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 succesor, 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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 Silver 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 GI's, 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 Auxiliary.

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 tc 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 handouts.

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 Janiero, 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 glady 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 Bouboulinas street, Military Hospital 401 and the Camp at Dionyssos. 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 Bouboulinas street, at Military Hospital 401 and at Dionyssos, 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 Bouboulinas 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 slanderers 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 subaltern police members shall be punished severely." Similarly, two of the British MPs in question (Gordon Gagier 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 slanderers 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 Febuary 1968.

The fourth report, which is characterised 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 diabetis 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 condition 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, gassings—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 rampaging 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, yippies, 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 disruptions 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 Emitt 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 universtiy district in Berkeley.

It followed the ejection of a group of "street people"—hippies, students and nonstudents—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 employes 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 1000 people who roamed the campus in the sixth day of disorders over People's Park.

About 2000 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 Pilisuk, 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 Recter. 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 employes 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 Pilisuck, 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—sometime—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 fail 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 panty 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 birdshot.

"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 nonnegotiable 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 folowing 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.[1] 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.[2]

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.[3] 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).[5] 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 illustratied 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 opportnity 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.[14]

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.[15] 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.[16] 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.[17] 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.[18]

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.[19] 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.[20] 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.[21]

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*.[22] 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.[23] 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 noncompliance 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.[24] 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

Footnotes 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 porgram 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 (coperatives) 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 specifity 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.[29] 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 checklist [30] 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.[31] 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" checklist [32] 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.[33] 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.[34] 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.[35] 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 becomes 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 preformed 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 nondiscriminatory 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 Opportunity [1] 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 programing 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 Cooperative.
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:

a. loans for soil and water conservation and the development of recreational facilities;

b. loans for senior citizen rental housing in rural areas;

c. loans to public bodies for the redevelopment of rural areas; and

d. 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:

a. loans to producer associations (21 primary recipients);

b. loans to cooperative marketing associations (25 recipients);

c. 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

d. 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:

a. National Forestry Administration—land use permits to States and public and private organizations for recreational and other purposes;

b. Cooperative Forestry—matching funds and technical assistance to States for fire control, seeding and tree planting;

c. Research grants—to institutions of higher learning for cooperative research in forestry; and

d. 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 ½ time; (c) less than ½ time but more than ¼ time]

| Agency [1] | Washington | | | | Field | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | Total | (a) | (b) | (c) | Total |
| 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 | [3] | [3] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FES | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FS | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | [4] | [4] |
| REA | 0 | 0 | [5] | [5] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SCS | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | [6] | [6] |
| 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 ¼ their time.

[3] FHA states that no employee spends more than ¼ 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 ¼ 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 ¼ time. 1 person spent more than ½ 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 | |
| ASCS | 7 | [1] 3 |
| C. & M.S | 6 | 5 |
| CSRS | 0 | 4 |
| FCS | 1 | |
| FHA | 3 | 13 |
| FES | 3 | |
| FS | 18 | 32 |
| REA | [2] 56 | [2] 186 |
| SCS | [3] | [3] |
| 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 |
| FS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FES | 26 | 18 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 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.

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 | | GS-18 | |
| Deputy Director | GS-11 | | GS-17 | |
| | GS-5 | | | |
| Assistant Director, Equal Opportunity Compliance | GS-8 | | GS-16 | |
| Assistant Director, Federal Employment | GS-7 | | GS-15 | |
| Assistant Director, Contract Compliance | GS-7 | | GS-15 | |
| Deputy Assistant Director, Equal Opportunity Compliance | GS-7 | | GS-15 | |
| Chief, Program Evaluation | GS-7 | | GS-15 | |
| Chief, Liaison and Review | GS-6 | | GS-14 | |
| Chief, Training | GS-6 | | GS-13 | |
| Chiefs, regional offices | GS-6 | [7] | GS-13 | 7 |
| Employment specialists | GS-5 | | GS-11 | |
| | | | GS-9 | 2 |
| Contract compliance specialists | GS-6 | | GS-11 | 10 |
| | GS-5 | | 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, Ferguise Mayronne, Judith Phillips.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Lester P. Condon, Inspector General.

Richard W. Fitch, Jr., Assistant to Inspector General.

Frank J. Brechenser, 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. Smiroldo, Administrative Assistant.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Lloyd H. Davis, Administrator.

Ralph E. Groening, Deputy Assistant Administrator.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Floyd F. Higbee, Deputy Administrator.

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).

[10] See footnote 11 *infra*.

