would "continue to work for this goal," and called upon the Nation to fulfill the dream of equality held so dear by his son. He said at that time:

This tragedy is not private; it is part of the public conscience of our country.

Robert Goodman, in 1967, became president of the Pacific Foundation, a broadcasting enterprise, of which he said:

It's free air is an affirmation of the Bill of Rights and a true voice of social responsibility.

He was a trustee of the Walden School, grounded in respect for individual worth. Within his profession of engineering Robert Goodman was president of a construction company and active in professional organizations.

Robert W. Goodman has been called that rare mixture of the practical businessman and the idealistic humanist. The demonstrated selflessness and good-

ness of his life and his idealism suggest that "the values Andy held so dear" and for which he gave his life must surely have been learned from his father.

I shall never forget Robert Goodman's unbelievable courage and fortitude and how—at the hour of stark tragedy for him—he compassionately thought first of others, the families of the two young men who sacrificed their lives with Andrew.

I cherished the friendship of Robert W. Goodman whose qualities of gentleness and dedication inspired all who knew him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Carolyn; his sons, Jonathan and David; his mother, Mrs. Charles Goodman; and all the family.

I include at this point in the RECORD the obituary from the New York Times of May 21:

ROBERT W. GOODMAN, PRESIDENT OF PACIFICA FOUNDATION, IS DEAD—FATHER OF RIGHTS AIDE SLAIN IN MISSISSIPPI WAS HEAD OF A CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Robert W. Goodman, the father of Andrew Goodman, one of three civil-rights workers murdered in Mississippi in 1964, and president of the Pacifica Foundation and the Grow Construction Company, Inc., died yesterday at Mount Sinai Hospital of a stroke. He was 54 years old and lived at 161 West 86th Street.

On Aug. 5, 1964, the day after the body of his son, a 20-year-old Queens College student, had been found with those of Michael H. Schwerner, also a white New Yorker, and James E. Chaney, a Mississippi Negro, Mr. Goodman told reporters:

"Our grief, though personal, belongs to the nation. The values our son expressed in his simple action of going to Mississippi are still the bonds that bind this nation together—its Constitution, its law, its Bill of Rights." He then wept in the arms of friends.

REGISTRATION DRIVE

The three young men, who were taking part in a voter registration drive for Negroes, had disappeared after having been released from the Philadelphia, Miss., jail on a traffic charge in June, 1964. After an extensive search, their bodies were found in an earthen dam six miles from Philadelphia.

Seven men, including the chief deputy sheriff of Neshoba County, Cecil Ray Price, were convicted in 1967 of conspiracy in the slayings.

Mr. Goodman became president of the Pacifica Foundation, whose nonprofit, listener-financed radio stations have frequently been the center of free-speech controversies. In the fall of 1967, after having served on the foundation's board for a year and a half. The foundation owns WBAI in New York, KPA in Berkeley, Calif., and KPFF in Los Angeles.

In an allusion to Pacifica, Mr. Goodman, whose construction company built tunnels, bridges and foundations, said in a biography he prepared last year:

"It has been said by some that this is another form of my underground activity. Perhaps—but for me its free air is an affirmation of the Bill of Rights and a true voice of social responsibility."

He had recently found new quarters for WBAI-FM and negotiated the terms for purchase of the building at 359 East 62d Street from the Bethesda Covenant Church.

Larry Josephson, the assistant manager of the station, yesterday called Mr. Goodman "that rare mixture of the practical businessman and the idealistic humanist."

In his biography, Mr. Goodman wrote: "I was born Aug. 5, 1914, in New York City—the very same day Europe declared war on itself. Since my birth nothing essential has changed except that the scene has

shifted to a broader stage whereon America now pursues warfare against Asia."

Mr. Goodman attended Cornell University, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1935 and a civil engineering degree in 1939.

For several years after graduating from Cornell, he built houses in Queens and then he designed and built cranes used during World War II in ship repair for the Navy.

In 1945 he joined the construction concern founded that year by his father, Charles, and he became president on his father's death in 1963. It is situated at 313 West 53d Street.

From 1946 to 1964, Mr. Goodman was a trustee of the Walden School. The school, he said was "a pioneer in modern educational theory and practice, where individual needs supersede the demands of system."

He was a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the New York State Society of Professional Engineers and the Moles, a contractors' organization for those who work underground. He has also served as a trustee of the Compressed Air and Tunnel Workers Welfare and Pension Trusts.

Mr. Goodman is survived by his widow, the former Carolyn Elizabeth Drucker; two sons, Jonathan and David; his mother, Mrs. Charles Goodman, and Mrs. Joanne Bucholz, all of New York.

A funeral service will be at 11:30 A.M. tomorrow at the Community Church, 40 East 35th Street.

THE NEW CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, when General Eisenhower appointed the present Supreme Court Chief Justice of the United States all of us had hopes then of having a good Chief Justice. I certainly hope as has been said today, that Mr. Chief Justice Burger will fulfill the hopes of those who preceded me on the floor. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF).

I hope that, if President Nixon does nothing else, he can appoint a Chief Justice of the United States who will turn that Court around and abandon its practice of legislating. This will have the effect of gaining some respect by the Congress of the United States for the Court and thereby gain some respect of the people of the United States.

However, under the leadership of the present Chief Justice this Court has capriciously embarked on a program of legislation beyond the intentment of anything Congress has ever written. As a matter of fact, it has been contemptuous of the Congress.

If the new Chief Justice will only do this, he will vindicate the selection by President Nixon. If he does this, I, for one, as everybody else in this Congress, I am sure, will thank the President for his selection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MAY 23, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, May 23, to file a privileged report on the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. LANGEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to ask the majority leader to acquaint us with the program for next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished acting minority leader the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day but there are no District bills scheduled for consideration.

However, on Monday there will be for the consideration of the House the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1970.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week we will have the Treasury Department-Post Office Department Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970 and H.R. 4204, to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict, subject to a rule being granted.

Of course, the Memorial Day recess previously announced will begin at the close of business on Wednesday, May 28, and end at noon on Monday, June 2.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further business may be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it intended to hold a session on next Thursday, or will there be an adjournment resolution adopted?

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope—and I shall discuss this with the leadership of the other body—that we will be able to adjourn by resolution so that we will not have to meet on Thursday. That is our hope.

Mr. GROSS. There would be no business on Thursday?

Mr. ALBERT. There would be no meeting on Thursday, but there will be business on Wednesday. We do expect business on Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

AS YE SOW

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was the evening of May 15. I was walking alone, along the almost deserted corridors of the Capitol, when I thought I heard someone whispering behind me. I turned around, but no one was there. Shrugging my shoulders I walked a few steps further, then, I heard it again. An unreal, almost ghostlike feeling was in the air, that for some strange reason had turned quite chilly. I looked around at those huge bronze and marble statues—there stood Tom Benton, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Roger Williams, and many others, all distinguished members of this great Republic, staring back at me through vacant, unseeing eyes. The hall remained quiet, I heard the sounds no more, so I continued with my journey.

As I look back to that evening, I am struck with the realization, that at just about the time I was there, the resignation of Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas was being delivered to the White House.

Now, I certainly am no believer in the occult, but could it be that the troubled spirits of those great Americans were aware of what had transpired that day? Could it be, that the very foundations of that old building were to once again feel the pain that "cronism" brings? Was it possible that those spirits, revered by so many, were ready to step down from their hallowed pedestals, and give them over to the "new wave," the antiheroes of the assorted "deals," "frontiers," and "societies" that have created a whole new series of monuments, sculpted by permissiveness, chiseled by cronism and polished by largess?

What form would these new statues take? Would they be cast in the likeness of those bulwarks of the "Great Society," Bobby Baker, Billy Sol Estes, Fred Black, or Walter Jenkins? Names from out of

the past perhaps, but names linked together in a chain, forged by the blacksmith of the Pedernales. A chain composed of weak links, yet strengthened by the respectability of a Presidential appointment, and confirmed by a fraternity. And we might add, why is the anvil so quiet lately?

Is it just a happenstance that a \$60,000 a year Supreme Court Justice would accept—with a clear conscience—a \$20,000 per annum lifetime fee? Or was he cast from the same mold as those before him—a glorified and high-priced "fixer," accepting payment for favors due?

Will there be others to fall by the wayside? Are there those now on the Supreme Court—with the same kind of conscience, but lesser fee—who accept the same kind of gratuity, or wheel and deal in real estate developments across the Potomac?

Was it ironical that the former Deputy Defense Secretary who signed the order for the new code of ethics, was to be sharply criticized for failure to follow it in the TFX contract and controversy?

Is it a mere coincidence that a former "Great Society" Secretary of Transportation accepted a \$95,000 a year job as head of the Illinois Central Railroad after his Department had earlier approved a \$25 million loan to the company?

Are we to believe that it was just a happenstance that the former Secretary of the Interior approved a \$550,000 contract to a private consulting firm, and less than a year later became board chairman of its Washington office?

Was it pure chance that a former Assistant Postmaster General became vice president of a firm whose profits jumped from \$60,000 in 1967 to over \$1.28 million in 1968, mainly on the basis of hauling Government mail?

How do these things come about? What makes them happen? Are the Nation's students really putting their finger on the truth when they say the "system" is corrupt? Is it possible that one man, in all innocence could appoint so many people, with so many obvious flaws in their character, to so many responsible jobs?

Could the Congress itself be at fault? Are we such easy marks, that just any old appointment, to any "nice guy" will be passed on without objection? It has been done before.

We have been warned many times by those with foresight and firm convictions, that any appointee to high office should pass the most rigid inspection. I do not mean that he should be crucified on a cross of divestiture. We are well aware that it is almost impossible to bring good men into Government at less than a quarter of their normal earnings. But we must insist on disclosure. The executive, the legislative, the judiciary, must all abide by the same rules. Let there be no doubt to anyone about the affiliations of any public servant. Let us remember that the "peoples right to know," is still the responsibility of the Congress. Let the Federal Government show the way by turning the tide of irresponsibility into the wave of integrity. Let the Nation's Capitol regain the re-

spect of those it serves, let the people once again point with pride to those who represent them as Members worthy of the Nation's trust. Let the word go out that truth is still synonymous with Washington. Let us make patronage an honorable estate and close forever the "credibility gap."

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM V. ROTH

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 16, our distinguished colleague, BILL ROTH, announced his candidacy for the U.S. Senate in 1970. After 20 years of dedicated service, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware has announced that he will not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to say that my father served with Senator WILLIAMS in the other body, and there is no Member of the other body who is more highly regarded than Senator WILLIAMS.

Mr. Speaker, in assessing the long-range effects of BILL ROTH's decision I find myself harboring a distinct mixture of emotions. While I am saddened to know that we will be losing his companionship and his counsel in the House, I am excited at the thought of his presence in the other body. As we have known BILL ROTH in the House as a man of resolute dedication and determination, so will he quickly be similarly recognized in the Senate.

The legislative and executive leadership that he has displayed in the House in a very short period of time will doubtless be generated to an ever greater extent in the execution of his senatorial duties.

Since his election to Congress, BILL ROTH's solid and constructive ideas have been reflected through an infinite range of legislative proposals. Above all, he has concerned himself with meaningful legislation of particular note, such as his innovative legislative efforts directed at the reorganization of our Federal Government, to draw from it greater efficiency in meeting our Nation's needs. His highly regarded "Roth Study of 1968" which focused on deficiencies in grant-in-aid assistance, was received with favor by both public and private officials, non-profit groups and the news media across this country.

BILL ROTH received national recognition for his efforts to reorganize the mass of Federal-aid programs. He has introduced—and this was in his first year of Congress—two original major pieces of legislation in this area, both cosponsored by more than one-third of the total House membership in both the 90th and 91st Congresses.

The Program Information Act, which would require the President to publish an annual catalog of all Federal-aid programs, and a bill to establish a Hoover-type commission to study the effectiveness of Federal-aid programs as they now exist.

The Roth study of 1968, which prompted this legislation and spotlighted deficiencies in the present grant-in-aid system, has been praised all across the country. His proposals have received the full backing of the National Governor's Conference, the Conference of State Legislators, and the National Association of Counties.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he has particularly distinguished himself. His discerning knowledge of international affairs has been evidenced through his intent participation in this committee.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in these statements concerning our distinguished colleague from Delaware.

I first met BILL ROTH before I came to Congress, and was impressed by him then, and, of course, I have found that impression continuously confirmed by his work after he came here.

I think in one respect the fact that his work in the area of Government organization and the reform of that organization will be perhaps the single item by which he is most remembered in this House, may not do him justice because that is simply one example of the profound effort that our colleague is able to generate in legislative and administrative subjects.

I will remember his service with me on the Committee on the Judiciary as thoughtful and creative, and also exhibiting that same quiet and thoughtful tenacity and willingness to engage in the kind of hard work that has typified his presence here in the House of Representatives.

I believe that his breadth of interest and his breadth of knowledge will provide a solid and forceful voice for reason in the other body.

He has served his Nation in many, many ways and he has served his Nation in many, many fields. I regret that we in this House will be losing his quiet but forceful voice and his calm but soundly reasoned arguments. The House of Representatives will be somewhat diminished by his loss, but the Nation will be the gainer by his continuation in the service of his country and the people of his State in the other body.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying this tribute to our colleague, BILL ROTH.

Mr. Speaker, beginning with the 90th Congress, my esteemed colleague, BILL ROTH, and I became close friends and I have enjoyed the privilege of knowing this man of character and integrity and great competence who represents the great and sovereign State of Delaware as a Member of this body.

Now that my distinguished colleague has announced his intention to seek elec-

tion to the U.S. Senate, I am certain that the voters of the great State of Delaware will make him a U.S. Senator where he will further distinguish himself in the other body.

BILL will have some mighty big shoes to fill, for JOHN J. WILLIAMS, who will be retiring next year has gained the respect and the gratitude of the entire Nation. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has been one of America's most courageous and effective legislators. His departure from the Senate will leave a void that only my good friend and colleague, BILL ROTH, can fill.

Illustrative of the kind of Representative BILL has been is the cataloging of Federal assistance programs which he has done for the benefit of not only those of us who serve in the Congress, but also for the benefit of the people back home who feel a little lost in trying to find their way through the maze of thousands of Federal programs without a guide. Congressman ROTH's contribution in this one endeavor alone is monumental and I think it bespeaks the kind of job he will do when he reaches the other side of the Hill on the banks of the Potomac in a place called the U.S. Senate.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON. of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON. of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to stand here today and join with my colleagues congratulating the people of the State of Delaware in having a person of the caliber of Congressman BILL ROTH to offer for the U.S. Senate from that State.

During the 90th Congress I had the opportunity to form a close friendship with BILL ROTH. I have been impressed by BILL, not just because of the fact that we have this friendship, but I have been impressed with his genuine desire to serve the people of this Nation, and the people of the State of Delaware.

We have a breakfast group that meets every Wednesday morning. BILL has chaired this group, and the important thing to me, so far as BILL ROTH's activities in this group is concerned, has been that BILL ROTH is not the type of person who seeks personal glory for himself, but he seeks to help and serve the best interests of all of his colleagues.

I am certain that, should BILL ROTH be elected by the people of Delaware to serve them in the Senate of the United States, that he will be a person who places the interest of the people of Delaware above his personal considerations, and that he will make great sacrifices and, indeed, the people of Delaware will be fortunate should they have the wisdom to elect BILL ROTH as their U.S. Senator.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to comment on the parallel between our distinguished colleague and Senator WILLIAMS. I think everybody who knows him draws the same conclusion. I believe the gentleman has put his finger on the basic strength of our colleague in this most appropriate comparison.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to join with you and to join with the others in saying a few words about our friend, BILL ROTH. It speaks well for the State of Delaware that a man like BILL ROTH is moving in the direction of the U.S. Senate.

BILL ROTH has all of the attributes of an outstanding statesman. He has set the pace toward organizing and reorganizing a better and more efficient congressional system. His reorganization bill means more efficiency, more savings to the Government, while at the same time expediting action.

His broad-minded approach to legislation makes his opinion most valued on the floor. His drive, energy, and activity have given him floor-leadership recognition here in Congress.

BILL ROTH will be an outstanding addition to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman for his most appropriate remarks.

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

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member in Congress, I have less basis in experience to speak about the gentleman from Delaware than have the other gentlemen who have participated on this occasion. But I have conceived a regard and a respect for the gentleman from Delaware. When I first came here a few months ago, to me one of the most intelligent pieces of legislation which crossed my desk was the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Delaware, which has been referred to already. I concluded that I would like to be one of those who would cosponsor that legislation. The gentleman from Delaware had asked for a special order to speak on the subject of his proposed legislation. I really did not know what a Member should do to participate in such a special order, but I felt that would be something that I would like to do, so I talked to the gentleman from Delaware about it.

He was, of course, very courteous, considerate, and helpful; so you might say that the first words I ever managed to utter on this floor were by the courtesy and under the guidance of the gentleman.

Therefore, I am very happy to have the opportunity to in some small measure return his courtesy by participating in this special order and saying to him, and to all of you, that I feel the people of Delaware will have a distinguished Senator, and I wish him well in that endeavor.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for yielding and taking this time so that all of us may come here and pay tribute to our colleague, BILL ROTH. Since our friend from Delaware has been here, he has shown the House of Representatives what an orderly mind he has. He has brought to the floor of

the House and to the people of this country a real effort to bring order out of chaos in Government. I do not know of any Representative whose name has appeared as often on the editorial pages of the newspapers of my district than the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. BUSH. As much as Senator KENNEDY?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Even Senator KENNEDY. The people of my district are concerned about how the Government is run. They are concerned about having it run in an orderly fashion. They are concerned about reformation efforts to see that we are on the right track, and that the people know what is going on in Government.

Certainly BILL ROTH has taken the leadership in this, and it has not been easy, because when you start looking at what makes up this very complex Government of ours and then start trying to pull together all of those complexities, I come back to what I said about the gentleman awhile ago: It takes an orderly mind to do that.

So we do have mixed emotions as we think about the fact that he will be leaving us. But I also have a great sense of satisfaction in knowing that we will have him across the Capitol, where we can call on him in the other body. I know that the good people of Delaware have benefited from his service in the House. I am sure that they will continue to benefit greatly when he is elected to the other body.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

First of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for taking this time to give us the opportunity to join in an accolade to a great public servant on the other side of the Capitol and to extend good wishes and make appropriate observations about the public service of a colleague of ours on this side.