[11] Memorandum, Joseph M. Robertson to Mr. Schnittker, 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 Exension 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] FCS 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 ongoing 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 Washington 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 Penkovskiy 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 "stepchild" 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 bricklawer—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 compartively 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-shipping 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 villified 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 Constituton 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-Dorhmann Co., Parvin-Dorhmann 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 has 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 coconspirator 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 judical 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 Pacifica 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 KPFK 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—on 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 intendment 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 "cronyism" 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 antiheros of the assorted "deals," "frontiers," and "societies" that have created a whole new series of monuments, sculpted by permissiveness, chiseled by cronyism 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 respect 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, nonprofit 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 election 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 thet 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 proliferation 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 commonsense 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. GUDE. 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 impact 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 valuable 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 Senate. 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 proferring 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-termer.

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 Nation 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 dispersed 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-propellent 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 antiaircraft 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 downtrend 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 th's 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 manpower. 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 Veitnam 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 elgible.

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 cosponsored 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 Employes & 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 maintnance 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," Gunter 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 Employes & 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 Mailliard, 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 Employes 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 employes 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 failing paper merges its commercial but not its editorial functions with a stronger competitior, 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 antitrust 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 continuing 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-vetoed 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 intensions 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 Mezö-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 Miskolczys, Fráters, Váradys, Jakabfys, Karácsonyis and others. The vicinity of the Principate of Transylvania, a small Hungarian 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 "nobile 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 Mezö-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 Bölöni 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 Legislature 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 influencd 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.

Agostan Haraszty 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 Wefare, 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. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, 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, incluidng 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.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—PART III: WEEDS IN THE GARDEN

**HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1969, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sermon preached by the Reverend Charles S. Hubbard, minister of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C., entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part I: An Introduction."

A second sermon preached by Mr. Hubbard on the same general theme which bears the title "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part II: Communism" was placed in the RECORD by my distinguished colleague, Senator SAM J. ERVIN, of North Carolina, on April 14, 1969.

Mr. Hubbard's third sermon on this same theme before his own congregation is entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part III: Weeds in the Garden." This sermon is another extremely informative and thought-provoking discussion of the dangers within our own land to the freedoms we all hold so near and dear to our hearts. So that more Members may have an opportunity to read it, I am inserting it in the RECORD as follows:

A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—PART III: WEEDS IN THE GARDEN

(By the Reverend Charles Hubbard, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C.)

At our last session we discussed the dangers of Communism, that the dangers are real, that coercive pressure from the outside of this Land of Freedom are terrible pressures. Today I want to discuss growing dangers inside our land. If Freedom is the soil on which man must grow; if man cannot live in dignity or pursue happiness outside of freedom—and I contend that he cannot—then freedom itself is essential. It is not a luxury; it is not just one of the virtues; it is the essential condition whereby man must live. It is the necessary soil of his being.

But there are "weeds in the garden of Freedom"—there are weeds right here in the United States of America, the cradle of freedom; and except we do something about these weeds, they are going to choke this garden before long.

Now, what are these weeds? I certainly do not have time to list them all, but I would say that one of the most dangerous weeds I know, one that is rapidly fouling the garden of the Freedom of Man in the United States, is the weed of lack of respect for the law. If we are going to live together as a civilization, there must be basic principles of law to protect all the people; and I have never studied nor known any time in the history of the United States when there has been less respect for the concept of government by law. There is a general contempt for law from all too many people in all too many walks of life. And this condition, unless reversed, is going to undermine our culture. For, my friends, except we respect and enforce the laws made by free men, we are soon going to surrender our freedom to the law of the jungle or submit to a totalitarian state which will enforce order, but care little for justice.

I will admit that any society, however good and just, will have it's law-breakers. I am not pleading here for paradise. But, to quote Horace Mann: "Let but the public mind become thoroughly corrupt, and all attempts to secure property, liberty, or life, by mere force of laws written on parchment, will be as vain as to put up printed notices in an orchard to keep off canker-worms."

What I am saying is that our essential freedom can die if we continue long to tolerate powerful organized crime syndicates that subvert the morals and ethics of our nation, manipulate a growing part of our economy and corrupt the lower levels of justice and law. And we do tolerate this social cancer. In fact, if a crook is sophisticated enough and rich enough, he is beginning to be quite welcome in the best of neighborhoods, the best of clubs and, I suspect, the "best" of churches. This weed is thriving today in our garden.

And this weed has a bigger brother which is being liberally fertilized from pulpit and college lectures all over our land. I can hear the preachers and professors now as they self-righteously declaim that there are "good" laws and "bad" laws, and you should not obey what you believe to be a "bad" law. Then they proceed to outdo the communists with word warping semantics. They tell us that personal rights are far more important than property rights; that justice must come before law and order; and that the whole "hypocritical" structure of our institutions must be torn down in order to make room for a "good" society. Their arguments are supported neither by history nor logic. They do not tell us that when property rights are put down in a once free land, all personal rights disappear soon thereafter. They do not tell us it is impossible to have justice for anyone without law and order. And they do not tell us when the institutions of a free society are ripped down, the new institutions will certainly not be those of a free people. No. But their spurious gospel has been heard and believed. Violent black militants, shouting impossible demands, have attacked the structure of freedom throughout the land. Whole cities have been disrupted, with vast areas burned and looted. Educational processes have been blocked by rioting minorities of college students. The destruction of your precious freedom is under way and gaining momentum through widespread lawlessness.

In the meantime we, and our whole structure of law, stand strangely paralyzed and bemused by the cry of "personal rights." Is there a "personal right" to commit crime without punishment? The citizen who obeys the law also has rights. He has the right to be protected from the plunder and pillage of the lawless and the right to live without fear of his safety or fear of the safety of his family. These rights are being violated every hour of every day, and many of us are getting very tired of it.

We do not need many more laws. What we do need are more fearless judges and more attorneys and more juries who are concerned with upholding the *spirit* of the law and the *true intent* of the law. The indulgence of the criminal is a broadening "yellow streak" in the character of our nation that can be fatal to us all. Lawlessness will certainly choke our freedom.

Other noxious weeds in the garden of freedom may be easily distinguished as a lessening responsibility toward work and the irreplaceable resources of our nation. A nation's true welfare depends on its power to work and to expand its resources. There can be no development without effort, and effort means work.

Yet, in spite of trade association standards, in spite of union rules, in spite of a proliferation of governmental regulations—there is much evidence today that self-interest easily undermines the excellence of the labors of men. There are too many examples I know of—of embezzlement and fraud and chiseling and featherbedding and cutting corners and quackery and shoddy goods and malpractice and kick-backs that come to my attention, for me not to fear how grave this situation must be. Is integrity in work and product dying? Are we entering the age of the "goof-off," and "gimmick"?

God forbid! I cannot believe that we can be so stupid for long. It is a simple law of nature and of God that no people can continue to use up and destroy and steal the very essence of its livelihood without bringing about its own destruction. So, isn't it about time that concerned people, like you and me, revolted against this phoneyness. Is it not time we declared we do not accept unethical practices as standard business procedures? Are we not ready to demand a recovery of the pride of craftsmanship and the obligation of business to really serve mankind. Must we not teach capital and labor alike that it is the quality of work, the genuineness of product, the dependability of character that will bring reward? We had better.

I am not here pointing an accusing finger at all business and labor. On the contrary, the solid majority of those who manage and work in the industry and business of America are ethical, honest and hard-working. I am stating, however, that if enterprise and labor loses its freedom because of a virulant and crooked minority, a great deal of our freedom will go down, too. George B. Cortelyou has said: "The greatest asset of any nation is the spirit of its people, and the greatest danger that can menace any nation is the breakdown of that spirit—the will to win and the courage to work."

Behind these evils, and responsible for most of them is the weed that is deadliest of all: a growing devaluation of the worth of man. We are in a moral crisis, and one of the problems of a moral crisis is that a lot of people do not even know we have one, or that it may be important. Thus we drift toward the law of the jungle. Thus we approach a bestial attitude toward life.

We are being told that God is absent—or dead. We are being taught that spiritual ideals and moral judgments are relative and subjective. Man is being pictured as a kind of neutral and helpless thing. And this negative, amoral, nihilistic interpretation of man inverts all our moral standards. It easily suggests that good is bad and bad is good. Why be restrained and distracted by spiritual ideals and moral standards if they do not exist? Why fear or love a dead God? Under this way of thinking life is nothing but a process of biological functioning. It can offer no satisfaction, save the pleasure of the moment. Self-gratification is the key to being.

This moral crisis is not without causes. Business is making its contribution through massive advertising campaigns that are "not quite honest." The news media often reports vital news in such a manner that the reader or viewer cannot be satisfied that he knows the truth. Even the government's statements of fact sometimes turn out to be not quite factual. All this is nourishing in the mind of the citizen a growing distrust in the very institutions that make possible a free land and a free people.

Then, when you consider the blatant corruption, the perversion, the cheap sex, the filth that is the subject matter and motivation of current movies, plays, novels and art,

you tend to wonder why there is any morality left. To defend this dirt by saying it is sensitive, it is art, it is reality—is an insult and a lie! Writers do need to be realistic. They need to picture the sordid as well as the sublime. But when people try to show that the normal cultural diet of humanity today is filth, I say they are sick. When these human buzzards portray perversion and say it is normal, when they left up self-gratification and say it is good, when they offer spiritual putrefaction and say it is clean—they are *not* just reflecting the mood of the times. They are setting the intellectual and spiritual standards of today and tomorrow.

And if you are wondering why idealistic youth is in rebellion today, you need wonder no further. They see the lie, the hypocracy, the deliberate attempt at degradation of all that is good and uplifting and holy—and they want no part in it. I want no part in it, either. You had better not. This weed of immorality feeds on the very soul of the dignity and freedom of man.