All of us in the country will miss the talent and dedication and work of that great Senator from Delaware who is retiring, and who is going to retire so he can enjoy a well-earned rest and relaxation. Hopefully he will continue his interest and have an influence for good.

I am especially pleased that there is in prospect for the people of Delaware the opportunity to send a very worthy substitute for the great Senator from Delaware.

I have known Congressman ROTH ever since he has been here, and I have noted his sense of dedication and his capabilities, and his desire, as someone said, to bring order out of chaos and to help us develop a better understanding of the business of Government.

The catalog of the Federal projects that he inspired and has largely been responsible for is in the hands of every mayor and every public official in my district. It is one of the most welcome

and appreciated documents and has been most helpful.

So I join all of those who have taken the time today to extend good wishes and fond hopes for success for this great young man who has served us so well in this body, where he will be missed, but our loss will be their gain, and I suppose in a sense some of us might agree that they have much to gain.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that I am a great admirer of the senior Senator from Delaware, my good friend JOHN WILLIAMS. I deeply regret that he has decided not to be a candidate for reelection next year.

But I can think of no more worthy successor to Senator WILLIAMS than our colleague, BILL ROTH, who has announced his candidacy to fill the vacancy.

I have enjoyed serving with him on the Foreign Affairs Committee and I can say with every confidence that his presence in the U.S. Senate will reflect a great credit on his State and the Nation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of our most valued colleagues has announced that he will not be seeking reelection to the House. While his time here has been relatively brief, he has made a tremendous impact on this body and has achieved much more than many of us will in a considerably longer period.

It was BILL ROTH who launched the first comprehensive effort to catalog Federal programs and services since big government began its relentless period of expansion. By the time his study was concluded, BILL had proven a number of important things.

In the first place, he had proved that he was resourceful and determined in pursuit of his goal. No one with less stamina or drive could have pieced together the often contradictory reports of hundreds of bureaus, agencies, and departments, sifted through the miles and miles of redtape, and prodded many apathetic or incompetent bureaucrats into cooperating.

Second, BILL's findings convinced us of the magnitude of both modern Government and its problems. It was a real shock for many to learn that Uncle Sam's right hand often does not know what his left hand is doing, and that competing or conflicting programs, carried on at vast Federal expense, were often being managed by rival agencies or subdivisions.

Finally, the result of BILL's effort was a greater working knowledge of the Government-organizational knowledge that enabled all of us to deal with Government more effectively on a day-to-day basis.

This is just one of the many contributions that BILL ROTH has made to the House. It typifies his spirit and dedication—qualities we will miss when he has left this body.

However, it now seems very likely that our loss will be the Senate's gain, and

that BILL ROTH will soon earn distinction in the other body, serving his State in an even higher capacity.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it will be a great loss to the House when our colleague, BILL ROTH, goes across the Capitol to the Senate to succeed the very distinguished Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware, who has announced he will not be a candidate for reelection.

For over 20 years Senator WILLIAMS has ably served his State and our country. His shoes will be difficult to fill. But I know no one who could be better able to do this than BILL ROTH. As Delaware's Representative-at-Large he has in fact already been a spokesman for the entire State in the Congress.

Our loss is the Senate's gain. And I am realistic enough to recognize that in the other body there will be greater opportunities for a man of BILL ROTH's unusual talents to render larger service to his home State and our country. To serve the people of Delaware where he can serve them best, and to the best of his ability is his objective.

Even as a freshman Member of the House, BILL ROTH made his mark. He undertook the almost impossible task of cataloging in a meaningful form all the federally-operated assistance programs. It was the type of undertaking that does not make headlines. It was the type of dull, tedious work that the average Member of Congress is not disposed to do.

But BILL ROTH is that type of man: he is the exception. He is one of those all too rare individuals in public life who is more interested in doing the job that needs to be done than in making headlines. It was my privilege to join him in sponsoring legislation he developed to provide for the catalog, kept up to date, that the general public and the Congress might know exactly what is taking place in connection with the multitude of programs.

To say the least, BILL ROTH's constructive efforts have contributed immeasurably to what is now being undertaken by the Nixon administration for a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and for the coordination of the various grant-in-aid programs.

There are many other ways in which BILL ROTH has contributed to the formulation and advancement of our party's program. He has proven himself to be not only diligent in the performance of his duties; he has proven himself to be a man of high principle, who stands firm on principle.

I join my colleagues in wishing for him the very best as he aspires to a Senate seat.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in a special tribute to Hon. WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr., on the occasion of his announcement that he will be a candidate for the U.S. Senate from Delaware in 1970.

BILL ROTH has been an outstanding legislator in the House of Representatives—dedicated to the enactment of good laws for the betterment of his fellow citizens, extremely knowledgeable in the field of foreign affairs, and possessed

of the sound judgment and wisdom necessary to our lawgiving decisions of today.

Although we shall sorely miss Congressman ROTH in the House of Representatives, he will be an invaluable asset to the U.S. Senate for the people of Delaware and for our country.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BILL ROTH has announced that he will not be returning to this Chamber in 1970, and has chosen instead to seek the office of U.S. Senator from Delaware. I wish him all the luck in the world and will certainly look forward to his occupying a desk on the Capitol's north side.

BILL ROTH epitomizes the idea that Government is meant to serve not just to exist. He has worked long and hard to eradicate waste and duplication. Congressman ROTH's Program Information Act, introduced in the 90th Congress to eliminate the multitude of overlapping program catalogs, and substitute instead a single official catalog, updated monthly, containing complete program descriptions and covering all Federal assistance programs, was a stroke of genius. His ability to find a better way is uncanny. His capacity for organization is unparalleled. His dedication is obvious. His bravery is attested to by the Bronze Star he received in World War II.

It is an honor to sit in the same Chamber with BILL ROTH, a matter of pride to be known as his associate, and a privilege to call him a friend.

Although it will be some time before BILL departs this Chamber, I wish to take this time to publicly wish him good luck and Godspeed.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have known BILL ROTH for several years and watched his very outstanding work in Young Republican's and later in the party structure. He has a keen mind and can immediately come to grips with the central issue in any problem.

Congressman ROTH has performed admirably in the House of Representatives. According to the unwritten rules, a freshman Congressman should observe the operation of the House in his first term serving his apprenticeship. Not so with BILL ROTH. He could not stand idly by while time passed. His outstanding work in drawing attention to the proliferation of Federal grant and aid programs had given him nationwide acclaim, and deservedly so. This project shows investigative ability and also great perseverance despite lack of cooperation from several executive agencies.

While I regret the fact that his services will be lost to the House of Representatives in the next Congress, he is well qualified to continue the excellent service in the Senate that the citizens of Delaware have come to expect from their distinguished senior Senator.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH), for taking the special order today to properly recognize one of our outstanding colleagues, WILLIAM ROTH, from Delaware.

Since the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), has made the decision to seek election to the U.S. Senate from

his State, it has created some up and down feelings with many of us.

In the relatively short period of time he has served in the House, he has created a mark that is etched with good work. We will be losing an outstanding Member in our ranks, but I am convinced the Senate will gain his astute capability of work and judgment after the election of 1970. I believe it is important for a man of BILL ROTH's capabilities to be utilized in the Congress of our Nation because I know his superior work will continue.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished Member of this body, Congressman WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., of Delaware. BILL ROTH has announced his candidacy to succeed Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who will retire at the end of his present term.

Although this is only his second term in the U.S. House of Representatives, BILL has demonstrated those qualities of integrity, hard work, and devotion to duty that have made him a valued Member of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I am pleased to serve with him.

Although we will be sorry to lose him as a Member of this body at the conclusion of the 91st Congress, I am confident that he will be a great Senator and serve his State and Nation well as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I received the news that my colleague from Delaware BILL ROTH, has decided to seek election to the other body with mixed feelings. I am, naturally, delighted to know that BILL will continue to serve the people of Delaware and the Nation; I am saddened by the knowledge that the House will be losing one of its more promising young Members, a man of proven ability and energy.

Like most people, I was deeply impressed with BILL's efforts to produce a complete, accurate, and useful listing of the proliferation of Federal domestic assistance programs. His diligent, thorough research effort has contributed significantly to the public awareness of the cost and size of the Federal program structure. More than this, BILL ROTH set out to do something about it.

I am pleased to be among the sponsors of the Program Information Act, first introduced by BILL ROTH in the last Congress. It is a necessary and long overdue piece of reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, BILL ROTH is an able replacement for the distinguished Senator he hopes to follow to the other body. The good people of Delaware are most fortunate to have a man of BILL's integrity and ability representing them in the House and, I am confident, in 1971, serving them on the other side of Capitol Hill.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with many of my colleagues in expressing my best wishes to Congressman BILL ROTH in his campaign for a seat in the U.S. Senate. It has been evident to me, in the short period that I have been privileged to be a Member of this body, that BILL ROTH is one of the most capable and knowledgeable Members of the House.

His efforts to control the great pro-

liferation of Federal programs and increase efficiency in the executive branch, through reorganization, will certainly bear fruit in the near future. The attention that he focused on these problems was long overdue and can only help to contribute to a better structuring of our Federal agencies. Certainly his revelation that no one knows just how many programs are in existence is an eye opener to us all. It has instilled in many of us a little extra element of caution when the subject of new Federal grant programs is discussed.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle are sorry to see him go because of his leadership, but this disappointment is softened by the thought of the many attributes that he will bring to the other body. We are comforted by the knowledge that the people of Delaware will not be losing a dedicated public servant but instead will be gaining a vital and intelligent voice to replace the very capable Senator who is retiring.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague from Delaware regarding his decision to run for the Senate seat which will be vacated by retiring Senator JOHN WILLIAMS. I think Mr. ROTH has shown impressive credentials for this seat during his House tenure. In fact, he has shown certain attributes of thrift and common-sense that characterized the service of the man he intends to replace.

Certainly we will remember BILL ROTH for his efforts to simplify and consolidate Federal assistance programs. Hardly had he arrived in this body when he took on the tremendous task of canvassing each Federal agency to determine what it was doing in public assistance work. This exhaustive research project uncovered examples of duplication and overlapping agency assistance programs and pointed up the inadequacy of existing Federal assistance catalogs and directories.

Mr. ROTH serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is also a member of the task force on international trade of the House Republican conference research committee. We will miss his energy and intelligence and the cooperative effort he has displayed in the House. On the other hand, I think he will make an excellent Senator from Delaware, and I wish him well in his new venture.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the tribute to our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., of Delaware, who has announced that he will seek higher Federal office in 1970, due to the retirement of the senior Senator from Delaware. That BILL ROTH will seek election to the other body is a great loss to this Chamber. But it is reassuring, on the other hand, to realize that the function of legislative oversight, which has been so outstandingly performed throughout the past 20 years by the senior Senator from Delaware, will be carried on. I call to your attention, as testimony to BILL ROTH's commitment to the oversight function of Congress, his comprehensive proposal to catalog all Federal assistance programs. This bill, H.R. 339, the Program Information Act, is desperately

needed in a day when the right hand of the Federal Government often does not know what the left hand may be doing. Overlapping and duplicity in Federal programs have existed for years and are increasing every day. Local and State—as well as Federal officials often are unable to locate the programs which would provide the very assistance needed. Everyone talked about the problem but no one had the initiative to do anything about it in a positive way until BILL ROTH came to Congress. In his quiet, capable way, he tackled the massive job of finding out the facts about the scope of Federal assistance. The result was his catalog proposal, which has gained support from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Despite his junior standing in this body, BILL ROTH has earned the respect and admiration of all who know him and are familiar with his dedication to hard work, commonsense, and good government.

Sometimes, of course, a brilliant man with a talent for legislative research does not possess the administrative ability necessary for political office. This is certainly not the case with BILL ROTH, as all his colleagues know. In the field of administration, BILL ROTH has, once again, assessed a great need and translated his findings into a concrete proposal designed to effect improvements. Alongside his legislation to create a catalog of Federal programs stands a bill of equal stature—which would establish a Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization. This proposal is another much needed step in a critical direction—initiated by BILL ROTH, a man with fundamental understanding of administrative necessities.

In addition to his talent for administrative organization and his profound understanding of the functions of legislative oversight, BILL ROTH's personal qualities should be mentioned here, too. Very often a man of such scholarship may lack the human understanding and warmth so essential in the representative of the people. To the contrary with BILL ROTH, who embodies the greatest sensitivity in compassion and human understanding. I know of no individual better qualified to represent the people than BILL ROTH. I salute him and wish him the greatest fulfillment of his aspirations for the future.

BILL ROTH, as his proposals demonstrate, is a man of action as well as words. Those who know him readily acknowledge his congenial disposition and love of humanity. Men of his capabilities are destined for leadership, and the people of Delaware are fortunate to be represented by a gentleman of his stature.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding Member of the House, a close friend, and a most distinguished public servant, our able fellow legislator, BILL ROTH.

BILL is certainly one of the most dedicated and able Members of this body. He is a most effective Representative of the people of Delaware, yet never forgetting his duty to all of the people of America

as a Representative in the Congress of the United States.

His diligence and hard work on the tremendous waste of Federal funds in the duplication and overlapping of departments and agencies is a monumental achievement, the results of which will increase the efficiency of government services and result in savings of millions of dollars.

I congratulate the people of Delaware in their choice of a Representative-at-Large. I am confident BILL ROTH will continue his great contributions to his State and to his country in whatever capacity the future holds for him.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, when I learned that BILL ROTH had decided to run for the Senate, I was struck by the fact that the House's loss will truly be the Senate's gain.

BILL ROTH will take with him to the Senate the same determination, ability and brilliant idea that he gave to the House. BILL is never content to sit back and merely discuss the problems of this country. He is more comfortable working vigorously to correct them.

I worked with BILL in his brilliant campaign to straighten the maze of overlapping Federal programs and compile a simplified and usable listing. The Roth study is a milestone in the reform of the Federal bureaucracy.

I join my colleagues in congratulating BILL ROTH for his fine service to the House of Representatives and in wishing him much good luck in his campaign for the U.S. Senate.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to salute my colleague, the Honorable BILL ROTH, of Delaware, who has decided to run for a seat in the U.S. Senate in 1970.

BILL ROTH is a very dedicated person and a very sincere person. He has done a good job in the Congress, and his presence and contributions will be missed very much in the House.

I congratulate BILL ROTH on his decision and I wish him success in his future campaign.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, as a first-term legislator BILL ROTH became frustrated by the labyrinth of Federal agencies and the difficulty of trying to correlate the needs of constituents with available Federal assistance. He and his staff became involved in a massive research effort which he said was "designed to ferret out and obtain meaningful information about the myriad of federally operated programs providing assistance to the American public." We have the results of this 8-month study in the "Listing of Operating Federal Assistance Programs Compiled During the Roth Study." This comprehensive catalog brings together a wealth of information which all of us are finding useful as we seek to help our constituents in their dealings with the Federal Government.

More than 180 Members have recognized the significance of this monumental work and have joined BILL ROTH in calling for annual publication of a catalog of all Federal assistance programs. He also has the bipartisan support of over 160 Members for his bill to establish a "little Hoover Commission" to be

known as the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization. The Commission would consider the problems of duplication, inadequate coordination, and jurisdictional overlapping that have come with the unprecedented expansion of government.

From the Roth study we have these two important measures that would help make the Federal Government more efficient and more responsive to the needs of citizens. All of us who joined our colleague from Delaware in sponsoring these bills think his efforts in behalf of better Government deserve wide recognition. We hope to see congressional action before he leaves this body.

BILL ROTH is an extremely able and hard-working public servant. I wish him well as he enters this new venture. The House will be losing one of its finest Members, but the Senate will be gaining a conscientious and dedicated legislator.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have learned of BILL ROTH's decision not to run for reelection to the House and, instead, seek election to the U.S. Senate in 1970.

I will regret very much his departure from the House where he has certainly made a tremendous record in a very short time, but I know his talents are needed in the Senate and he will be a worthy successor to Senator WILLIAMS.

I had the pleasure of getting well acquainted with him during the 90th Congress when he was a valuable member of the task force on Western alliances and I came to respect his good judgment and his effectiveness.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, during his service in the House of Representatives, BILL ROTH has established himself as a knowledgeable and constructive proponent of renewal of government institutions.

He has sponsored several bills to improve the operation of the executive branch of Government and was an early sponsor in this session of H.R. 6278, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969.

I am confident that, when BILL ROTH is elected to the U.S. Senate in 1970, he will continue his commitment to the modernization of American Government to make it more responsive to the changing needs of the people of this country.

He is the kind of legislator who will be missed in the House.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we learned that one of our brightest young colleagues, WILLIAM V. ROTH, will run for the Senate next fall. His announcement to seek the seat which is to become vacant on the retirement of Delaware's senior Senator next fall, was received with mixed emotion in the House. All of us wish BILL well and are confident that he will prove an invaluable addition to the other body; however, we are sincerely reticent to yield from our ranks a Member of his stature and potential.

Those who know him well are not surprised by the announcement. Indeed, BILL ROTH has distinguished himself in every phase of his career.

BILL enlisted in the Army as a private

in 1943 and served in the Pacific where he was awarded the Bronze Star. By the time he was discharged in 1946 he had risen to the rank of captain.

His track record in the Republican Party is equally noteworthy: he served as chairman of the Delaware State committee and as a member of the national committee before coming to Congress nearly 3 years ago.

In the House, BILL has quickly mastered the legislative gamut and gained the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he has gained an expertise which will serve him well upon his election to the other body.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for all of his many friends when I say that while the House is sad to see a good friend and distinguished colleague depart its ranks, the loss is not surprising because BILL ROTH is one of those rare individuals whose energies and talents compel him to strive for further attainment. We wish him well in his endeavor, and lament the loss from our ranks but in so doing are consoled by the fact that he will not be leaving the Congress altogether.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., Member at Large from the State of Delaware, has demonstrated outstanding talents as a lawmaker.

Following his 1966 election to the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman ROTH undertook a comprehensive study of Federal grant programs in which State and local governmental units might qualify and share.

Although the Office of Economic Opportunity had prepared an expensive and detailed listing of more than 1,000 separate Federal programs of this type, Congressman ROTH, through his independent study, was able to establish numerous discrepancies and to reveal much useful information which the Office of Economic Opportunity had overlooked or neglected to catalog.