So—I ask you—are you satisfied? Are you now prepared to give up your God-given sense of plain decency and honor? Are you ready to accept deceit and crookedness and pornography and degradation as the proper expectation for our day? Are you now willing for atheists and hoodlums and libertines to set the standards for our society? In spite of our well-founded concern for the threats of communism, we who love God and freedom need to awaken to the deadly threat right here in the bosom of our country that comes from the toleration of moral rottenness.

Of course, we who lead the spiritual life of America are the most responsible. All too often we have joined the current fad of scratching the itch and ignoring the disease of society. There's been far more preaching today on the evils of capitalism, on profits, on exploitation of labor, on social planning, than on the mind and heart of Jesus Christ. This gospel must be held high first, for it is the only workable motivation for morality, honesty, brotherhood, or anything else worth having. We will never attain a good and free society through the manipulation of selfish people. One man has said: "You can rearrange a bunch of rotten eggs any way you want to, but you are not going to make a good omelet."

Let us re-dedicate ourselves to the God who can empower us all to really be worth while. Let us all pray, witness for, and guard that which we know is Christian and right and decent and honest and good. This is the way of freedom for everybody. Any other way is chaos and ruin. God bless you.

---

## SERIOUS HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES CAN BE ECONOMICALLY ELIMINATED

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, serious hunger in the United States can be eliminated and the cost to do so could not be excessive. One year ago today I introduced a bill to attempt to accomplish this objective; and subsequently, the Appropriations Committee brought out in its Public Law 90–463 a provision to do just this. Under the provisions of that 1968 Appropriations Act, funds were made available to the Secretary of Agriculture to feed the seriously hungry. The bill I am introducing today makes these funds available on a permanent basis.

This principle has been approved by Congress when it passed the 1968 Agricultural Appropriations Act by a vote of 347 to 28. By making the appropriation for this program permanent, the Secretary and State and local welfare agencies involved can know that time and energy expended developing a program such as this would not be wasted as a result of cancellation of the program after 1 or 2 years. If Congress wants this program, which seems evident by the overwhelming vote this bill received, then we should make this an ongoing program and not one subject to short-term political fluctuations.

---

## A RESOLUTION FOR A STUDY OF THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY BANK PROPOSAL

### HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, how are we going to make sure that young Americans get all the education which the complexity and specialization of our modern society demands?

No one denies that the value and importance of higher education continues to become more and more of a necessity, yet each year there are still hundreds of thousands of our young people who have both the ability and the desire to continue their education, but cannot do so because they lack the finances. They lose out, but so, too, does society as a whole. The man who would have made a major breakthrough in medical research never does so, because he did not have the money to go to a good college or to medical school. How can society afford to let that happen?

Those of us who are privileged to serve in the Congress are especially aware that education is the very heart of a democracy and that the progress and well-being of our Nation is predicated upon the educational growth of our people. The education of our citizens is too important to allow financial obstacles to stand in the way. In February 1968, in a message to Congress, President Johnson, fully accepting this principle, proposed an Educational Opportunity Act:

> To set a new and sweeping national goal; that in America there must be no economic or racial barrier to higher education; that every qualified young person must have all the education he wants and can absorb.

The policy of the new administration also seemed hopeful, for during his campaign for election President Nixon declared:

> My Administration is committed to the proposition that no young American who is qualified to go to college will be prevented from doing so because he cannot afford it.

In the light of that statement it was particularly disappointing to see the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations for cutbacks in financial assistance to students pursuing higher education. The administration's budget for the national defense student loans recommends $155 million; this is a substantial reduction from last year's appropriation of $190 million, and far less than the $270 million total in requests from the colleges. The recommendation for the health professions student loan program stands at $15 million, down $10 million from the funds available last year, and way below $41 million requested by the schools involved. I hope that the Congress will restore these funds.

But even if these programs had full funding, we would only have begun to meet the problem. More must be done. In 1967, the President's panel on educational innovation proposed the establishment of an educational opportunity bank. It would enable every qualified American to attend the college of his choice regardless of his family's financial status. The bank would make loans to students accepted at postsecondary schools to cover their tuition and living costs against a pledge to repay out of future earnings. After graduation the borrowers would be charged 1 percent of their gross income over 30 years. Any student could borrow, and any student could borrow as much as he needed.

The limited loan programs existing at present can meet only part of the requests, and they do not allow undergraduates to borrow any more than $5,000 over the period of their collegiate years. This is not enough money for a poor student to attend a private school even if it is one with moderate tuition. The educational opportunity bank would not restrict the size of the loan; without interfering with present local, State or Federal student assistance programs, the bank would give any student the opportunity to pay his own way to any college, university or professional school to which he could gain admission.

Here are the advantages which a loan bank would offer:

First. It would increase the number of postsecondary students from low-income families, and would relieve the burden of hard-pressed middle-income families who may have several children attending high-cost universities.

Second. The economically disadvantaged and middle-income students would be able to approach their choice of a college with options similar to those now reserved for the well to do.

Third. It would make the student responsible for his own education, and would stimulate, I am sure, a more serious and mature approach to his studies. Under the present family-sponsored system, we tend to prolong adolescence.

Fourth. It would remove the heavy burden of working while in college to pay educational costs thus enabling the otherwise financially strapped student to devote full time to his studies.

Fifth. It would tend to make the higher education institutions more responsive to the needs of the students themselves who would, under this program, wield the buying power.

Sixth. The plan would enable both public and private institutions to improve the quality of education by charging tuition fees closer to the full cost of education.

Seventh. It is a voluntary plan that offers help only to those who want it.

Eighth. The student would not have to worry about a loan he could not pay for some unforeseen reason because his obligation to repay is related to his future income.

Ninth. The availability of loans would not be directly affected by the state of the money market.

Tenth. Educational costs would be met without the hazards of direct Government interference.

In March of last year I introduced a resolution calling for a thorough study of the proposal by the House Education and Labor Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee. No action was taken on the resolution. Since that time the results of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education have been published. This commission has also recommended the establishment of a national student loan bank. The commission advised making loans available to undergraduate and graduate students without reference to their need; it also suggested repayment of the loan according to a percent of earnings after graduation.

I believe that the Congress should take with utmost seriousness the recommendations of these two outstanding commissions, the President's Panel on Education Innovation, and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Accordingly, I am reintroducing a resolution directing the aforenamed committees to undertake a study of the educational opportunity bank proposal as soon as possible. I hope that they will provide us with whatever legislation is needed to implement this plan in the very near future.

Priorities should not be forgotten. The most important investment we can make in providing for the future of our Nation is to give advanced educational opportunities to as many of our people as possible.

## SOME CHANGE IN OUR JUDICIARY'S STATUS IS NECESSARY

### HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a bill which would require that Federal judges, District, Court of Appeals, and Supreme Court, submit themselves to approval of the people 5 years after appointment and every 5 years thereafter.

This proposal is patterned after the constitution of the State of Alaska, which makes the judiciary accountable to the people without political involvement. This is somewhat of a middle position between total nonresponsibility and partisan political standing for the bench.

Mr. Speaker, some change in our judiciary's status is necessary. The courts have become powerful arms of the Federal Government as quasi-legislative to quasiadministrative organs. It is time that the men who fill these offices answer to people.

## PEOPLE WANT TRUTH

### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 2-week business trip to my State of Nevada where I met with several constituents around the State and received from them a good sounding on their feelings toward several subjects regarding national and international affairs. The strong feelings voiced by the majority, I felt, required my statements on the pressing issues facing the United States in the world today. A scheduled speech I was to deliver in Las Vegas, Nev., allowed me this outlet of communication as a Representative of the people of Nevada. This speech was delivered May 14, 1969, at the Tropicana Hotel while I was a guest of the Las Vegas Kiwanis Club and I now offer my remarks for the RECORD:

PEOPLE WANT TRUTH

Mr. Chairman, Kiwanis Club members and friends, it is really a pleasure and a privilege to appear before you today and it is good to be back in Las Vegas, even for a very short visit. I am going to omit lengthy preliminaries because I do not want to waste any valuable time. It is usually my custom to speak "off the cuff," but because there are a number of very vital subjects which I wish to touch upon, I am going to refer to my notes in order that none of these issues will be omitted.

Actually, I have come to have a "heart to heart" talk with you today, because I believe that you want me to "lay it on the line." As the saying goes, I intend to "tell it like it is." I believe that all that the American people want is to be told the plain, simple truth. Unfortunately, we have become the victims of widespread distortion of facts, double talk and the confusion of issues.

However, I have come to the conclusion that the so-called great silent majority is now waking up, and these good, decent people of America are not going to remain silent much longer! They are discontented and even disgusted with the status quo. They know something is wrong, and they want to do something about it. They want to get back to plain, simple truths.

Because I know that Kiwanians are devoted to high principles, as well as to the welfare of our youth, I am going to confine my remarks mainly to the things which relate to our young people—who are most assuredly America's most important product. It is through such programs as the annual "Kid's Day," sponsored by Kiwanians and the U.S. Air Force, with the air power show at Nellis Air Force Base, that our country can instill more pride, patroitism and spirit in our youth.

First of all, I want to talk about the students of today—in our public schools, and more particularly in our colleges. How do we communicate with the dissident students in order to curtail the unrest and the violence that are striking at our educational institutions? How do we cope with this rabble-rousing minority which is interrupting and disrupting the freedom of academic achievement? In turn, how do these students, who are causing the disruptions, communicate with the college administrators?