As a former member of the House Judiciary Committee, and presently as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman ROTH's commitment to his committee work as well as to his responsibilities on the floor of the House merits the favorable recognition of all who have had the privilege of serving with him.

It is rumored that our colleague may aspire to serve in the other body in the event of a vacancy, which the retirement of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS would create. Whatever our colleague's decision may be, it is patently clear that BILL ROTH possesses the essential qualities of industry, resourcefulness, leadership, and dedication to the public interest which make for the finest congressional material.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in this special order and extend a brief and frank appraisal of Congressman ROTH's service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my Republican colleague from Delaware, BILL ROTH, who will be a candidate for the Senate seat to be filled after the retirement of the distinguished senior

Senator from Delaware, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

BILL ROTH has consistently shown himself to be a devoted public servant and an able legislator. He has unstintingly demonstrated a determination to eliminate waste in Government spending and confusion and duplication in Federal administration.

During the time that it has been my privilege to serve with him, he has become an acknowledged expert on the subject of eliminating waste in Federal expenditures.

BILL's concern for good Government and economy in the spending of the American taxpayer's money have won him the respect of his colleagues and of the voters of his district and his State, a respect that will insure him the support of the people of Delaware and victory in the senatorial election that is to come.

This approbation is not a gift; BILL ROTH has earned it by hard work, the dedicated performance of his responsibilities, motivated by a consuming desire to improve the circumstances of his constituents and of all Americans by improving the machinery of Government.

My best wishes to an outstanding legislator and a beautiful human being, Representative BILL ROTH.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congressman WILLIAM V. ROTH's greatest service to the House of Representatives and to literally thousands of citizens in every district in every State has been his monumental work in cataloging the myriad of Federal assistance programs.

Very few duties that befall a single Member of Congress are as important to good government and democratic procedure as the free flow of information between the Government and the people. It is not enough to be on the side of free speech and the first amendment. All the rights of free speech and freedom of inquiry and freedom of access to public information mean absolutely nothing if the information is not generally available in comprehensive and understandable form. This is the cause that WILLIAM V. ROTH has served so effectively.

The Office of Economic Opportunity spent \$100,000 on a catalog of Federal domestic assistance programs and did not find as many as BILL ROTH. It seems almost unreal that a single Congressman could do a better job than the entire Federal Establishment. BILL ROTH is eloquent testimony to the fact that one man can still make an impact on the course of our huge Government. It is a vivid commentary on the health of the Federal bureaucracy to know that BILL ROTH did in 8 months what the Federal Government could not do in 2 years.

BILL ROTH, by the breadth of his imagination in tackling a project the Government would not tackle and the diligence of his effort in doing what the Government could not do, has shown himself to be exceptionally well qualified to serve the people of the State of Delaware in the U.S. Senate.

BILL ROTH has made a great contribution in his service here in the House, and I am proud to have served with him. His work on behalf of the people of the people of the State of Delaware and the Nation

will be continued and enhanced by his election to the Senate.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great experiences I have had in the Congress has been the opportunity to work with my colleague and neighbor from Delaware on matters affecting the well-being of the Delmarva Peninsula.

During the last few years, the poultry industry—which is the largest single enterprise on the Delmarva—has had many problems. BILL ROTH has shown a keen understanding of the industry and of its many complicated facets. He has pursued an aggressive role in helping to smooth out the rough spots wherever they occurred in this giant complex, on which so many people of the rural areas of Delmarva depend for a living.

Of course, we all know of his diligent efforts toward the enactment of legislation to authorize a comprehensive listing of Federal programs to aid State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to work closely with BILL ROTH on these projects. I know, first hand, his tremendous capability for achievement, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my appreciation for the manner in which he serves his district and the Nation.

Mr. GUNDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in tribute to my distinguished colleague from the State of Delaware, who has announced his intention to depart this House and move to that other body. I have profited by his presence here and I share with my colleagues the benefits of his contribution to this House as well as to the entire Government. BILL ROTH, in dealing with his constituents, has always sought to provide all of the facts and the fullest information on every aspect of our Federal Government. In doing so, my colleague from Delaware quickly became aware of a very critical need for this Government to do a better job of providing full and reliable information on the myriad Federal assistance programs. Accordingly, be proposed in the Program Information Act that the President transmit to Congress annually a catalog of Federal assistance programs together with a report detailing the measures taken by the President to simplify the various applications forms and guidelines, and to consolidate them. The resulting catalog to be updated monthly would fit the needs of Congress, the Executive, and the public.

While seeking to meet the goals of providing a single source of reliable information on Federal assistance programs, my colleague's efforts in this direction has simultaneously led to his leadership in advocacy of a reassessment of the entire Federal administrative machinery for badly needed reforms.

BILL ROTH has made a considerable contribution to the Congress, and I am pleased to be a beneficiary of his studious proposals and imaginative approaches to strengthening our Federal Government by efficient organization.

While it is with regret that we receive news of his intended departure from the House, it is still with a sense of real pride that we know our distinguished colleague will continue his very substantial contribution to the Congress and to this

Government as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, BILL ROTH is a man easy to admire. He has risen through the ranks of politics to the congressional seat that he now holds with great distinction and he has done so in the face of what many regard as some special obstacles.

Like the Congressmen from Wyoming, and only three other States, our colleague BILL ROTH represents alone an entire State. His district is that of the Senators from his district and the related problems are the same as those represented and handled by the Senators from Delaware. So in a very real sense his two terms in the House of Representatives have been a training ground for his representation of the great State of Delaware in the U.S. Senate. Although the House will miss BILL ROTH, we are delighted that he is seeking the Senate seat.

I first had the privilege of meeting BILL ROTH when he and I were chairmen of our Republican State organizations. He ran a fine, victorious ship and went on from there, as did I on a somewhat different time frame, to run for the House of Representatives.

We all know and respect BILL ROTH's magnificent job as an economist and streamliner of the Federal bureaucracy. His fight to have the Government aid programs cataloged has won him nationwide attention. It will allow Congress to weed out duplications and the public better to understand what is being done with its tax dollars.

Like the Delaware Senator he will replace, the highly respected JOHN WILLIAMS, BILL ROTH will be known as a watchdog when he joins the other body in 1971.

The House will be losing a very able Member, but the Senate will certainly be acquiring a statesman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining in a special order to honor my friend and colleague, WILLIAM ROTH, of Delaware. BILL has announced that he will run for the Senate in 1970.

BILL's leaving will be a great loss to this body. I have worked closely with him, and have found him a conscientious and able statesman.

He is a man of action, one who perceives a need and attempts to alleviate it. An example of this is the Program Information Act. I had the privilege of cosponsoring with him in January.

BILL had conducted an extensive study of the subject. BILL—as all of us—had found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to locate all the operating programs of the Federal Government. He proposed this Program Information Act to open the lines of communication between the Federal, State, and local governments and the general public.

This act would make it mandatory for the President to transmit a current catalog of all available Federal assistance programs to Congress.

This is just one example of BILL's ingenuity and concern.

Elected as U.S. Representative at Large from Delaware to the 90th Congress, November 8, 1966, BILL has served his constituency well, as attested by a strong vote of confidence last November.

In this short time, he has left the im-

pect of his vigorous ideas on Congress. No one is more deserving than BILL for commendation, and I wish him well in his new endeavor.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity today to say a few words in behalf of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH). Although BILL has been a Member of the House of Representatives for less than 2½ years, he has already made a profound contribution to the good functioning of our Government, and is a credit to the people who sent him here.

So it is with both pleasure and regret that I view BILL's decision to run for a seat in the U.S. Senate. We in the House will be losing a valuable colleague. But on the other hand, it is comforting to know that should the good State of Delaware see fit to elect BILL ROTH to the Senate, he will be continuing his fine work on the other side of the Capitol.

Perhaps BILL's single most valuable contribution during his short tenure in the House was his attempt to find out how many Federal programs are in existence and what they are doing. BILL was not a Member of the 89th Congress, and so had not caught the Great Society fever in which so many new Federal programs were enacted. When he arrived on the scene, he discovered that he did not know everything the Federal Government was doing. Even worse, none of us here in Congress who had been passing all these programs could tell him either. Nowhere, in the entire Federal Establishment, was there a single person who knew.

How is it possible, he wondered, for the Congress to know what new programs are needed when it does not even know what programs are already in existence and what they are doing?

And so BILL embarked on a massive, 8-month study to find out what the Federal Government is doing. At the end of that time, he still had not been able to discover every program, but he did compile an impressive list of over 1,000 programs. Many of these, he found, overlap and duplicate each other. His study underlined the fact that all of us should have realized, long ago, that Congress has not been properly doing its job.

As a result of his study, BILL drafted two bills to facilitate the work of Congress and to improve the operation of the Federal Government. These bills are the Program Information Act, providing for an annual compilation of all Federal programs, and the Executive Reorganization and Management Improvement Act, creating a modern Hoover-type commission to review the organization, operation, and management of the Federal Government.

As one who has been keenly aware of the urgent need for congressional reform, I considered it a great privilege to have cosponsored these two bills, both in the 90th Congress when they were first presented, and again this year in the 91st Congress. This much-needed legislation has won widespread support from Members on both sides of the aisle, and I hope Congress will have the good sense to act on them.

BILL ROTH has made many other valu-

able contributions here in Congress, too numerous to mention. But let me simply say that the drive and determination which it took to complete his study, despite the many frustrations, is indicative of the kind of man BILL ROTH is. His qualities of honesty, intelligence, concern, and enthusiasm mark him to become a fine Senator. It is my sincerest hope that the good people of Delaware will display the same good sense in electing BILL ROTH to the Senate that they have twice shown in sending him to the House of Representatives.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join my colleagues in the House today to pay special tribute to BILL ROTH, who will be going on to serve in the other body of Congress. But it is with a great deal of regret that I see BILL leaving us. We will be losing a fine, dedicated, hard-working Member with a great future here in the House.

I wish him well in this forthcoming campaign and I know he will have an equally distinguished career as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by our Republican colleague from Delaware, WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., that he will be seeking a seat in the other body gives us a sense of both satisfaction and regret. We are sure his experience in this House has given him the foundation on which to build a new record of achievement elsewhere. And at the same time we know he will be missed on the Foreign Affairs Committee and in this body as a whole because of his many contributions.

Since entering this House in the 90th Congress, BILL ROTH has been a leader in the effort to reorganize the Federal Government. As a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I can say with some authority that BILL ROTH's study of the deficiencies in the present grant-in-aid system played an important part in stimulating the corrective legislation that was introduced in both the 90th and 91st Congresses. BILL ROTH's effort to unravel the mysteries of the grant system has been called the most significant achievement of the 90th Congress, while his legislative proposals have received the full backing of the National Governors Conference, the National Association of Counties Convention, and the Conference of State Legislators.

The people of the First State and of the Nation will be well served indeed to have Delaware's able Representative in this body continue his fine record in another Chamber of this Congress. He has the highest standards of dedication to follow. The senior member of the Delaware delegation, whose decision not to run for a fifth term of office prompted ROTH's determination to succeed him, has saved an entire generation of Americans millions of their hard-earned tax dollars by his sharp scrutiny of the Nation's financial affairs as the senior Republican on the appropriate committee. In the full expectation that he will continue the noble tradition of Republican service so laudably exemplified by the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, we wish our colleague, WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., unlim-

ited success and the full support of his fellow citizens.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that my good friend, BILL ROTH, has announced his candidacy for the U.S. Senate from the State of Delaware. In so announcing, BILL is aspiring to fill the seat now held by JOHN J. WILLIAMS; and there is a singular appropriateness about this. Here are two men, who from their very first days of service in the Congress, have shown their total dedication to service to their people.

The stature of the distinguished Senator from Delaware is almost legendary, and I shall not attempt to add to that legend in these remarks. But I hope I may comment on the stature of my distinguished colleague here in the Congress who represents Delaware.

As all of my colleagues are well aware, an enormous portion of our time is committed to assisting our constituents who come face to face with the staggering bureaucracy of the Federal Government, and who cannot begin to find a way through. As a matter of fact, countless numbers of these constituents have spent veritable careers really trying to find what section of what department is actually charged with supervising a program they may be seeking.

There are duplications. There are apparent duplications where only a man with a razor could split the differences between the jurisdictions over similar programs. In the face of this, from his earliest days in Congress, BILL ROTH set about the monumental task of cataloging every program that exists in the Federal Government—the eligibility requirements, the administering agencies, the funding information, the application prerequisites, the regional and Washington contacts, and finally the sheer mechanics of application.

It is interesting to note that the Office of Economic Opportunity put a task force on doing a similar job. Yet out of this one congressional office of BILL ROTH, there came a catalog more complete than anything the task force had done. As a matter of further information, out of this study conducted by BILL, he became one of the few men in Washington who knew all the programs going on in the Federal Government.

Recently President Nixon proposed a Grant Consolidation Act, aimed at eliminating overlap and duplication in Federal aid programs. This is surely closely related to the gigantic study our distinguished colleague made, which finally spelled out the countless areas of duplication which exist.

Pursuant to this study, BILL has proposed a vast overhaul of the machinery of Government, which all of us agree is long overdue. As my distinguished colleague noted in the past, the rumored taxpayers' revolt might become a reality "unless we take immediate steps to prove to the people back home we are making a maximum effort to spend their tax dollars more efficiently."

The people of the great State of Delaware have shown great wisdom in electing BILL to the House of Representatives. I am certain they will show equally great wisdom in electing him to the Sen-

ate. At a time when the great problems we face in America demand that we have the finest representation, I know the people of Delaware will realize that they can get no better than they will get from BILL ROTH.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the tributes to our able colleague from Delaware.

The career of WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., as "BILL" is formally known, has been unusual. His preparation has been remarkable, consisting of a bachelor's degree from the University of Oregon and additional degrees from Harvard Business School and Harvard Law School. His progress from private to captain, together with his receipt of the Bronze Star, is eloquent testimony to the manner in which he served his country during World War II.

Since returning to civilian life, he has been a successful lawyer and a leader in the Republican organization, not only in Delaware but on the national level. For the past 2½ years he has been a Member of the popular branch of the Congress.

One of the accomplishments for which BILL ROTH will be remembered is his attempt to be a one-man Hoover Commission. The tremendous growth of the Federal Government during the last decade, which has been accompanied by a doubling in spending and a great proliferation of bureaus, has made it virtually impossible to comprehend the vastness of the national governmental establishment.

Although frustrated by the refusal of many Federal officials to cooperate with him, the gentleman from Delaware did manage to compile a comprehensive catalog of Federal programs. Its lack of completeness was not his fault, and I am optimistic enough to believe that the Congress will eventually have a complete compilation. When we do, we will have to remember that it was BILL ROTH who laid the groundwork for the publication and that we would probably not have had it were it not for his herculean efforts and his commendable persistency.

When our distinguished colleague from Delaware leaves this historic Chamber, where so many eloquent voices have debated the issues, where so much good, bad and indifferent legislation has been enacted, and where so much history has been made, the good wishes of his fellow Members will accompany him. Fortunately, he will be with us for the months that yet remain before adjournment, during which time we will benefit from his experience as we struggle with the many problems with which we are faced.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is always with a certain amount of sadness that we receive news that one of our colleagues is leaving the House. This is indeed so with the announcement by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), that he will not be a candidate for House reelection next year. Our sense of loss is tempered by the knowledge that he is going to run for the U.S. Senate. Our best wishes go with him. His service to his district, State, and Nation can only be classified as exceptional. His investigation of the size of Federal Government has prompted public praise and stirred up congressional inquiry.

The man he is seeking to succeed is

the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, who has earned a reputation for integrity, tenacity, and selfless public service during his tenure in the other body. I can think of no more fitting man to aspire to the Senator's seat—for during his service in the House, BILL ROTH has demonstrated the same outstanding qualities and dedication to serving the public.

I know that I join my fellow House Members here today in proffering our appreciation for the fine job he is doing here—and our best wishes for his future in public service.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues this afternoon in paying singular tribute to the Congressman from Delaware, BILL ROTH.

My friendship with BILL ROTH goes back many years prior to the time when we began our tenure in this House as Members of the 90th Congress. In the early 1940's, we were classmates at the Harvard Business School.

In the short 2½ years that BILL ROTH has been a Member of this House, he has served on three distinguished and influential committees. After serving on the Judiciary and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees during the 90th Congress, he was named to the Foreign Affairs Committee in January. In addition, he was appointed to the Republican policy committee for the 91st Congress, a very infrequent and noteworthy accomplishment for a second-term.

I believe his most outstanding achievement, however, is the extensive listing of operating Federal assistance programs which he and his staff prepared last year. As a result of this investigation, the Program Information Act was formulated and introduced. Congressman ROTH also introduced the Executive Reorganization and Management Improvement Act. I was pleased to join him and over 100 of our colleagues in cosponsoring both bills this year. Hopefully, once he takes his seat in the other body, sufficient support can be generated there which will make it possible to enact the bills into law.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that not only will BILL ROTH reach his goal of election to the other body but also he will contribute significantly to the deliberations of our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH).

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank GEORGE BUSH and each and every one of my colleagues for their most gracious and far too generous remarks. I must admit it is somewhat embarrassing to hear them, but I must also admit it is the kind of embarrassment one richly enjoys.

I, too, am filled with mixed emotions at deciding to seek the Senate seat. As one who has been wisely counseled by the senior Senator from Delaware, and as one who admires him greatly, I was saddened by his decision not to seek reelection. As a matter of fact, I delayed my own decision in the hope that he could ultimately be persuaded to change his mind. I now know that this is not possible.

Very frankly, no one can replace our

senior Senator, one of the great men to have served in the other body. His expertise in fiscal matters, his bedrock integrity, and his moral courage will be sorely missed. I am sure you can understand that it was with some trepidation that I decided to seek his seat.

There is another reason that my decision was made with mixed emotions. My stay in the House has been for me one of the happiest occasions of my life. Legislatively, it has been exciting and challenging here. I have been fortunate in making many new friends, all of whom I greatly admire and respect.

To those who have freely given me so much guidance, and to those who have expressed their confidence in my effort, I give my humble thanks.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for those heartfelt and appropriate remarks.

I think it really speaks very well of the gentleman to see the number of people who have participated in this special order. I cannot help but put the things that have been said about him into the context of our great President's inaugural address when he talked about lowering our voices.

This is the message that Congressman ROTH got when he first came to the House, and with a lowered voice he has made a contribution far disproportionate to his length of service in this body.

As he has forged a distinguished record for himself in the House, so has BILL ROTH achieved success in countless other areas of endeavor.

His educational accomplishments must certainly be regarded as uncommon. He holds bachelor of arts, master of business administration, and bachelor of law degrees.

In June 1943, he interrupted his education at Harvard to enlist in the U.S. Army. Before his discharge 3 years later, he had attained the rank of captain and had earned the Bronze Star Medal.

In addition to holding membership in the Delaware Bar Association, and the American Bar Association, he is admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court and has served on several statewide and national legal committees.

In Delaware, he has been State Republican chairman, chairman of the State commission on modernization of State laws and cochairman of the Delaware Citizens' Committee for Reorganization of the Federal Government.

I think it apt to summarize the career of BILL ROTH as one that has been consonant with success—success achieved through sacrifice and initiative. Apathy has been anathema to him; action has not.

In viewing BILL ROTH's past, present, and future, I am reminded that T. S. Eliot once said that "a mature poet must have a sense of history." This, too, I think, applies to statesmen. BILL ROTH is such a statesman.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to express the personal pleasure I have had in knowing BILL ROTH so closely in the House and being associated with him in our breakfast group and being able to talk with him about the tough problems which face the country

and the personal problems with which each of us wrestles as we try to set ethical standards. There is nobody whose judgment I respect more in regard to the question of ethics in our Government as he goes about interpreting his service to his country.

So, I think to sum up the comments that have been made here today, I would simply like to wish him well in his election and with great confidence wish him well in his long service to his country and the U.S. Senate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING COMMUNIST MILITARY THREAT MUST NOT BE OVERLOOKED IN DEBATES ON NATIONAL DEFENSE SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in the present discussions over the proposal for limited deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile defense system and other defense expenditures and problems there is in my opinion a serious danger that considerations vital to our national security during the next decade and beyond are being overlooked and obscured.

Clearly it is important that we do have full and meaningful debates about our national defense policies, because they have a vital bearing on our national security and on our domestic policies and priorities. All sides of these far-reaching issues must be thoroughly explored and considered.

However, it is essential that these discussions are conducted with reason and in full recognition of the world as it is, not as we would like it to be.

A look at the history of the Communist movement makes it all too clear that the military power and policies of the Communists led by the Soviet Union for years have represented a serious menace to our welfare and the welfare of the entire free world. The military threat posed by the Soviet Union and its Communist allies certainly has in no way diminished. Their goals of world domination are still the same.

It is a matter of great concern to hear criticisms leveled at our defense efforts which appear to completely ignore the threat to our security and welfare posed by the Soviet Union and its Communist allies.

It is a matter of concern to hear criticisms which completely overlook the fact that with the world situation what it is today we must maintain our present defense capabilities and prepare our Na-

tion for the threats which we could be faced with in the decades ahead.

It is essential as we discuss our current defense policies that we are aware of and consider with as much clarity as possible the present and future capability of the Communist threat.

There is no question but that in terms of thermonuclear military capability the two major powers in the world today are the United States and Soviet Russia, though of course there is evidence that Communist China is devoting a significant proportion of its limited technical resources to the end it will be included among the super powers.

The Soviet Union is continuing to develop its military capabilities, both offensive and defensive. In addition to its work on strategic missiles forces, the Soviet Union has given considerable attention to its general purpose forces, which, incidentally, twice in the past year, have actually been engaged in military operations. It is working on strategic defenses, on expanding its naval forces, on developing tactical aircraft, to name a few areas.

I present here some of the known facts about the Soviet threat so that the American people know what we are up against. These facts underscore the seriousness of the problems we face in the world today and the pressing need for our Defense Department and the individual military organizations to be at complete readiness for our protection.

THE SOVIET THREAT

The picture of the Soviet Union which emerges from the known facts, based on unclassified information which can be set forth from qualified military, technical, scientific and intelligence experts regarding recent and future trends in Soviet military capabilities, is that of a nation already immensely powerful militarily, and increasing that power in virtually all areas.

STRATEGIC OFFENSE

The Soviet strategic offensive is one of a variety of modern weapons capable of great destruction.

The Soviet inventory of operational land-based intercontinental missiles will reach about 1,050 in 1969.

The latest Soviet ICBM systems have been deployed in hardened and widely separated single silos, each presenting a separate aiming point for an attacking force.

In addition to these measures to reduce the vulnerability of their ICBM's, the Soviets are engaged in active research and development to make other qualitative improvements, such as a program to develop a multiple warhead delivery system on one type of their ICBM's.

They also continue to work on an experimental weapon system which has come to be labeled a fractional-orbit bombardment system—FOBS. It is, in effect, an extended-range ICBM which flies on a lower trajectory than a normal ICBM and thus would be more difficult for U.S. radars to detect and track. It might also be fired southward from the U.S.S.R., approaching the United States from the south and avoiding United States northward-facing early warning radars.

The Soviet Union has a force of about 700 medium-range and intermediate-range missile sites. Most of these sites are located in the western U.S.S.R., where they could launch missiles against any targets in Western Europe.

The Soviets claim to have a mobile strategic missile, and they have publicly displayed tracked transporter-launchers for this type of system in Moscow parades for the past several years. They have also paraded a two-stage, solid-propellant missile which could be used for this purpose.

As their strategic missile forces have grown, the Soviets have allowed their inventory of long-range bombers to decline slightly. They now have some 150 heavy bombers supplemented by about 50 tankers for aerial refueling. Their medium bomber force, composed of twin-jet aircraft, amounts to somewhat less than 800 aircraft. Soviet medium bombers are believed to be targeted against the NATO countries and other areas of the periphery of the Soviet Union.

In an effort to extend their operational usefulness, many of the bombers, both medium and heavy, have been modified to carry air-to-surface missiles. In addition, some of the older medium bombers have been replaced by a newer model with a supersonic dash capability.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE

Defense against strategic attack continues to hold its traditionally high priority in Soviet military planning. New anti-aircraft systems are being introduced, and an anti-ballistic-missile—ABM—system is being installed for the defense of Moscow.

The Moscow ABM system has been in development for more than 10 years. Construction of launch sites and attendant radars began about 6 years ago and has proceeded irregularly since then. There have been signs that the Soviets are not going to deploy as many ABM launchers as they originally intended.

The missile for the Moscow ABM system, the Galosh, was first seen in November 1964 when it was paraded, enclosed in its canister, through Red Square in Moscow. The system apparently now has a certain operational capability. Furthermore there are indications that the Soviet Union is continuing ABM development, for the purpose of improving their initial system or producing a new, improved version of their ABM system.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are still highly concerned about the threat from manned bombers and air-launched missiles. During the last few years they have upgraded their fighter-interceptor defenses by introducing new aircraft with better performance and armament. Their current inventory probably numbers about 3,500 interceptors. In 1963 they began deploying a new defensive missile system, sometimes referred to as the Tallinn system, in many areas of the Soviet Union for defense against aircraft and air-to-surface missiles.

The Tallinn deployment is superimposed on a large network of sites for the older and shorter-range SA-2 air defense missile system. In addition, the Soviets are deploying mobile surface-to-

air missile systems to provide improved tactical defense against attacking aircraft.

NAVY

In 1963, Admiral Gorshkov assumed command of the Soviet Navy with an order that ships would put to sea. Since then, the Navy has developed from a waterborne adjunct of the ground force into a significant maritime power, operating with increasing frequency in distant waters.

The Soviet Navy began continuous deployments in the Mediterranean some 4 years ago. Since the Arab-Israeli war of June 1967, a flotilla including nuclear submarines and missile-armed surface ships has been operating in these waters with deployment reaching as many as 50 combatant and support ships including submarines. Soviet warships are also active in the Indian Ocean now.

All of the major surface ships built since 1960 have been armed with surface-to-air or surface-to-surface missiles. Over 20 major surface ships and nearly 50 submarines are equipped with long-range antiship cruise missiles. The Soviets have also deployed about 100 Osa- and Komar-class patrol boats armed with a short-range missile similar to the one which the Egyptians used to sink the Israeli destroyer *Eilat*.

The current inventory of surface ships consists of some 22 cruisers, 80 destroyers, 25 guided missile destroyers, and some 2,300 ships such as other patrol boats, auxiliaries, support ships, minesweepers, coastal escorts, and intelligence collectors.

The Soviets are also building several new classes of ships intended to help them catch up with U.S. naval capabilities. Two large helicopter cruisers launched in the past 2 years will be used for antisubmarine operations.

The submarine fleet now numbers approximately 380—its effectiveness is being improved by the addition of new types of torpedo-attack and ballistic missile submarines.

The new Soviet Polaris-type submarine can fire 16 ballistic missiles to a range of 1,500 miles. Several units of this class are operational and production is continuing.

About 40 older ballistic missile submarines carry an average of three launchers each. They are believed to be targeted against European and Asian targets.

The Soviets now have about 44 submarines equipped with cruise missiles with a range of about 300 miles. These submarines are believed to be intended to attack naval and merchant vessels. Some 300 other submarines are configured for torpedo-attack missions or used for training.

The Soviet Navy also has a land-based air force and a small force of marines. The Naval Air Force has increased in the last few years and currently has about 500 bombers and 370 other aircraft for transport, reconnaissance, and antisubmarine warfare. The aircraft are all land based, primarily on the European coastline of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Navy has no aircraft carriers.

Increased Soviet interest in amphibious

landing operations became obvious in 1967 with the introduction of tank landing ships, some of which have been deployed to the Mediterranean since June 1967. The force of Soviet marines is believed to number about 6,000 men.

GROUND FORCES

The Soviet Army is estimated to number about 2 million men, organized into 140 divisions. Most of these divisions are below full combat strength but many of them could be brought up to strength rapidly. About half of them are stationed in the western U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe opposite NATO.

The evolution of Soviet ground forces over the past several years has been characterized by emphasis on mobility and short-term striking power.

Soviet capability for airlifting troops, and equipment, has been enhanced by the introduction of the new AN-22 heavy assault transport, which the Soviets unveiled at the 1967 Paris air show. The Soviets claim that this aircraft can carry 88 tons of cargo to a distance of 2,800 nautical miles nonstop. The current Soviet air transport force has about 1,500 short- and medium-range aircraft. In addition a large part of the Soviet inventory of some 1,500 helicopters supports the ground forces.

With respect to ground forces, the Warsaw Pact countries continue to maintain very large deployments along their borders with the Free World in continental Europe. Their forces are equipped with modern weapons with a particular emphasis on armored—tank—units.

TACTICAL AIRCRAFT

The display of new aircraft in the Moscow Air Show of 1967 revealed the extent of Soviet efforts to upgrade their tactical air strike and interceptor capabilities. Ten new or modified fighters were demonstrated, including two with variable-sweep wings. Several were clearly experimental and may not be produced in quantity. Others may be produced for Soviet air defense and tactical fighter units. Four new vertical takeoff and landing aircraft were displayed, reflecting Soviet interest in dispersing fighters away from improved airfields.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

With respect to the more distant future, the Soviets are now making a very large, expensive and obviously determined research and development effort. Soviet spending during the past year for military and space sciences is estimated to have grown at a 10-percent rate.

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

To ignore the military threat of the Soviet Union, and its Communist allies, or to pretend it is not there and on that basis attempt to downgrade the need for adequate military preparations on our Nation's part could represent a hoax on the people of our Nation.

There can be no doubt that President Nixon and the Defense Department are confronted with a tremendous responsibility of assuring that we maintain sufficient strength to deter attack now and in the future.

Certainly there is a need for the citizens of our Nation to demand the mili-

tary to be efficient and to spend tax moneys wisely and efficiently. There is a need for the public to demand that our Nation's defense policies be in the best interest of our Nation and are carried out without waste or mismanagement.

However, Mr. Speaker, during this period of debate and decision the issues involved in the defense of this Nation and the threats to our security must not be overlooked, obscured or ignored.

We all long for positive steps toward achieving lasting peace, but we cannot proceed with unilateral disarming when the Communist world is working feverishly to build up its military capabilities to ever higher levels.

TO INCREASE FEDERAL SHARE OF WELFARE COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with 13 of my colleagues in cosponsoring legislation to increase the Federal share of welfare costs, including medicade, to 90 percent. The legislation would also establish a minimum national standard for welfare benefits and eligibility, and eliminate the freeze on AFDC scheduled for July 1.

I reject the view that New York State and States like it are being penalized for the better-than-average standard of welfare benefits they provide, through a vast in-migration of the Nation's poor seeking a higher level of welfare benefits. Such States are, however, being penalized by the present Federal welfare system which pays a greater share of the welfare burden to those States who provide the lowest level of benefits.

The establishment of national welfare standards would give everyone, irrespective of whether they live in a rich or a poor State, an opportunity to avoid the permanent physical and mental damage which frequently goes with hunger and malnutrition. The 90-percent Federal funding would make such minimum standards possible, and would also shift much of the welfare burden to the Federal Government, which is in a far better fiscal position than the States or local governments. If the July 1 freeze on AFDC is not eliminated, just that much more of a welfare burden will be thrown on the States and localities by the Federal Government, a kind of a block grant in reverse.

I can find no evidence to support the view that New York State's welfare budget is being increased because the poor from other States are migrating to secure its higher level of welfare benefits. New York State has no residency requirement, and yet the percent of the welfare budget that goes to "State charges," those without 1 year of residency in the State, is equal to only three-tenths to four-tenths of 1 percent of the total welfare budget. The number of recipients is less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of the caseload.

This is not to say that all or even a

large part of even that seven-tenths of 1 percent figure came to New York to secure welfare benefits. In 1964, local welfare agencies were required to investigate anyone suspected of moving into the State to secure welfare. The number found to have done so was so insignificant that after 30 months, the reporting requirement was dropped. The cost of administering the investigation was far greater than the level of abuses uncovered.

The situation was analogous to the national welfare study done in 1962, which was also meant to uncover "ineligible" recipients. In New York State, the out-of-pocket administrative cost of uncovering one such recipient as a result of that study average \$12,000. If that recipient had not been uncovered, the cost to the taxpayers would have been only \$2,500. From a cost-benefit ratio, it was ridiculous to conduct such an investigation. And furthermore, the ineligible recipient would more than likely have been caught in the next redetermination, anyhow.

The character of New York State's recipients also suggests that migration for welfare is a myth, at least as far as the Empire State is concerned. Between two-thirds and three-fourths of those currently on the rolls were residents of the State at least 10 years—far longer than even the 1 year required by the now outlawed State residency requirements—before applying for assistance. The situation may be slightly different in other States, for unlike Illinois or Michigan, New York does not have the cyclical industry, which draws the poor to jobs only to strand them when a downturn occurs in the industry to eliminate the jobs they had come to secure. New York's industries are more stable.

What is responsible for increasing New York State's welfare budget is the present federal system of welfare benefits, which rewards most of those States which provide the least adequate level of welfare benefits and whose taxpayers shoulder the least burden. Despite the fact that New York State provides the highest AFDC benefit rate in the country at \$71 a month, that it has the highest welfare recipient rate, and that its taxpayers shoulder the greatest welfare burden at \$16.25 per \$1,000 of a person's income, the current Federal welfare system pays only 42.4 percent of New York State's welfare costs, compared to 82.4 percent for Mississippi which has an AFDC benefit rate of only \$8 a month, and shoulders a low per capital welfare tax burden.

The Federal Government picking up 90 percent of the cost of welfare would not only eliminate such an inequitable situation, but would provide badly needed financial relief to States and local governments. For New York State, which as a whole spends \$1.9 billion a year for welfare, this could mean much of that almost \$2 billion could be spent for better quality education, housing, or for tax relief. After education and health, welfare is the greater government expense in New York State.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY GRAND JURY'S EVALUATION OF THE WELFARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, grand jury completed its term of service. I am inserting the final report of the grand jury, authorized by one of Greater Cleveland's outstanding civic leaders, Joseph Silber, grand jury foreman, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

This excellent report is of interest to all concerned Americans because it searches to find a meaning for the recent crime wave that has struck our country. The members of the jury gathered considerable evidence which demonstrates that a majority of crimes are committed by men under 25 years of age. This statistic alone is widely known, but the fact that most of these lawbreakers come from families that receive public assistance is not as well recognized.

It is necessary that we discover the reason that our welfare system is producing criminals in significant numbers. It becomes apparent that our system of aiding needy families requires drastic revision. The report recommends a complete restructuring of our present welfare program to better equip those families receiving public assistance to produce useful and lawabiding citizens.

The questions that were raised in the report are of vital import to all Americans. I urge my colleagues to study this report and evaluate the important ideas that it presents. Following is the report:

FINAL REPORT, CUYAHOGA COUNTY GRAND JURY, JANUARY 1969 TERM

To: The Honorable BERNARD FRIEDMAN, Presiding Judge, Criminal Court, Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio

DEAR JUDGE FRIEDMAN: The Grand Jury, which was impaneled on the first Monday in January and received its charge from the Honorable Bernard Friedman, Presiding Judge of the Criminal Court, commenced its service on the following day and continued to carry out its legal duties until the Term ended on April 1st, 1969.

During this Term, this Jury was in session twenty-five (25) complete days, and considered all of the cases which were presented to it by John T. Corrigan, the Prosecuting Attorney of Cuyahoga County.

During its deliberations, the Jury heard 1,373 witnesses. It returned 743 indictments and 49 no bills.

We have heretofore filed two interim reports, the first of which dealt entirely with the operation of the County Jail. Under the charge of the Court, and as provided by law, the Jury made two visits to the County Jail and one to the House of Correction at Warrensville, which is an institution owned and operated by the City of Cleveland. We made certain recommendations with reference to the housing of prisoners and reported on the conditions at the jail. We are pleased to note that these recommendations have been in part carried out. We hope that in the immediate future further use will be made by the County of the facilities in Warrensville, thus reducing the serious overcrowding

at the County Jail, which is the primary cause of most of the problems existing there. We must point out, however, that use of the Warrensville facilities is only a temporary move, and that the proper administration of criminal justice requires the construction of a new County Criminal Courts Building and Jail in the very near future.

The earlier reports of this Grand Jury touched briefly on the operation of the Police Department of the City of Cleveland, as well as the Police Departments of many suburban communities. We should like to further emphasize that this Jury was very favorably impressed with the professionalism and competence of the police officers who appeared before us. We believe that the Cleveland Police Department consists of a great number of dedicated officers who are entitled to a greater measure of public support and confidence as guardians of the rights of the people to be safe and secure in their daily lives. In the vast majority of cases where complaints are made against the police, such charges are unfounded. While it is true that in isolated instances some police officers might show excessive zeal in the apprehension of suspected criminals, in the main, most charges of improper conduct by policemen in the performance of their duty were found baseless insofar as this County is concerned.