I am going to be very frank—even very blunt—in what I am going to say to you today. I think that the conditions which are facing us are so serious that there is no longer any time for "pussy-footing" or keeping silent on the issues. Therefore, I am going right straight to the point in saying what I believe to be necessary for the security, for the advancement and for the continued preservation of our great institutions of learning. The subject calls for straightforward, plain talk, because it involves each and every one of us in this room—as well as others across the nation.

My answer is simple. There has to be a meeting of the minds between the dissident students, and the college educators and administrators. Furthermore, this should take place before the unwanted incidents occur, and not afterwards. We are all familiar with what happened at San Francisco State College, and what is continuing to happen on many other campuses.

When Mr. S. S. Hayakawa took over the reins as college president in San Francisco at the peak of student violence, he took the "get tough" approach by calling in the police—for the protection of those students and professors who chose to study and to teach. Mr. Hayakawa had no other choice than to counteract with force against the violence of the demanding students. (It is important to add that many of the trouble-making dissidents are not students, at all. Many of them are trained agitators who travel from college to college.)

I think that all of us must agree that when a minority group (or a small number of students) make their demands at gun point—or in some cases with fire bombs—in order to force a university to change its policies, it is time to "get tough." If the radicals take over, academic freedom will die, and America will wither away.

It is my true belief that the situation can be remedied without bloodshed, violence and guns. However, we will have to "get moving" right away! There are several major college campuses already doing that which I am endorsing today. That is, to have meetings in which the president, the deans and a representative number of faculty members participate, daily or several times a week, along with a representative number of students. The purpose of these meetings would be to discuss university problems, with a view to maintaining the peaceful process of getting an education.

These meetings would have to be in compliance with the current set of rules of the university, and not in any way designed to take away the powers of the university, or the college president. Chaotic and violent demonstrations will never accomplish anything for the students. Maybe the radicals will realize this when the university administration removes them from the enrollment lists and throws them off campus. This has already occurred in some colleges—but it hasn't happened often enough!

When you and I went to school—to college—there were probably things about both the policy and the curriculum which we did not like, but we did not engage in violent take-over demonstrations to show our disapproval. After all, no one is forced to attend any college. He can always leave! I believe that the general public is getting plenty "fed up" with the riotous, gun-toting rabble-rousers who do their dirty work, and then cry:—"Police brutality"—when it is necessary to establish law and order.

We have Federal aid to education because the States are overburdened with many other expenses. I wish that the Federal funds earmarked for higher education could be put in the hands of the States, instead of Washington, D.C. Many of my colleagues in Congress, as well as myself, (in view of the violence and the criminal activities which are taking place on many campuses) are not in favor of giving Federal aid to those universities which have been beset with serious demonstrations. It is my belief that all students found guilty of rioting and the destruction of buildings and classrooms should not only be scratched from the list of getting

Federal aid, but they should be dumped out of school on their so-called intellectual ears!

And while I am on the subject of these rabble-rousers, I would like to include the "SDS" characters (Students for a Democratic Society). While this group of trouble-makers have a nice-sounding, patriotic name, no one should be misled—because there is nothing patriotic or democratic about them! I have done a lot of research along these lines which reveals that they are nothing but a bunch of thoroughly brain-washed revolutionists—in most cases trained by outsiders who are not even enrolled as students. However, the Students for a Democratic Society are not the only agitators provoking unrest on our campuses, because there is another bunch of rioters known only as militants.

Now, while I have been condemning these people I have just mentioned, I assure you that they are not the only ones to blame for the disgraceful condition which pervades many of our colleges. I believe that there is also an urgent need to weed out those radical faculty members and administrators who "go along" with the rioters, and even instigate much of the trouble. On the other hand, I would condemn faculty members and administrators who will not listen to fair and just demands of the students.

Good, academic leadership is the basic key to solving the campus administration side of the problem. And putting an end to permissiveness will go a long way toward rectifying the condition. We just cannot permit this lawlessness. To permit a comparatively small handful of radicals to destroy our institutions of learning is preposterous and unbelievable! (I am happy to report that my bill to create a select committee to investigate crime and disorders in cities and on campuses was passed by the House of Representatives last month.)

Our students today are probably probing deeper into the meaning of events, and they are obviously coming to our campuses with greater knowledge than years ago. They are asking questions, and they are entitled to receive right answers. This is healthy, but it is not healthy for students or the university to be allowed to be attacked violently by a minority group bent upon disrupting the system of learning. We should not confuse anarchy with academic freedom!

This is something that every couple with children approaching college age should be concerned with right now.

As I said before, I believe that the people of this country, as a whole, are waking up to the fact that our country is in great danger. I find that the people of Nevada are particularly alert to the danger. In my travels around the State—in numerous conversations with people—and in my large volume of correspondence—there is a great dissatisfaction being expressed. People are tired of being told that black is white, and that wrong is right. They are able to recognize a falsehood when they hear it, and they are intelligent enough to want to do something about it! They are asking, "since when has America adopted the policy of the 'Big Lie'?" They are exclaiming, "we want to get back to the truth!"