The Cleveland Police Department maintains a very efficient scientific unit, and one of the best identification systems in the United States, but they are severely handicapped by their inadequate quarters in the Central Police Station, which might also be remedied by the construction of a new criminal courts building.

A diminution in criminal activities requires active cooperation with and support of the police by all the citizens of this community, regardless of race or color. We urge that programs and activities designed to improve understanding and cooperation between policemen and the public they serve be increased and expanded.

Suburban police must rely largely on the professional help of the Cleveland Police Department in order to increase the solution of crimes committed in this County.

A statistical breakdown of the cases which came before this Jury is appended to this report.

Numerical statistics do not begin to tell the story of crime in our community and throughout the nation unless we realize that each number represents one or more flesh and blood human beings, and that each number also represents an impact on the safety and security of our entire civilization.

In the bulk of the remainder of this report, we will describe and discuss our efforts to look behind these statistics.

Millions of words have been written about the cause of crime, poverty, discrimination, broken homes—these are widely recognized as factors which often produce criminal tendencies.

Wishing to obtain a fresh look at the subject, we assigned a special investigator for the Grand Jury to make a study of the backgrounds of the largest group of accused criminals whose cases were presented to this Jury.

We had noted that the most common age of law breakers brought before this Jury was 18. The next most common age was 19. More than half of crimes against property were committed by people between the ages of 18 and 25, and more than 60% by people under 30 years of age.

We decided to study the 148 cases which came before us during the months of January and February involving defendants between the ages of 18 and 25. We wanted to see where these criminals under 25 came from. What did they have in common?

In a careful check of available records, our investigator found that 117 of the 148

individuals involved had a common bond. Some time during their lives, their families had been the recipients of public welfare in one form or another.

This was 78% of the criminals in this age group.

While sweeping generalizations are usually unwise, these figures would seem to indicate that there is a shocking correlation between crime and welfare.

We recognize that every human being and every family is different. Many individuals and families with welfare records have demonstrated excellent moral strength and characteristics. Many have risen from humble circumstances to positions of responsibility and personal success.

However, the findings of our investigation seem to substantiate the conclusion of many observers that our present welfare system is both a failure and a threat to the very survival of our American civilization, in that it fails to exercise any social controls over its recipients.

Is a new criminal class emerging from our welfare rolls? Is welfare producing a generation of juvenile delinquents and criminals?

Are our vast expenditures for welfare producing better citizens? Or are we unwittingly helping large numbers of human beings to slide into criminal activities which may destroy their own lives and make them enemies of society, civilization and the public which provides the money for welfare programs through its tax payments?

Even the most casual examination of the welfare system discloses gross inequities and unrealistic cruelties. For example, welfare families in this County are given a clothing allowance of \$5.00 per child. This sum is supposed to give children a proper wardrobe for attending school. Asking welfare mothers to clothe their children for such a paltry sum is like telling them to produce an impossible miracle.

Both nationally and in this community, our welfare system is a patchwork of programs and policies which have totally failed to achieve their objective. Indeed, many of our welfare programs and policies, instead of solidifying and enhancing family life, have tended to encourage the breakdown of the normal family.

It is our belief that the American public would not begrudge a single dollar of the enormous amounts spent on welfare if better results were produced. In this wealthy country, there is no reason for anyone to go hungry. Every child should be entitled to decent clothing, a proper diet, good medical care, and an opportunity to obtain a first-class education and moral guidance in preparation for a useful and constructive adulthood.

Our welfare system is obviously failing to achieve these objectives.

The time has come to stop drifting and face up to this situation.

It is a national as well as a local problem. We urgently suggest that the President appoint a commission of the most competent experts available to devise a completely new welfare program for this country.

We suggest that one proposal worthy of consideration would be a plan to remove small children from homes of unfit mothers who have been adjudged guilty of child neglect. While the family unit is the firm foundation of our civilization, the government has an obligation to give neglected children a fair chance in life.

In Cuyahoga County alone, about 50,000 children are now supported by the Aid to Dependent Children program.

Of these, more than half are in "broken homes"—mostly in what the statisticians call "female-headed homes." Some of these welfare mothers are widows, but a larger proportion are either unwed mothers or wives abandoned by their husbands.

Somehow, children in such homes must be provided with a better environment and greater opportunities. To accomplish this must be a major aim of a new concept of welfare.

Because a majority of the ADC mothers are Negroes, there is a tendency to shy away from frank discussion of this problem for fear of stirring racial animosity. We believe that the black community should be especially eager to face up to this problem and seek a more sensible solution than is possible under present welfare program practices.

Unfortunately, one cannot offer a total solution of this vexing problem of public welfare. However, we feel impelled to point out that it is perhaps the most crucial immediate human problem facing this country and this community. Solution of this problem will require the best thinking that our civilization can muster.

We cannot afford to delay tackling this monumental problem any longer. The cost in wrecked lives, crime and money is too great. We sincerely believe that one of the greatest steps that could possibly be taken to reduce crime and increase the personal safety of every member of this community would be to find a new and successful approach to the welfare problem, one which would put emphasis on restoration of the family unit.

The writer of this report wishes to express his thanks to the other members of the Grand Jury for their conscientious, intelligent, industrious, and dedicated service in carrying out their duties and responsibilities as Grand Jurors of this County. We should also like to express our appreciation to the Honorable Bernard Friedman, Presiding Judge of the Criminal Court, who at all times since the beginning of his Term gave to the Jury the benefit of his wise counsel and sympathetic understanding, and who assisted us materially in carrying out our duties and responsibilities as legally charged by him and by the law of this State.

This Jury was also the beneficiary of the advice, counsel and direction of the Honorable John T. Corrigan, Prosecuting Attorney of this County, as well as that of his assistants who presented their cases to the Grand Jury in proper and legal form, and made the task of this Jury much simpler. Thanks are also due to the various court attaches, particularly Mr. Raymond F. McCool, and Mr. William C. Horrigan, who were assigned on a full-time basis to the Grand Jury.

All of the members of the Jury agree that their service, although at times arduous, was truly rewarding and educational. We all appreciate the opportunity to have served.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH S. SILBER,
Foreman.

Cuyahoga County grand jury January 1969 term of court

Automobile stealing.....	33
Assault to rob.....	5
Burglary.....	101
Carrying concealed weapons.....	29
Cutting.....	1
Defrauding innkeeper.....	2
Defrauding garage owner.....	7
Drug law.....	78
Embezzlement.....	4
Felonious assault.....	9
Forgery.....	66
Housebreaking.....	23
Issuing check to defraud.....	4
Grand larceny.....	43
Murder, first degree.....	12
Murder, second degree.....	15
Manslaughter, first degree.....	11
Homicide by vehicle.....	5
Armed robbery.....	72
Unarmed robbery.....	24
Robbery of financial institution.....	1
Receiving stolen property.....	19
Attempted burglary.....	6

Cuyahoga County grand jury January 1969 term of court—Continued

Burglary of inhabited dwelling.....	11
Stabbing.....	4
Shooting.....	27
Shooting at.....	2
Torturing another.....	1
Neglect.....	9
Rape.....	14
Sodomy.....	3
Carnal knowledge of female under 16.....	5
Rape of female under 12.....	3
Rape of female under 14.....	1
Abduction for immoral purposes.....	4
Incest.....	1
Possession obscene film.....	1
Possession obscene photo-sale.....	1
Poor relief fraud.....	3
Malicious destruction of property.....	6
Operating motor vehicle without owner's consent.....	2
Escape from jail.....	5
Larceny by trick.....	9
Misuse of credit card.....	5
Fraudulent check.....	3
Possession sawed-off shotgun.....	8
Possession machine gun.....	1
Possession dynamite caps.....	1
Entry coin device.....	2
Aggravated assault.....	15
Assault and battery.....	1
Assault with dangerous weapon.....	2
Bigamy.....	1
Breaking and entering.....	2
Removing parts from motor vehicle.....	1
Total number of indictments.....	743
Total number of no bills.....	49
Total number of cases.....	660
Witnesses.....	1,373

WM. C. HORRIGAN,

Assistant Grand Jury Commissioner.

THE NATION'S MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, I introduced legislation to create a comprehensive manpower program for this Nation. My efforts to draft this bill were given great impetus by the work of the National Manpower Policy Task Force.

The task force is a private nonprofit organization of academic manpower experts, which is devoted to the promotion of research in manpower policy.

Its present members are:

NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY TASK FORCE MEMBERS

- Curtis Aller, San Francisco State College.
- E. Wright Bakke, Yale University.
- Lisle Carter,* Cornell University.
- John T. Dunlop, chairman, Harvard University.
- Rashi Fein, Harvard University.
- Eli Ginzberg, Columbia University.
- Frederick H. Harbison, Princeton University.
- Vivian Henderson,* Clark College.
- Myron Joseph, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Charles C. Killingsworth, Michigan State University.
- Sar A. Levitan, The George Washington University.
- Garth L. Mangum, vice chairman, The George Washington University and University of Utah.
- Charles A. Myers, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Albert Rees,* Princeton University.
- R. Thayne Robson,* University of Utah.
- Arthur M. Ross, University of Michigan.

M. H. Trytten, National Academy of Sciences.

Arnold L. Nemore, Executive Director.

* Joined the Task Force too late to participate fully in the deliberations on this statement.

On January 7 of this year, the task force published a position paper entitled, "The Nation's Manpower Programs," which represents the combined judgment of the task force members. Despite divergence of opinion on details, the members agreed to a unanimous statement without indicating individual exceptions.

I highly recommend the reading of this report in its entirety, but, in order to pay tribute to an excellent document and to call it to the attention of my colleagues who may not have had a chance to review it, I would like at this point in my remarks to insert excerpts from this fine statement:

THE NATION'S MANPOWER PROGRAMS

(NOTE.—Although the training and use of the nation's human resources are not a new public concern, only in the 1960s have federally supported manpower programs emerged as a major tool of economic and social policy. As a result, the last half dozen years have been filled with feverish activity. Now is an opportune time to take stock. In this statement, we attempt to state succinctly the objectives of manpower policy and review the accomplishments and shortcomings of the last few years. In addition, we believe it is in order to suggest what steps should be taken in the years ahead.)

I. THE STATUS OF MANPOWER POLICY

Manpower policy is aimed at developing and using the capacities of human beings as actual or potential members of the labor force. Although its central operational field is the labor market, manpower policy also has a bearing upon economic, education, and military policies, not to mention programs in welfare, antipoverty, and urban development. In fact, there is a manpower dimension of almost every aspect of economic, social, and political policy.

In most of these policy areas, manpower problems are but one aspect—albeit important—of the decisions our society must reach. Education, for example, has many purposes beyond preparing people to be workers. Learning enriches human life, shapes attitudes and values, extends knowledge, makes better citizens, and prepares man for leisure. Yet all would agree that education also helps develop the skill, knowledge, and motivation that enable individuals to participate in the labor force. Thus, manpower considerations are a crucial element of education policy.

Economic policy likewise has concerns broader than the employment or utilization of workers. Yet, as the Employment Act of 1946 declares, the United States is committed to maintaining high employment levels. Today there is broad consensus that manpower considerations must play an important part in economic decisions. As an example, the 1964 tax reduction was initiated primarily to stimulate economic expansion and reduce unemployment.

Insofar as poverty may be alleviated and diminished by creating jobs and educating, training, or upgrading the members of poor families, manpower policy is centrally implicated. It is also involved in programs to provide people on welfare incentives to seek and hold jobs.

Likewise, a viable science policy requires selection, training, motivation, and effective utilization of high-level professional man-

power. The military, too, is centrally concerned with manpower. As the nation's largest employer, it is a major participant in the building of the nation's manpower policy. The armed forces draw upon the country's pool of manpower and operate a massive training organization which has a far-reaching impact on the nation's labor force.

As the scope of manpower policy is broad, so the policy-makers are many and diverse—including employers, unions, school boards, local, state, and federal agencies, colleges, and voluntary organizations. As a result, no single, consistent, or cohesive strategy has emerged—or perhaps can emerge—for developing and utilizing human resources in the United States. Manpower policy comes in pieces, and pieces do not fit easily into a neat pattern.

Most experts agree that our manpower policy should be directed at the full range of problems. They differ not over the broad objectives of manpower policy, but over methods of implementation, the amount of effort which can be mounted to attain the desired goals, and the most effective instruments for coordinating and integrating a wide array of efforts. The 1969 manpower policy agenda for the new Administration and Congress centers on the above issues.

A successful manpower policy requires the recognition of several basic principles:

1. A high level of effective demand, maintained through appropriate monetary and fiscal policies, is the single most important condition for a successful manpower policy.

2. Education, housing, health, transportation, welfare, and manpower policies are interdependent, yet we know little about the trade-offs among them. In some respects these policy areas are competitive and in others complementary. Careful judgment is required in allocating funds among them.

3. The interdependence of rural areas and cities must also be recognized. Economic development of rural areas, for example, can reduce in-migration to already congested urban areas. Moreover, the manpower policies of one area affect, and in turn are affected by labor patterns in other localities.

The change in Administration offers new opportunities and challenges based on the experiences of the past years. It is our conviction that the three highest priority manpower problems are:

- 1. Providing adequate jobs for the competitively disadvantaged;
- 2. Developing the talents and abilities of the entire labor force, but with emphasis on longer-term professional, technical and skilled personnel; and
- 3. The manpower aspects of military requirements.

Though these problems will confront the new President as soon as he assumes office, his freedom of action will be sharply restrained by the realities of the current political and economic scene. Therefore, we set forth only those recommendations which we consider to be of highest priority. Some are immediately actionable. Some can be implemented only over a longer period of time. Some are aimed at improving the efficiency of current spending. Others would require a realignment of spending priorities at existing expenditure levels; still others would require increased expenditures.

In the 1930s, when one of four workers was without work, it was obvious that the fault lay with the economy rather than the individual; now, with widespread talk of labor shortages and unfilled jobs, the public tends to believe that anybody who is unemployed doesn't want to work. Yet high unemployment among certain groups suggests strongly that these present-day unemployed, like the masses of workers in the 1930s, are largely the victims of labor market forces over which they have little control.

Looking ahead to the next four years, we must take account of the effects of the Viet-

nam war on employment and unemployment. Since mid-1965, the size of our armed forces has grown by 700,000 men, most of whom were taken from the civilian labor force or would have joined it if the war had not intervened. Careful estimates indicate that the growth of defense expenditures since mid-1965 has directly increased civilian employment by about one million. Nearly 60 percent of this increase has occurred in blue-collar occupations, although in 1965 only a little more than 40 percent of total employment was in such occupations. Unless appropriate measures are taken, the employment prospects of the disadvantaged may become more severe when the demands generated by the war decline. Returning war veterans and released war production workers may not experience excessive difficulty in obtaining jobs, but they will make it even more difficult for disadvantaged groups to find employment. If, as all of us hope, the Vietnam war is phased out, the labor market outlook is for rising competition for available lower-level jobs and increasing hardships for those who, in a peacetime economy, are among the last-hired and the first-fired. Communities concentrating on military production will also face substantial problems of adjustment.

LESSONS FROM THE EXPERIENCE

For all of the problems which manpower programs have encountered in recent years those involved need offer no apologies. Hindsight shows that all the programs could have been improved, but who could have done better by foresight? The present challenge is to apply the lessons of these years to develop a coherent manpower policy, not just for the moment but for the 1970s and beyond.

The first lesson is that at the local level, where people are located and must be served, available manpower services should be provided on the basis of need, not impeded by diverse eligibility requirements, varying administrative practices, or competing agencies. The separate programs must be fused into a single comprehensive federal manpower program—providing a variety of services in varying mixes depending upon national conditions and local need, preferably funded by a single federal source.

This means that each community should have a single contact point within reach of each individual, to dispense all services, or refer the individual to places where needed employability services can be obtained. A one-to-one relationship is frequently required between the individual and a skilled counselor, so that an effective plan can be worked out, attuned to the individual's needs and preferences as well as the realities of the labor market. The counselor must be able to furnish or obtain the necessary services, whether remedial basic education, training, a sheltered job, a pair of eyeglasses, or day care for young children. Such counselors, and other staff, will not appear by chance, and their recruitment and development must be an integral part of the manpower program. Evaluation must be continuous and thorough, assuring that successful programs expand and that mediocre or substandard efforts are quickly terminated.

In the past decade of experimentation, federal initiative stimulated programs, and problems were approached nationally. National objectives and policies, reflecting the aggregate of individual and community needs, are important; but unique problems occur within states, communities and job markets whose conditions differ widely. We must now build upon trends already underway to strengthen the capabilities of communities and states to plan their own manpower programs to implement national objectives with the financial support and technical assistance of the federal government.

Because state governments have traditionally been rurally dominated and unfamiliar

with urban problems—and because many urban problems were new to everyone—the rush for action has tended to bypass the states in favor of direct federal-community relations. A new modesty born of experience admits the limits of federal administrative capability, while mayors and governors are increasingly asserting themselves and demanding a more direct role in the planning and delivery of services. Many of the urban areas flow across state lines in a vast, formless interdependency. These city-states need a new federal-metropolis relationship. But these are relatively few and there are simply too many cities, towns, hamlets, and rural areas for the federal government to seek a direct local relationship.

The federal government needs the states and the states need it, and both need and are needed by the cities. The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPs) represents the first halting steps toward a comprehensive planning system merging the interests, powers, and resources of federal, state and local governments. Needed is an administrative system whereby the federal government identifies national priorities and issues guidelines for states (and perhaps for major metropolitan areas). The states, in turn, should do likewise for cities at federal discretion would provide ample insurance that the needy could be served.

The emphasis of manpower programs in the past decade has been strongly remedial. Given the backlog of problems caused by years of neglect in our schools and public institutions and years of rapid change in our society and economy, that backlog has not significantly declined and it must. Remedial efforts are bound to be unsatisfactory as long as the flood of underprepared new entrants remains uncurtailed. Herein lies the task of compensatory early childhood education to make up for the deficits of home and neighborhood environments; improved elementary and secondary education, particularly in urban slums and rural backwaters; effective and modernized vocational and technical education; and assurance that all these, and college as well, are available to all who are or can be qualified, regardless of finances, race, or ethnic origin.

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO SERVING THE DISADVANTAGED

We recommend new legislation that would build upon CAMPs and other efforts at streamlining the administration of manpower programs. The bill should allow manpower services to be structured more along functional rather than program lines, so they can be tailored according to community and individual need. Based on recent experience, the services to be offered should include:

1. Outreach to find the discouraged and under-motivated and encourage them to partake of available services;
2. Adult basic education to remedy the absence or obsolescence of earlier schooling;
3. Pre-vocational orientation to expose those of limited experience to alternative occupational choices;
4. Training for entry-level skills those persons without a rudimentary education;
5. Training allowances to provide support and incentives for those undergoing training;
6. Residential facilities for those who live in sparsely populated areas or who have a home environment that precludes successful rehabilitation;
7. Work experience for those unaccustomed to the discipline of the work place;
8. Job development efforts to solicit job opportunities suited to the abilities of the disadvantaged job seeker;
9. Subsidized private employment for the disadvantaged;
10. Job coaching to work out supervisor-worker relationships once a job is found;

11. Creation of public service jobs tailored to the needs of job seekers who are not absorbed in the competitive market;

12. Supportive services—such as medical aid and day care centers for mothers with small children—for those who need corrective measures to enter or resume positions in the world of work; and

13. Relocation allowances for residents in labor surplus areas, coupled with special inducements to employers to bring jobs to those stranded in depressed areas.

Authorizing all these remedial manpower services in a single piece of legislation and funding them with a single appropriation suggests, though it does not absolutely require, the creation of a unified federal manpower agency. The consolidated budget should include at minimum all expenditures for remedial purposes, though of course planning would be improved if federal funds were appropriated to the same agency. In any event, administrators should have maximum flexibility in allocating funds among the various services. Advance funding is needed so that organizations are not in a constant state of uncertainty.

Most of the manpower funds should be allocated through state governments on a formula encompassing population, labor force, unemployment, and poverty criteria. However, special provisions might be designed providing for the delegation of funds and responsibility to the larger cities. A portion of the total appropriation, perhaps as much as 30 percent, should be left in the hands of the federal agency for research, experimentation and demonstration, technical assistance and staff training, interstate programs, and to serve populations neglected by states and communities which refuse to follow national guidelines.

The legislation should require each state (and possibly also each large metropolitan area) to prepare and update annually a three-year plan for use of its share of the funds in relation to other available resources. These should be included in a state plan encompassing the rest of the state and related city plans. All relevant interests, public and private, should have access to the planners. Planning should be the responsibility of the elected officials—governors and mayors—with the state requiring the various jurisdictions within major metropolitan areas to plan jointly. A firm principle should be that public monies be spent only by or through units of government directly responsive to the electorate. Private organizations, whether for profit or not, should be used only if answerable to elected officials.

State and local planning organizations can and should vary according to needs and preferences. However, the planning and operating functions should be kept separate, with evaluation performed by the former. The plans should relate manpower needs and functions to education, economic development, housing, and other problems and activities in the community and state. The federal agency should prepare and disseminate planning guidelines and review and approve plans enforcing the guidelines. Provision of technical assistance and continuous monitoring and evaluation, either in-house or by contract, would enable the federal agency to assess state and local performance. Congress, too, should undertake evaluation of federal agencies by broadening the General Accounting Office's capabilities, responsibilities, and resources.

Though centralized planning is imperative at the federal, state, and local level, consolidation of state and local agencies delivering manpower services is not. What is needed is a single agency to represent the applicant, helping him to identify his needs and plan accordingly. The agency would have authority to purchase from public or private sources whatever services are required, and would be recipient of the state and city

share of the manpower budget for direct service to individuals. Vocational Rehabilitation agencies provide one model, but they are limited in capacity and in exposure to the labor force. A more likely recipient would be the Employment Service, provided its local offices can be persuaded to give the disadvantaged higher priority than they have thus far done. Governors and mayors might be left free to designate other agencies. OEO should continue as a federal sponsor of local community action agencies and for newly proposed community self-help corporations.

An individual's eligibility should be determined by income, demographic characteristics, and locality; service should be universally available for those who meet the eligibility criteria. Hopefully, this would avoid the frustration and discrimination inherent in serving only a fraction of those eligible.

The range of services available under a comprehensive program should include two types of programs on which little systematic experience is available as yet: (1) involvement of the business community in recruiting, training and upgrading the "hard core" unemployed through payments for training and other costs such as through the National Alliance of Businessmen; and (2) development of governmental projects designed to make maximum use of low-skilled workers, carried out either on a contract basis or by governments themselves.

SCANDAL AT SBA—IX

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, Albert Fuentes has been dismissed from his post at the Small Business Administration, and his case is being referred to a grand jury. However, this does not end the problem that his case is a symptom of.

This case would have never occurred had the SBA maintained the type of administration that it should have. There is every reason to believe that the administrator was not aware of the travels and activities of his special assistant; had he been the problem would have never arisen.

Even now there is evidence that the right hand men of SBA do not know the difference between their right and left hands; they travel incessantly to San Antonio, make statements, and travel on. They say different things at different places. Whether their inconsistencies are due to incompetence or some peculiar motivation, I know not, but certainly the top liaison man for SBA, informed these matters demand correction.

For example, 2 days ago, Jim Reed, the top liaison man for SBA informed the Banking and Currency Committee that the reason Mr. Fuentes was fired was that he had been instructed to stay away from the charges involving him, and not to take any action except to await results of investigations. Instead, the man went to San Antonio and began soliciting statements and undertaking other efforts. This was why he was fired, according to Mr. Reed 2 days ago.

Yesterday, for the press in San Antonio, Mr. Reed said that Fuentes was fired for getting into a public quarrel with a Member of Congress, by whom he meant me. Now, which was it? Was the man fired for not following orders, or

because he had become a political liability? Mr. Reed cannot have it both ways, one way for the Congress and another for the press. It is a sign of the laxness at SBA that he would even make such disparate statements.

Further, one can only wonder why so many of the SBA brasshats have been in San Antonio of late. They must be setting some sort of record.

GUILD, UNIONS, BUSINESSMEN, EDUCATORS UNITE IN SUPPORT OF NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pleased to learn yesterday that the House Judiciary Committee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished dean of this august body, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), will commence hearings on the proposed Newspaper Preservation Act in the very near future.

The hearing will provide an opportunity for proponents of the measure to show how unfounded in fact are the fears and apprehensions expressed by certain opponents of the legislation. I am confident that after the issues involved have been fully explored, even those who presently oppose the measure will see the need for and merits of the act.

I express this confidence because in my home State of Hawaii I have seen militant opponents of the proposed legislation become earnest supporters of it, after they had entered into serious discussions with its proponents. In fact there is so much widespread support in Hawaii that I know of no opposition to the measure being voiced in any sector of the community.

All labor unions involved, including the Hawaii Newspaper Guild, AFL-CIO, the Honolulu Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union, Local 413, AFL-CIO; the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 1245, AFL-CIO; the Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union, Local 201, AFL-CIO; and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 142, have endorsed the bill as introduced.

So have the 17,000-member Hawaii Government Employees Association, the United Public Workers, the Teamsters and Allied Workers, Local 996, AFL-CIO; and the Hotel, Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, Local 5, AFL-CIO.

University professors and public and private school teachers too have joined in support of the Newspaper Preservation Act. The Hawaii Education Association, consisting of 7,500 school teachers and administrators, has strongly urged passage of the measure in letters written to Members of Congress.

Businessmen also, through their chambers of commerce, have added their support to the measure.

At the official government levels, the Hawaii State Legislature adopted on

May 15, 1969, a resolution urging the Congress to enact the proposed measure into law, and the Council of the County of Maui adopted a similar resolution on April 7, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, it is not in any way exaggerating to say that the people of Hawaii overwhelmingly support passage of the Newspaper Preservation Act. This I believe is most meaningful because Honolulu is one of the 22 cities in the Nation which will be affected by the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the Tucson newspapers case. The people of Hawaii appreciate the fact that they are presently given the choice of two daily newspapers with two different views. This choice was about to be denied them in 1963 when, because of financial difficulties, one of the dailies was about to go out of business. It was only because it succeeded in arranging a joint operation for printing, advertising, and circulation with the other daily, that it managed to survive.

In the light of the Supreme Court's Tucson decision this joint operating arrangement and similar arrangements in 21 other American cities are in violation of the Federal antitrust laws. As a consequence, the newspapers involved are faced with the dilemma of continuing the joint operations to remain in business under threat of prosecution for violation of the antitrust laws, or of dissolving the joint operations and accepting the inevitable failure of their businesses; unless Congress provides relief through appropriate legislation.

The newspaper preservation bills co-sponsored by more than 90 Members of the House and 33 Senators will provide the needed relief. The proposed legislation will keep alive the second newspaper in Honolulu and 21 other cities to provide a second separate and independent editorial voice, so necessary in a democratic society such as ours.

Given a choice between the continuance of a free press and upholding the sacredness of the antitrust laws, we who believe in our system of society will without any question choose a free press. So it is that business, labor, educators, and others in Hawaii have united in support of the Newspaper Preservation Act.

In the hope that my colleagues who harbor some doubts about the measure may have the benefit of the views of those who have given serious consideration to the subject matter, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD, resolutions and news accounts of the various actions taken by the previously mentioned organizations:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser,
Apr. 2, 1969]

UNION SUPPORTS LAW TO SAVE NEWSPAPERS

The Executive Committee of the 370-member Hawaii Newspaper Guild (AFL-CIO) yesterday recommended that Guildsmen in the Islands support the Newspaper Preservation Bills recently introduced in Congress.

The Hawaii Newspaper Guild's members work at The Honolulu Advertiser, the Star-Bulletin and Hawaii Newspaper Agency in Honolulu; the Hawaii Tribune-Herald in Hilo and the Maui News in Wailuku.

The Guild's Executive Committee expressed concern over a recent United States Supreme Court ruling in the Tucson news-

paper case and its possible implications for The Advertiser.

The Executive Committee urged Guild members to write to their U.S. Senators and Representatives, to State legislators and other interested parties, asking them to support the Newspaper Preservation Bills.

"Our concern is with the direct and immediate threat to the survival of The Advertiser," the Executive Committee said.

Text of the suggested letter to be written to the Congressional delegation and others follows:

"On behalf of the 370 members of the Hawaii Newspaper Guild, I write to ask your support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills recently introduced by 25 Senators and 84 Representatives.

"Our concern in the matter stems from the direct and immediate threat to the survival of The Honolulu Advertiser posed by the Supreme Court's ruling in the Tucson newspaper case. It is our understanding that the financially weaker paper in many, if not in all of the other 21 cities with joint newspaper plans, is equally imperiled.

"We recognize, better than most organizations, the importance to an open society of a vibrant press and of the need to preserve competition of ideas in the marketplace. We are all too aware that nationally, cities with competing newspapers have declined from 552 a half-century ago to about 50 now—of which 22 are in the joint-plan category.

"Some six and a half years ago, the morning Advertiser—which was in dire financial circumstances—was saved by its entry into a joint plan with the evening Star-Bulletin. Advertising, circulation and mechanical functions were merged, but ownerships and editorial policies and staffs remained separate. It was clear that the merging of only the mechanical departments—which the Justice Department has said it would condone in such cases—would not produce economies sufficient to sustain the operation.

"As a result of the partial merger—the alternative to a single ownership of morning and afternoon papers and a single editorial policy—Honolulu is remarkably well served by the diversity of news and editorial commentary.

"Our representation of a significant number of the employees of the two papers here makes us familiar with local newspaper economics. If the joint plan here were broken up, The Advertiser as an entity would die.

"Theoretically, it might be suggested that a new organization would move in to fill the void. Realistically, it would not. Honolulu would wind up as a single-ownership city, just as much larger cities have: Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Atlanta, Indianapolis, many others.

"This would be as tragic as it is needless. Your support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills would contribute greatly to the preservation of independent editorial voices here and elsewhere. We hope that your reply will be favorable."

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
May 8, 1969]

TWO MORE UNIONS BACK NEWSPAPER BILL

Two more Hawaiian unions have added their support to newspaper preservation bills introduced in Congress.

The Hawaii Teamsters & Allied Workers, Local 996, and Hotel Restaurant Employees & Bartenders' Union, Local 5, have written Hawaii's Congressional delegation urging support of the bills.

Arthur A. Rutledge, president of both unions, wrote that the unions "are concerned over the jeopardy in which The Honolulu Advertiser is placed by the recent ruling of the U.S. Supreme court in the Tucson press case."

"It is common knowledge that the Advertiser went through a substantial period of

losses prior to the merger of its commercial departments with those of the financially stronger Honolulu Star-Bulletin," Rutledge said.

"As a consequence of the consolidation of mechanical, advertising and circulation functions, but with maintenance of separate ownerships and separate editorial staffs and policies, The Honolulu Advertiser has been able to continue publication; so that the papers here provide two different and independent viewpoints to the community.

"Although Local 996 and Local 5 do not always agree with either paper on issues facing organized labor, the community and the nation, we fully recognize the importance of having the greatest possible diversity of independent opinion and comment," Rutledge said.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Apr. 8, 1969]

THIRD UNION JOINS PRESS PLEA

Honolulu members of the Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union yesterday wrote to the Hawaii Congressional delegation in support of the Newspaper Preservation Bill.

This is the third Hawaii union to do so, the Hawaii Newspaper Guild (AFL-CIO) and the ILWU having taken similar action last week.

Thomas K. Sing, president of Local 201, said the lithographers and photoengravers are fearful "that the recent Supreme Court decision in the Tucson newspaper case will put The Advertiser out of business unless the Newspaper Preservation Bill becomes law."

"We are also concerned," Sing said in his letters to Sens. Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye and to Reps. Patsy T. Mink and Spark M. Matsunaga, "with the threat posed by the decision to many other American daily papers which are operating under joint facility agreements."

Many of the union's members work at the Hawaii Newspaper Agency, which performs all non-editorial functions for The Advertiser and the Star-Bulletin.

"We can assure you," Sing told the delegation, "that there is strong editorial and news competition between our two Honolulu dailies. Indeed, there is more competition today than there was prior to the formation of the joint facility.

"A few weeks ago in joint negotiations with the five other newspaper unions, we were able to obtain wages that are among the highest in the nation.

"Incidentally, in Honolulu the newspaper unions have negotiated jointly for almost 10 years—and this approach to collective bargaining has virtually eliminated the possibility of a multiplicity of strikes which sometimes take place when union agreements have separate expiration dates."

Senators Fong and Inouye and Representative Matsunaga are among co-sponsors of the Newspaper Preservation Bill.

This legislation would provide that a financially failing paper which consolidates its advertising, circulation and mechanical departments but not its editorial department with its stronger competitor, will be treated under law as if it were in a full merger. No predatory practices would be permitted.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser,
Apr. 10, 1969]

MACHINISTS BACK NEWS BILL

Support for the Newspaper Preservation Bills now pending in Congress was voted Tuesday by members of the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 1245, who are employed by the Hawaii Newspaper Agency.

The Machinists are the fourth Hawaii union to give their support to the legislation, which is being given bipartisan support in Congress.

Carl J. Guntert, senior business agent for the Machinists, said Lodge 1245 directed its

secretary to write to the union's international headquarters and to congressman in Washington, D.C., urging support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills.

Guntert said the Machinists are concerned about the effect of a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision involving the Tucson newspapers.

"Although we understand there was some difference between the Tucson case and the situation in Honolulu," Guntert said, "we are fearful that unless this legislation is adopted some court may make a similar ruling relative to The Advertiser and the Star-Bulletin.

"This could be to the detriment of the newspaper industry and the employes of that industry in the Islands.

"We think it makes a lot of sense to make full usage of the printing equipment at the News Building by printing the morning paper at night and the evening paper in the daytime on the same presses."

The Hawaii Newspaper Agency, which is the joint production facility for The Advertiser and Star-Bulletin, employs the Machinists who gave their support to the Newspaper Preservation Bills. Other unions which have pledged similar support include the Hawaii Newspaper Guild, ILWU and Lithographers & Photoengravers.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, May 8, 1969]

TEAMSTERS, HOTEL, RESTAURANT UNIONS FAVOR NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION BILLS

The Hawaii Congressional delegation has been urged to give "hearty support" to the Newspaper Preservation Bills by the Teamsters & Allied Workers Local 996 and the Hotel, Restaurant Employees & Bartenders' Union, Local 5, AFL-CIO.

Letters signed by Arthur A. Rutledge, president of the unions, have been sent to Senators Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye and to Representatives Spark M. Matsunaga and Patsy T. Mink.

The legislation would provide that when a newspaper in failing financial circumstances merges its advertising, circulation and mechanical departments, but not its ownership or editorial functions, with a stronger competitor it would be treated under law as if it were in a full merger.

Such a law is needed to grant relief from a U.S. Supreme Court ruling against such joint-plan operations—although complete mergers involving a single ownership of morning and afternoon papers and a single editorial policy have been permitted in many large cities.

The Hawaii Teamsters and Hotel Workers Unions' letter is in accord with those from five unions which have contracts with the local newspapers and from the Hawaii Education Association.

Text of the letter follows:

"Hawaii Teamsters & Allied Workers, Local 996, and Hotel, Restaurant Employees & Bartenders' Union, Local 5, are concerned over the jeopardy in which The Honolulu Advertiser is placed by the recent ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Tucson press case.

"It is common knowledge that The Advertiser went through a substantial period of losses prior to the merger of its commercial departments with those of the financially stronger Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

"As a consequence of the consolidation of mechanical, advertising and circulation functions but with maintenance of separate ownerships and separate editorial staffs and policies, The Honolulu Advertiser has been able to continue publication; so that the papers here provide two different and independent viewpoints to the community.

"Although Local 996 and Local 5 do not always agree with either paper on issues facing organized labor, the community and the nation, we fully recognize the importance of having the greatest possible diversity of independent opinion and comment.

"It is our understanding that a score of other cities across America have similar joint-plan arrangements and are also seeking legislative relief from the Court's ruling on Tucson.

"The fact that 33 United States Senators and some 90 Representatives of both parties and of widely varied views have sponsored Newspaper Preservation Bills is indicative of the magnitude of the problem and the need for a Congressional remedy.