I think that one glaring example of misrepresentation and misleading information lies in the area of the Vietnam situation—which subject is uppermost in the minds of most of us. I happen to have a son over there, myself, so the subject is very close to my heart.

I am going to quote from two recent news items—one which relates to a top Republican leader, and the other which is accredited to a Democratic source. Thus, the subject is removed from the realm of political or one-sided propaganda. I believe that the American people were thoroughly deceived by the last administration concerning the situation in Vietnam, and I can see no difference, thus far, under the new administration.

The first article appeared in the Nevada State Journal of May 2, 1969, and it refers to a statement made by Senator George D. Aiken, the senior Senate Republican from Vermont. These are the words of Senator Aiken, who is Ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:—

"Common sense should tell us that we have now accomplished our purpose as far as South Vietnam is concerned. It is my belief that the United States would do well to advise the South Vietnamese Government immediately of our intentions, and then start an orderly withdrawal of our military personnel, turning that country and that war back to its rightful owners. It may take some time to complete this operation," he added, "but it should be started without delay."

Now, I will quote from the second news item, which appeared in the May 2, 1969 issue of the Reno Evening Gazette. The Democratic source is none other than former Secretary of Defense, Clark M. Clifford, who was a strong supporter of U.S. Vietnam policy when he became the Johnson administration's Defense chief in 1968. One of President Johnson's closest associates, Clifford entered the Defense Department publicly committed to the idea that the American intervention was necessary, not only to save South Vietnam, but to prevent the takeover of other non-Communist nations in Southeast Asia. It is quite shocking, therefore, to read that he now states that he left office convinced that the Nation's military effort in the war was "hopeless." At a meeting of some of the Senate Foreign Relations committee members, on April 22, 1969, former Defense Secretary Clifford declared his disillusionment and his change of heart concerning the war in Vietnam. He told the Senators that he left office "in disagreement with many of former President Johnson's Vietnam policies, and convinced that the Domino Theory (which contends that the fall of Vietnam would lead to the takeover of other nations) was fallacious.

In view of the reversal of opinion on the part of former Defense Secretary Clifford in regard to his previous conviction that American intervention was necessary, and his present agreement with other top ranking foreign policy leaders who consider the Vietnam war as "hopeless," it appears that there is something terribly wrong about continuing a "hopeless" situation—at the cost of our servicemen's lives. (With 300 to 400 of our boys killed every week, this is an exceedingly high cost!) I say, therefore, if this is a hopeless war which we cannot possibly win, I want my boy to come home! And I am sure that you want your boys to come home, too!

I believe that the people of America—the parents and families of our fighting men—are entitled to know the truth. I also believe that the majority of the American people are exceedingly tired of going along with a no-win war. Personally, I hate war. However, I firmly believe that if we are fighting for a just and honorable cause, we should give it all we have, and get it over with! In this respect, I am a hawk! If our Nation is as powerful as we are led to believe, then our fighting men should be given the opportunity to win! It is nothing less than criminal to make them fight a "hopeless" war—with their hands tied!

The people of this country are entitled to know the truth about Vietnam. We have been kept in the dark long enough. I say that we should either win, or get out of Vietnam!

While we are considering foreign policy, I want to speak briefly on the subject of foreign aid. If there ever was a false presentation of facts, this program is it! If our foreign aid program were really doing and accomplishing that for which it was intended—feeding the hungry and helping the poverty-stricken all over the world—I would be in favor of it. In fact, I did favor the Marshall plan at the outset. However, our present foreign aid program has grown into the most corrupt extravaganza you can imagine. It is a program which benefits crooked politicians and world bankers—and which brings aid to enemy, Communist countries. I believe in calling a spade a spade—and calling a lie a lie. Let us not call something "foreign aid" when it really amounts to treasonous aid to the enemy.

The same thing applies to trade with Communist countries—which countries in turn, use our supplies and our equipment to kill our American fighting men! I say, "stop all trade with Communist countries!"

It is sickening to me to be told to "go easy" on the subject of communism. Why is this treated in such a "hush-hush" manner by our Government? Why must we be careful not to offend the Communists? It may not be a "declared war" that our boys are fighting over in Vietnam, but they know that it is a real war, all right. They also know who is supplying the Viet Cong with ammunition and armaments.

Now, let us take a look at the United Nations organization. I don't think we have to look very deeply to see who is running that show! The Communists have dominated that organization ever since its inception—when Alger Hiss, the convicted Communist, helped to frame it. (But we pay 70% of the bills of the United Nations.)