"These Newspaper Preservation Bills have the announced support of the Hawaii Newspaper Guild, the Printing Pressmen & Assistants Union, Local 413, the Lithographers & Photoengravers Union, Local 201, International Association of Machinists, Local 1245 and the ILWU, Local 142, all of whom have had contracts with the two Honolulu dailies for the six years of the joint-plan operation, and are thus intimately familiar with the economics of the local press.

"Local 996 and Local 5 join with these unions in urging the Hawaii Congressional delegation and their colleagues to give hearty support to the Newspaper Preservation Bills."

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Apr. 15, 1969]
NEWSPAPER BILLS GIVEN SUPPORT BY PRESSMEN

The Honolulu Printing Pressmen & Assistants Union, Local 413, has announced its support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills now pending in Congress.

The union whose members are employed by the Hawaii Newspaper Agency, joint production facility for The Advertiser and the Star-Bulletin, is the fifth labor organization to pledge its support to the Congressional legislation.

John Pedro, president of the Pressmen's Union, said he and his members are asking Hawaii's Congressional delegation and other Congressmen to support the Newspaper Preservation Bills.

He said passage of the bills would "eliminate the threat to the existence of the morning Honolulu Advertiser, a threat created by the recent Supreme Court decision in the Tucson newspaper case.

"We do not challenge the high court," he said, adding:

"But we believe the decision, if applied to all papers produced and distributed on a joint facility basis, threatens the existence of many daily papers and will be the cause of many cities winding up with one daily paper or with single ownership.

"The intent of the Sherman Act, as we understand it, is to prevent monopolies.

"The Tucson decision, unless remedied by legislation, will encourage newspaper monopolies in certain cities and defeat the purpose of the Sherman Act."

Pedro pointed out that the Pressmen have negotiated with The Advertiser and the Star-Bulletin (and their joint production facility, the Hawaii Newspaper Agency) for more than 10 years.

"We are familiar with the past and current financial status of both," he said. "It is our opinion that The Advertiser would have died had it not entered into a joint facility arrangement with its competitor."

Pedro also pointed out that in Honolulu "the two dailies have two distinct editorial policies and Honolulu has superior news coverage.

"It is the consensus of the community that it would be a tragedy for Honolulu to become a single-ownership city or a single-daily city," he said.

Pedro and the 152 members of the Honolulu and Hilo local of the Pressmen's Union said Congressional support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills "would contribute greatly to the preservation of competitive journalism here and in several other cities."

Other newspaper unions which have expressed support for the bills are the Hawaii

Newspaper Guild, Lithographers & Photoengravers, ILWU and International Association of Machinists.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, May 15, 1969]

THE 17,000-MEMBER HGEA FAVORS
NEWSPAPER BILLS

The 17,000-member Hawaiian Government Employees Association has endorsed the Newspaper Preservation Bills now before Congress and urged their "expeditious passage."

The legislation is being sponsored in the U.S. Senate by Hawaii Sens. Daniel K. Inouye and Hiram L. Fong; and Sens. Mike Mansfield, the majority leader; Fred R. Harris, national Democratic chairman; Alan Cranston, Hugh Scott, Wallace Bennett, George Murphy, Howard Baker and 24 others.

In the House the sponsors include Reps. Spark Matsunaga, Ed Edmondson, House majority whip Hale Boggs, James Symington, Edith Green, Don Clausen, William Malliard, Paul McCloskey Jr. and 82 others.

The HGEA support of the measure is the latest in a series of union and other endorsements in Hawaii.

Daniel K. Ainoa, executive director of HGEA, sent the following letter to the Hawaii delegation:

"The Hawaiian Government Employees Association, with 17,000 members, is writing to ask your support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills (S-1520 and HR-8765) and to urge their expeditious passage.

"We are aware of the recent court decision in the Tucson newspaper case and the threat it represents to the survival of the Honolulu Advertiser and its joint-plan relationship with the afternoon Star-Bulletin.

"The Advertiser was widely known to be in an ominous financial condition before entering in 1962 into a consolidation of its commercial departments with those of the Star-Bulletin (but with a retention of independent ownerships and editorial staffs and policies). It is clear that if the joint arrangement were ordered dissolved, The Advertiser could not survive as a separate institution.

"The two daily voices which we presently have are obviously better than having a single editorial policy in the community.

"We believe with Judge Learned Hand that the First Amendment presupposes that 'right conclusions are more likely to be gathered out of a multitude of tongues, than through any kind of authoritative selection. To many this is, and always will be, folly; but we have staked upon it our all.'

"With the general welfare of Honolulu in mind, we would appreciate whatever you and your colleagues are able to do to facilitate the passage of the Newspaper Preservation Bills."

Other organizations which have similarly backed the legislation include the Hawaii Newspaper Guild, the Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union Local 413, the Lithographers & Photoengravers Union Local 201, International Association of Machinists Local 1245, the ILWU Local 142, the Teamsters & Allied Workers Local 996, the Hotel, Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 5, AFL-CIO, the Hawaii Education Association, and the Retail Board of the Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, Apr. 6, 1969]

ILWU BACKS BILL TO SAVE NEWSPAPER

Support of the Newspaper Preservation Bill now in Congress was voiced yesterday by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union in Hawaii, on behalf of its 26,000 members.

Carl Damaso, president of the statewide Local 142, said the remedial legislation is necessary because of the Supreme Court ruling in a Tucson newspaper case.

The decision, he said in a letter to Hawaii's congressional delegation, poses a real threat

to The Honolulu Advertiser and other papers which operate on a joint-plan basis.

Under this plan, commercial and production facilities of two papers are consolidated, but separate ownerships and separate and independent editorial policies and staffs are maintained.

Twenty-one U.S. cities, from San Francisco to Pittsburgh, from Nashville to Salt Lake City, have such arrangements as an alternative to a single ownership.

SPONSORS OF BILL

Sens. Daniel K. Inouye and Hiram L. Fong and Rep. Spark M. Matsunaga are among the 32 senators and more than 90 representatives sponsoring the Newspaper Preservation Bill.

The ILWU letter pointed out that "we represent the circulation department employees of both The Advertiser and its afternoon competitor, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and we understand the economics of the newspaper industry.

"Because of the desirability—yes, the necessity—of maintaining two competing and editorial voices in Hawaii, we, and the other five newspaper craft unions, cooperated with the publishers in the formulation and effectuation of the joint facility arrangement.

TUCSON DECISION

"It is our opinion that the Tucson decision will magnify the 'problem' it would in theory eliminate. Certain papers produced and distributed by joint facilities would be forced to close. Other papers, unable because of the decision to enter into a joint plan, would meet the same fate. In such instances the community is the loser.

"Today, we have in Hawaii two independent dailies. We have two distinct editorial policies and excellent news coverage. We want to keep both.

"We believe, because we are familiar with the local situation, that if the joint facility were broken up, The Advertiser would die.

THEORY ONLY

"In theory it could be argued that some person or some corporation would establish a new morning daily. However, the people of our state and the people in the several states where joint production facilities exist cannot read theory. They want and need two or more competing papers.

"We urge you and your colleagues to support the Newspaper Preservation Bill and thus preserve The Advertiser and other daily newspapers.

"Incidentally, all of the newspaper unions in Honolulu recently negotiated the highest wage increases ever. The increases, which range from \$40 to \$48 a week, would not have been possible without joint facility production and distribution."

GUILD BACKING

An endorsement of the Newspaper Preservation Bill similar to the ILWU's was announced April 1 by the executive committee of the 370-member Hawaii Newspaper Guild (AFL-CIO).

The congressional sponsors of the legislation include both liberals and conservatives from the Democratic and Republican parties.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, May 5, 1969]
SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED IN HAWAII EDUCATION BACK BILL TO SAVE NEWSPAPERS

The Hawaii Education Association, composed of 7,500 teachers and others in Island education, Saturday reaffirmed its support of the Newspaper Preservation Bills now before the U.S. Senate and House.

Letters signed by Daniel W. Tuttle, Jr., executive secretary of H.E.A., whose members are unified with the National Education Association, are being sent to the Hawaii delegation and to other members of Congress.

They reiterate the organization's position taken last fall. Congress adjourned before the legislation could be passed and new bills

have since been introduced and are awaiting action in the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. The H.E.A. letters asks "assistance in a crisis facing The Honolulu Advertiser—and a score of other newspapers across the country—as a result of the Supreme Court's recent ruling in a Tucson case.

"A legislative remedy is urgently needed.

"Six years ago the morning Advertiser, in dire financial straits, merged its commercial functions (mechanical, advertising, circulation) but not its editorial with the afternoon Star-Bulletin. The result was to keep The Advertiser alive and to preserve for the community two separate and independent editorial voices.

"The alternative would have been a full merger with the Star-Bulletin, resulting in a single ownership of morning and afternoon papers and a single editorial policy.

"This has been the route which papers in much larger cities—such as Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Atlanta, among others—have gone, and without Justice Department action.

"We would submit," said the H.E.A., "that the general welfare is better served by a partial merger with two voices than by the full merger with one voice.

"If the joint plan in Honolulu were broken up, The Advertiser as an entity would die. So would the financially weaker paper in most, if not all, of the other joint-plan cities including Nashville, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Miami, Tulsa, Knoxville, Birmingham, Columbus, Ohio, Madison, Wis., Salt Lake City, Charleston, W. Va., Evansville and Fort Wayne, Ind., El Paso, Shreveport, Bristol, Va.-Tenn., St. Louis, Albuquerque and Lincoln, Neb.

"To save the joint-plan papers, Newspaper Preservation Bills (S-1520 and HR-8765 and others in the House, all identical) have been introduced by 33 Senators and some 90 Representatives. They run the political gamut in both Senate and House.

"The proposed legislation provides simply that when a falling paper merges its commercial but not its editorial functions with a stronger competitor, the result should be treated under law as if it were in a full merger.

"No predatory practices would be condoned or permitted. In other words, the partial merger could engage in no actions which are not permitted in a full merger.

"Hawaii's Senator Dan Inouye, chief sponsor of the Senate bill"—along with Senator Hiram L. Fong and colleagues on both sides of the aisle—"put it well when he said, 'Where the public interest in a free and varied press runs afoul of the language but not the spirit nor the intent of the anti-trust laws, it is time for Congress to take corrective action.' The large number of cosponsors shows a substantial sharing of this viewpoint.

"What an irony it would be if the Sherman Act, designed to stimulate competition, were employed in the joint-plan newspaper cases to destroy the competition in ideas so fervently needed in an increasingly complex world.

"H.E.A. hopes you can see your way clear to give this legislation your support."

All but one of the labor organizations which have contracts with The Advertiser, The Star-Bulletin and the Hawaii Newspaper Agency have strongly endorsed the legislation.

These include the Hawaii Newspaper Guild (AFL-CIO); Local 142, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; Local 413, Honolulu Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union; Local 201, the Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union; and Lodge 1245, International Association of Machinists.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
May 16, 1969]

HAWAII LEGISLATURE BACKS NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION BILL

Hawaii's Legislature has endorsed national legislation aimed at preventing Honolulu and other cities from having only one newspaper or single ownership of the newspapers.

A concurrent resolution was adopted by the House yesterday and the Senate on Wednesday expressing "full support in the passage of the Newspaper Preservation Bills."

The resolution referred to the joint-plan operation of the Honolulu Advertiser and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which are separately owned and have independent editorial policies and staffs, but share production facilities.

"The existing Honolulu joint-plan must be allowed to continue because its dissolution will precipitate either a single newspaper or single ownership of both newspapers to the great loss and detriment of the State of Hawaii, including the City and County of Honolulu," the resolution said.

Hawaii's U.S. Senators Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye and Representative Spark M. Matsunaga are pushing the national newspaper preservation bills with 31 other Senators and approximately 90 other Representatives as co-sponsors.

The bills would provide relief from a recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling in a Tucson newspaper case which threatens joint-plan publishing arrangements in many U.S. cities.

RESOLUTION 96

Whereas, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Senator Hiram L. Fong, and Representative Spark M. Matsunaga are among the 32 senators and 90 representatives sponsoring the Newspaper Preservation Bill; and

Whereas, the Newspaper Preservation Bill will make it possible for independent newspapers to use joint facilities; and

Whereas, the I.L.W.U. supports said bill; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the County of Maui that it does hereby urge the Congressional Delegation from Hawaii to support the Newspaper Preservation Bill; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Hawaii Congressional Delegation.

U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who views today's observance of Maritime Day with a rising sense of optimism. The reasons for this optimism are many:

First. During last year's campaign, President Nixon spoke of his commitment to a new program to revitalize the American merchant marine, a program that would be fair and equitable to all segments of this industry. Since he assumed office, the President and numerous officials in the executive branch have reaffirmed that commitment, and have let it be known that the administration is working on a program for submission to Congress.

Second. Legislation has already been introduced in this session to modernize the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and while in my view that omnibus maritime bill needs strengthening to make it serve the needs of this Nation, the fact that it was introduced is a reflection of the con-

tinuing concern here in the Congress for remedial action in this field.

Third. In addition to the omnibus bill, there are individual measures dealing with an overhaul of the cargo preference program and extending to the entire merchant marine a program to encourage the investment of private funds in new ship construction.

Fourth. The legislation which the 90th Congress passed—and which was pocket-vetted by the President—to reconstitute the Maritime Administration as an independent agency, has been reintroduced under the cosponsorship of more than 170 of our colleagues in the House of Representatives. One of these bills is H.R. 266 of which I am a cosponsor.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am heartened about our maritime prospects. For the first time in recent years, we can look forward today with reasonable optimism to the day when our U.S. merchant marine will be a source of pride to the country. I believe there is in this Chamber, and in the executive branch, a new spirit of determination to achieve this goal, a determination based on the recognition that a healthy merchant fleet is a vital part of our overall capability on the world's seas, and that this seagoing capability is a requisite of our national security today just as it has always been in the history of our country.

For those who may doubt, or feel indifferent to, the role of seagoing strength in international security affairs, I recommend the reading of an article which highlights in a graphic manner just what the Soviet Union is doing in this connection.

I believe it has implications which ought to be of highest concern to this Government and to the American people. The article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for May 21, 1969. I include it at this point in my remarks:

SOVIET AID FORMS STRATEGY PATTERN

(By Elizabeth K. Valkenier)

There is a pattern to Soviet maritime activities that has gone largely unnoticed—that of creating naval facilities and gathering intelligence under the guise of economic aid.

Long before the dramatic appearance of the Red Fleet in various harbors from Morocco to Iraq the Soviets had built or modernized ports and developed commercial fishing for countries along the shores of the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and elsewhere around Africa.

Certain Soviet activities preceding the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 indicate that there can be a direct connection between this type of economic assistance and military operations.

In that summer the Soviets tried to camouflage their stepped-up military traffic by publicizing the technical aid granted to Havana. They asserted they were busy enlarging the Cuban trawler fleet, locating fishing grounds, and building a new fishing port on the Atlantic to be used jointly by Cuba and the Soviet Union.

PARALLEL ROUTES

After the Kennedy-Khrushchev confrontation over the offensive missile sites in October, nothing more was heard of the ambitious plans for the joint fishing port aside from delivery of a floating dry dock for Havana's harbor in the fall of 1964.

Sinister objectives, as in the case of Cuba, are not the only purpose of Soviet maritime

aid. But its pattern does suggest definite strategic aims along important sea routes for the worldwide operations of the Soviet Navy.

Take the matter of ports, for example. With an eye to securing easier access to the Indian Ocean, Moscow began to acquire a foothold south of Suez. The first economic aid agreement concluded with Yemen in 1958 provided for the construction of a port at Hodeida. Four years later, the Soviets began working on a deep-water port at Berbera in Somalia.

And in May, 1967, just before the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli war, they undertook to build a fishing harbor for the United Arab Republic. Located in the Gulf of Suez, it was to serve as a base for joint Soviet-Egyptian deep-sea fishing in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean.

On the west coast of Africa, Guinea received Soviet assistance in reconstructing the port at Conakry under the terms of the first aid agreement of 1959. With the harbor dredged, Soviet warships could dock at Conakry when they took to cruising African waters 10 years later. In nearby Ghana, the Soviets managed to modernize the fishing port at Tema before Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown.

SURVEY DROPPED

It must have been the prospects of greater strategic mobility in the western Mediterranean that prompted the Soviets early in 1961 to insist on making a survey for a shipyard at the small fishing port at Alhucemas on the northern shore of Morocco.

Western technicians had previously advised against the project, since the port was not served by a railroad. Eventually the Russians reached the same conclusion and shifted their feasibility studies to the bay of Tangier.

The construction of shipyards at Bassra in Iraq and at Alexandria has extended the reach of Soviet sea power. Red Fleet units regularly visit Alexandria nowadays, where they maintain their supply and repair facilities. Bassra became a port of call in May, 1968, a visit which marked the first appearance ever of the Russian Navy in the Persian Gulf.

Numerous other maritime projects, especially in countries that do not receive Soviet military aid, serve as a strategic wedge. Work on such projects, resulting in extensive use of these countries' ports and coastal waters, establishes a Russian presence and can facilitate the gathering of intelligence.

TRAINING RECEIVED

In several cases the only aid the Soviet Union renders to a strategically located country that has not been particularly cordial to Moscow is connected with the sea.

In the Persian Gulf, Kuwait is enlarging its fishing fleet with Russian-built seiners on which Kuwaiti sailors also receive training from Soviet experts.

In Jordan, Moscow had no success with its military aid offers. But early in 1968 it persuaded Amman to accept economic assistance for a number of unspecified "maritime projects," thereby extending the Soviet presence to the Gulf of Aqaba.

The development of commercial fishing, a prominent item in Soviet aid program, often opens up the ports of the aid recipient to Soviet trawlers. Under the terms of the 1964 aid agreement, Tanzania permits Soviet fishing vessels to dock in its ports in return for assistance in developing its ocean fishing. A similar reciprocity exists with Senegal.

The facilities thus acquired increase the range of Soviet fishing fleets. These fleets often include electronic intelligence-gathering ships disguised as trawlers. Soviet trawlers have also been used for landing and picking up undercover agents. Last autumn Ghana intercepted some Russian fishing boats on suspicion of smuggling arms.

ADEN OBJECTIVE

Moscow's persistence in offering economic aid that builds up an infrastructure for later naval capability continues unabated.

The latest object of Soviet interest is the port of Aden. Strategically better located and far larger than Hodeida, it has already served as a port of call for Soviet warships cruising the Indian Ocean. In February of this year, South Yemen signed an aid agreement with Moscow to improve Aden's harbor and docks.

Soviet eagerness to enlarge this port's facilities suggests that the Red Fleet hopes to add Aden to its list of repair and supply bases that already includes Algiers, Alexandria, Port Said, and Latakia. If those intentions are realized, Russia will have taken a major step toward achieving its dream of a permanent presence in both the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE WARREN BURGER AS CHIEF JUSTICE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Judge Warren Burger as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is a good appointment, in my opinion.

While I am not personally acquainted with Judge Burger I know that he has an enviable reputation as a man of solid integrity, hard work, and dedication to the highest principles of justice.

He meets the test of qualification that I set forth in a bill I introduced regarding Supreme Court Justices. In that bill I proposed that anyone appointed to the Court have at least 10 years experience as a judge, either on a State supreme court or a U.S. court of appeals.

Mr. Burger, at age 61, has served for 13 years on the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

But further than that he fits my picture of how a Supreme Court Justice ought to think, and he fits the picture that I believe the great majority of Americans have.

He is a conservative on the question of law and order. By that I mean he believes that laws are enacted to be obeyed. He has opposed court decisions which emphasize rights of the accused at the expense of the victims of crime.

He believes in a truly balanced assessment of fairness in seeking fair trials in criminal cases. He chides other Federal judges for insisting on "perfect trials" which all too often result in turning the criminal loose on a technicality.

On the court of appeals he frequently has been the only judge to stand up for the local policeman and the general public. He once wrote that the decisions which have made it so difficult to convict criminals run the risk of creating "a society incapable of defending itself."

These decisions could lead to "the impotent society" as he called it.

He has consistently, in his work as a judge in the District of Columbia, demanded commonsense and responsibility in criminal law.

Just as important, he takes the view that the Supreme Court's task is to interpret the law and the Constitution, not to rewrite it.

He takes the strict constructionist position in that he believes the Constitution should be considered for what it actually says, not for what it might say.

To the extent that his position as Chief Justice influences the Court, I believe

decisions made by the Court will show a decided change for the better.

And finally, Mr. Burger is not in any way a crony of the President who appointed him. There is no question of having too close an association with the White House or with any part of the executive branch, or for that matter, with the Congress or any political group.

This is not to say that I expect to agree with each and every decision and comment made by Mr. Burger if he is confirmed as Chief Justice.

I expect that I will not agree with him on many occasions. But certainly I will find myself comfortable with his approach to the vital role of the Chief Justice in our system of government.

And I believe most of us in the first congressional district of my State will feel the same way.

The appointment of Judge Burger, of course, is that of Chief Justice to replace Justice Earl Warren who is retiring after long years on the Court.

Mr. Nixon still has the appointment to fill the vacancy arising because of the resignation of Justice Abe Fortas a few days ago.

There is now some controversy over another Associate Justice, William O. Douglas. Like Justice Fortas, he, also, has apparently received funds, other than his salary, while serving on the Court.

The funds have been paid him by one or more groups with obvious interests in matters of Government policy and action. There is some feeling that Justice Douglas, also, may decide to leave the Court.

Over the next 3 or 4 years President Nixon may have the opportunity to completely change the complexion of the Supreme Court. I believe this is probably the most important task he will have as President.

In my view it has never been more important that the Supreme Court retain a position that is completely above all possible reproach. Its members must be without blemish as men of total integrity.

The reason this is so vital today is that the so-called establishment is under fire from all directions.

If our system of government is to remain healthy and orderly it is absolutely essential that the Supreme Court is free of any possible attack on its veracity. I believe the appointment of Judge Burger as Chief Justice meets this need.

A TRIBUTE TO AGOSTON HARASZTHY

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 11, the American Hungarian Federation paid tribute to Agoston Haraszthy, a pioneer in American agriculture, and the "father" of modern California viticulture.

Col. Agoston Haraszthy came to America in 1840 as a "political exile." His earlier struggles in Europe and his ultimate achievements in the United States are truly an "American success story" that deserves to be told and retold.

Thus it is, that I insert in the RECORD

today, the eulogy to Agoston Haraszthy that was delivered by Dr. Elemer Bako at the centennial memorial program in Colonel Haraszthy's honor on the patio of the Department of Agriculture last Sunday.

Today, 100 years following his passing, I am privileged to represent here in the Congress that region along the north coast of California so richly blessed by Colonel Haraszthy's contributions to our State's wine industry. It is estimated that 80 percent of California's harvested grapes are the direct descendants of the vine samplings he collected throughout Europe more than 100 years ago.

Dr. Elemer Bako, area specialist, Library of Congress, chairman of the Cultural Committee of the American Hungarian Federation, gave the following address:

AGOSTON HARASZTHY'S HUNGARIAN BACKGROUND

The man whose memory we came to honor here today, was an extraordinary personality, by his conduct of life, by his personal appearance, as well as by the virtue of the high goals he set for himself and for his contemporaries, eminently for the new settlers and planners of California's economy in the 1850's. These character traits marked him as a leader early after his immigration to the United States: a leader who possessed the powers of initiative, imagination and intellect, moral standards as well as practical know-how. Thus, he was able to perform among the multi-faced crowd of his new environment in a rather unique way: his ideas and proposals caught the eye of the rich as well as of the man of moderate means, of the highest official of the state as well as of the humblest vineyard hand. He was able to move forward swiftly, to embrace all details of the task he took upon himself, and to propose the solution for all phases of the work he thought should be done in the best interest of California and of the national economy in his particular area of pioneering reforms, until the irresistible winds of the political strife which blew over the entire life of his new country for a number of years, shut all doors in the face of this peaceful planner and builder.

Agoston Haraszthy's personality was formed in Hungary: first, by being born into a family which had a long history in Hungary's northeastern regions where the flames of liberty and freedom were always kept alive. Both in the County of Ung (from where the title of nobility of the Haraszthys derives) and in the County of Bihar, at the gates of Transylvania (where Agoston Haraszthy's immediate ancestors were living for several generations), the home atmosphere of the Haraszthys, through many generations, was that of the landed nobility: they received their education in the classics at the college, then proceeded as practitioners in matters of public administration, in the management of their estates and other properties, including various industrial establishments. They have received their training for both to serve in office in times of peace and to serve in the armed forces in times of war.

It was especially the second home of the Haraszthys, the town of Mező-Telegd, in Bihar County, situated among rolling hills of romantic beauty, two miles from the historical city of Nagyvárad, which formed the heritage most decisive for Agoston Haraszthy's life in America. Among the landed neighbors of the Haraszthys there were representatives of the aristocracy, like the Counts Haller and Korniss (both with close ties to Transylvania) as well as numerous representatives of the common nobility: the Miskolczy, Fráter, Várady, Jakabfy, Karácsony and others. The vicinity of the Principate of Transylvania, a small Hun-

garian state which was separated from the rest of the country after the Turkish occupation of the central regions of Hungary in the 16th century, kept up the banner of freedom and hope for the adjoining territories. Consequently, participation in public affairs for the families around the Haraszthys was traditionally a "noble officium", and propagation of the public good was obligatory. The able sons of these families promoted the country's political, economic and cultural interests and often allied themselves for the service of such tasks.

Another essential part of Agoston Haraszthy's personal heritage, his mind's preoccupation with viticultural matters, originated also with the town of Mező-Telegd which is located, at the outskirts of the city of Nagyvárad, among grape-bearing hills. This little town, populated then mostly by Hungarian farmers adhering to the Calvinist faith, produced wines of excellent quality.

When and how Agoston Haraszthy's parents moved to Futak, in Southern Hungary, in the so-called Bácska, is yet unknown to us. There, the Haraszthys were surrounded by German settlers who were invited to Hungary by the Habsburgs in the wake of the expulsion of the Turks in the 18th century. It might have been the initiative and creative talents of the Haraszthys (so splendidly demonstrated by Agoston later) which moved his parents to this region: its soil was the richest in Hungary, and it appeared to be in the best interest of the Hungarian nation to have at least some Hungarians among the new owners of that rich country.

Upon the conclusion of his secondary education, Agoston was delegated, very likely by the County of Bács, to become a member of the Hungarian Royal Body-Guards, then stationed permanently at Vienna, Capital City of the Austrian Empire. This body of young Hungarian talent in Vienna was regarded in Hungary as the best stock of future leadership for the nation. Among these young officers, most of whom spoke several languages, were found many with scholarly or literary interests; others turned to political or economic studies. They were among the first in Hungary who, since the end of the 18th century, familiarized themselves with the progressive ideas of Western Europe and the principles of the young American democracy, and if not all of them became leaders during the Hungarian "Age of Reform", in the second quarter of the 19th century, most of them emerged as able representatives of the reform movement, led by its recognized leader, Count Stephen Széchenyi.

The Imperial Court, sensing the new power beyond the call for reform, reacted through the ingenious system of control and oppression which was the true reflection of its master-mind, the omniscient and omnipotent Chancellor Prince Metternich. The potentially dangerous leaders like Louis Kossuth and Baron Nicholas Wesselényi were jailed for several years, causing also the downfall of many of their open or secret followers among the reform-minded generation of the young.

Agoston Haraszthy, then in his 28th year, with tenures of service as private secretary to the Palatine (Vice-Roy) of Hungary and as a district administration chief in Bács County, probably became entangled (as suggested by his own statements) in these political movements. Since he was already married (to a Polish beauty of that country's nobility, whose family was forced earlier to flee Poland for similar anti-Habsburg activities), Agoston Haraszthy, also father of three young children, had to seek his future somewhere else. Thus, accompanied by a young relative, Charles Halász, Agoston entered the United States in 1840, and settled in the Territory of Wisconsin as a "political exile", indicating that his association with Kossuth's and Wesselényi's followers caused him to leave his country.

His travel to the United States of America

did not come about by a chance decision. Haraszthy's generation was already well informed about the American way of life by the work of Alexander Bóloni Farkas, a Hungarian from Transylvania, who traveled in the United States in 1831, and in an excellent book which quickly achieved two editions, described the institutions and the people of America. The leader of the Hungarian reform movement, Count Széchenyi himself wrote to the author that "according to my knowledge, there is no other writer who, up to our times, had presented the Hungarian fatherland and its public with a more useful and beautiful gift." This work became the source of information for all educated Hungarians, including Agoston Haraszthy, about the United States.

Although he came in the wake of Kossuth's political activities to America, during his coming years in the United States Haraszthy turned more in the direction of Széchenyi's philosophy who cautioned against premature political action and preferred economic evolution for his nation. When, after four years in this country (during which Haraszthy founded the present Sauk City, then named "Town Haraszthy" after him, and planted his first hopyard in Wisconsin), he returned shortly to Hungary, persuaded his father to sell the family estate and to move with his only son's family to America, Haraszthy became the embodiment of the type of Széchenyi in his new country. His farsighted planning toward the realization of his dream: the great future of California as the leading grape and wine producing land of the world recalls the methods of Széchenyi whose call to reform prompted his nation to found the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the National Casino (for spirited, high-level discussions on public matters), the Hungarian National Museum, the National Theater. The "Széchenyi Generation" launched the first steamships on the Danube, initiated the regulation of the rivers of Hungary, founded scores of newspapers, scientific and literary journals, and laid down the foundations for a modern Hungary so solidly, that not even the rigid, absolutistic era which followed the defeat of the Kossuth Government in 1849 by the armies of the Austrian and Russian Emperors, could destroy them but they maintained themselves as the great reservoirs of the nation's intellectual and political powers.

Agoston Haraszthy's life in the United States reflected a man of Széchenyi's own making. His educational background, both as an officer and public official, enabled him of moving along smoothly and effectively through established channels; his social training came through in his polished manners, while the common citizens, including the workers in the vineyard, were filled with enthusiasm over his "money-making" ideas.

The heritage which he carried with himself to his new country was woven by invisible hands into the texture of his American life: gradually he became an American citizen, deeply loyal and inseparably attached to the United States. This new, inner self emerges at the sight of the flag in the French city of Bordeaux, from the depth of Agoston Haraszthy's soul when he wrote in his diary on September 15, 1861:

"As it was Sunday, all that could be done was to walk around the city and write correspondence. Bordeaux is a very fine city. It possesses large, shady walks, promenades and squares. It has a good safe harbor in the River Garonne . . . Many ships from our own country sweep the harbor with their airy forms. High above all others is unfurled to the winds the beautiful *Star-spangled Banner*. In beholding the flag of my country, I felt rush into my heart a thrill of pleasure and pride. Even without the flag, it was easy to recognize at once our American ships. Their high masts, towering far above the forest around them, their sharp-cut bows, their finely-moulded lines, pronounced them American."

The former country gentry and officer of the Royal Body-Guards, the struggling young Reformist submerged with the past, but their values contributed decisively to the emergence of a variant among the citizenry of the United States: like the great vines of Hungary which strive on the fertile soil of California but their fruits are different from those of Tokaj and the Balaton Lake region, the American Hungarian, with all his sentimental affection and cultural heritage which might still bind him to his past, is as loyal and genuine an American as his next door neighbor.

Agoston Haraszthy was the first, shining example of this creative, dedicated American Hungarian citizen.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

I regret deeply that previous commitments in California prevent me from being here to speak to you today, for this is indeed a memorable occasion. Colonel Agoston Haraszthy, who came to California by ox-team with the forty-niners, fortunately had quite a distinct vocation from those seekers of gold. His, as we know, was agriculture and the harvest of his work and foresight is still being reaped today, 100 years after his death.

Perhaps this recognition was most succinctly noted in a California State Legislative resolution of 1961 which not only paid tribute to Colonel Haraszthy's pioneering efforts in agriculture but formally designated him as the "father" of modern California viticulture.

During two decades in California, Colonel Haraszthy's dedicated efforts helped increase wine production fiftyfold to about three million gallons a year. Today our vineyards produce 160 million gallons yearly, wines which rank as the world's finest.

No one would be prouder of these achievements than Colonel Haraszthy. But I am certain his ambitions, were he alive today, would not cease, for Colonel Haraszthy, like all the pioneers who made our country great, never permitted reality to catch up with his dreams.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MURPHY.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1969.

Z. MICHAEL SZAZ, Ph.D.,
American Hungarian Federation,
3216 New Mexico Avenue NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DOCTOR SZAZ: Too often we overlook those true men of vision whose foresight has so profoundly influenced our lives. I am very happy that through the efforts of the American Hungarian Federation we have come to honor one of those men, Agoston Haraszthy.

One hundred years after his death, there is no question of the importance of Haraszthy to the state of California. He is the father of our wine industry. We estimate that 80 percent of California's harvested grapes are the direct descendants of the cuttings he brought from Europe well over 100 years ago.

California has put Count Haraszthy on its cultural maps, and there is no doubt he belongs there. In a very significant way, he put California on the nation's economic and gourmet maps.

Agoston Haraszthy died in 1869—in obscurity, at least from a California's point of view. He died outside California, in Nicaragua, where he became a plantation owner after his political eclipse in California.

Now we are happy to reverse the effects of that eclipse, once and for all we hope.

Agoston Haraszthy is a California hero.
ALAN CRANSTON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI, for May 26 through 29, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, for May 26 through June 6, 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. FEIGHAN, today, for 10 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission, to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland.

Mr. FISH in five instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. MORSE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. ST GERMAIN in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. BARING in two instances.

Mr. DOWDY.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1969, 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:

792. A letter from the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

793. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1968; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for expenses of the U.S. section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

795. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11582. A bill 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, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the report calendar, as follows:

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Delina; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEED:
H.R. 11582. A bill 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, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BENNETT:
H.R. 11583. A bill to eliminate suffering from hunger among the needy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. AD-DABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUT-TON, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REES, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 11584. A bill to provide for the protection of children against physical injury caused or threatened by those who are responsible for their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 11585. A bill to provide for the protection of children against physical injury caused or threatened by those who are responsible for their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:
H.R. 11586. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide statutory and cost-of-living increases in OASDI benefits and raise the earnings base, to liberalize the retirement test, and to raise the age at which entitlement to child's insurance benefits on the basis of school attendance ceases; and to amend title XVIII of such act to include certain drugs among the benefits covered under part B thereof and to provide payment for certain services furnished outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:
H.R. 11587. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:
H.R. 11588. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H.R. 11589. A bill to require, as a prerequisite to Federal assistance, that institutions of higher education must adopt and enforce federally approved plans for curbing campus disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GETTYS:
H.R. 11590. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:
H.R. 11591. A bill to provide that the only son of a family, the sole surviving son of a family, or a member of the Armed Forces whose father, brother, or sister is serving in a combat zone shall be exempt from service in a combat zone as a member of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOWARD:
H.R. 11592. A bill to amend the first section of the act of November 5, 1966, to define the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:
H.R. 11593. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11594. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of

sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCKNEALLY:
H.R. 11595. A bill to authorize donations of surplus foods to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. REES, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 11596. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to authorize the Government National Mortgage Association to guarantee obligations issued by State agencies to finance low- and moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MAY (for herself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.R. 11597. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wildfire disaster control fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAYNE:
H.R. 11598. A bill to require all Members of Congress to disclose all income; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. MINSHALL:
H.R. 11599. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:
H.R. 11600. A bill to promote private U.S. participation in international organizations and movements, to provide for the establishment of an Institute of International Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:
H.R. 11601. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11602. A bill to modernize the U.S. postal establishment, to provide for efficient and economical postal service to the public, to improve postal employee-management relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:
H.R. 11603. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:
H.R. 11604. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for insured operating loans, including loans to low-income farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLEN:
H.R. 11605. A bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:
H.R. 11606. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:
H.R. 11607. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the continued payment of supplemental annuities in accordance with present law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11608. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to extend the time and increase the authorization for the institutional investor study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR:
H.R. 11609. A bill to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. PUCINSKI, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 11610. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:
H.J. Res. 739. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:
H.J. Res. 740. Joint resolution expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLLOCK:
H.J. Res. 741. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for popular approval of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:
H. Res. 423. Resolution to authorize the Committees on Banking and Currency and Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of establishing an educational opportunity bank; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

184. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the protection of rare and endangered species, including the American alligator; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

185. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the tax exemption for municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. VIGORITO introduced a bill (H.R. 11611) for the relief of Catherine Krieger, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

119. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners, Clark County, Wash., relative to flood control and protection facilities for the Vancouver Lake, Wash., area, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.