And let's take a quick look at the peace talks now going on in Paris. If ever there could be a greater travesty, so far as accomplishment is concerned, I would like to know what it is. Days upon days of haggling over the shape of the conference table (whether round or square)—while more and more boys continue to die—make us wonder just what purpose the organization is serving. There is talk, and more talk, but nothing happens.

Coming to the national scene, isn't it about time to recognize just what is behind the attempted breakdown of juvenile morality, the pornography on our newsstands and in the mail, the so-called "sex education" in the schools, and the filthy movies that infest our theaters? Should we not recognize what is behind the widespread violence in the land, and dare to call it by its correct name—communism.

If we are looking for straight answers, we might also take up the matter of crime on the streets—and the "soft on crime" attitude of the Supreme Court. The good, decent, law-abiding citizens of this country are getting mighty disgusted with having every leniency and every protection extended to criminals, caught red-handed in the act of their guilt—and binding the hands of the Nation's police. The general American public is not stupid, and people know that the cry of "police brutality" has been a Communist slogan as long ago as the Communist-directed revolutions which took place in 1848. (Also, the slogan, "We Shall Overcome.") Generally speaking, the American people are anxious for a return to law and order. (I might add that many of us strongly oppose the Supreme Court's decisions to allow Communists in defense plants—and schools.)

We might here touch upon the Supreme Court's decision which ruled out prayer in public schools. According to a Harris poll, more than 94 per cent of the American people stand in favor of prayer in public schools. How can it be that the overwhelming majority is ignored, and a small minority—a mere handful—is allowed to represent the thinking of the great American public? Unfortunately, many people do not realize that it does not require an amendment to the Constitution to bar the Supreme Court from hearing any school-prayer cases. It is within the will of the people—and within the power of Congress—to change the Supreme Court ruling.

I believe that prayer should be restored to the American way of life. I believe, also, that the people should know the truth regarding the power of Congress to change the Supreme Court's ruling. Furthermore, I believe that every public office holder should be questioned as to how he stands on this important issue. Our country was founded on prayer, and I think that it is a horrible thing when the principal of a school has to avoid the mention of the word prayer. (This happened at a California school at a memorial service for the late President Eisenhower. The school principal announced:—"We will now have a moment of silent meditation.")

In my talk today I have given a few glaring examples of double standards, double talk and the double trouble that is abroad in our country. I know that the people of this country are seeking answers—and that they want to get back to good, old American truth! I believe that this applies, also, to the majority of our youth. They want to be told the facts, and they (of all people) are entitled to know the truth.

I intend to keep on telling the American people the truth!

---

## CAMPUS RIOTS AND PORNOGRAPHY

### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues will have seen a Washington newspaper article, "An Angry Scholar Speaks Out on Campus Rioting," by Dr. Dwight L. Dumond on May 4. It appeared earlier in the Detroit News. It is lengthy and I shall not ask that all of it be included in the RECORD, but I commend it to your diligent attention.

Dr. Dumond, distinguished professor emeritus of history at the University of Michigan, includes this observation in his analysis:

The militants are not progressives, not liberals. They are reactionaries of the most extreme sort. They seek to destroy, not to build, and they are achieving little except chaos and retardation. When the revolution has consumed its leaders, as always happens, and the wreckage is cleared away, we will be about where we were before the trouble started.

How soon the return to academic freedom and effective teaching will come about is a matter of conjecture, but it cannot come until order has been restored and the banners of principle and morality are again unfurled at the many disrupted and disgraced colleges and universities across our land.

Dr. Dumond continues:

They cannot speak without obscenities. They cut great holes in desks, write erotic notes on desks at which decent people have to sit after them, and burn holes in carpets and cork floors. They have revolted against everything that is decent and respectable.

Mr. Speaker, while demanding order on the campus, government and the general public should at the same time insist upon a return to decency in campus publications.

Pornography and obscenity, which came into prominence with violence and vandalism in the university sphere, should be cotargets of the crusade to clean up the campus. Student rebellion and student immorality have been combined in the Communist-initiated and carefully devised plan to destroy both our institutions and our precepts.

Neither can any longer be tolerated.

Whether transplanted from Moscow or Peking, these evils should not have been allowed to take root in this country. In an article that appeared in the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat of May 6, which I should like to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, Columnist Vera Glaser explains why there was reluctance to deal firmly with the revolt.

The same docile and cringing permissiveness that allowed campus rioters to get out of hand is responsible for failure to stop distribution of raw and revolting printed material. Had existing laws been utilized to prevent disorder in its early stages, as many of us advocated when the rebellion erupted in 1965, campus disruption would never have approached current levels.

Since the new administration is simultaneously striking out at violence and at salacious material mailed to juveniles, the attack should include campus smut. If justification is needed linking obscenity with insurrection, the student body of every college and university includes many boys and girls under 18 years of age.

President Nixon said on May 2:

American homes are being bombarded with the largest volume of sex-oriented mail in history. Most of it is unsolicited, unwanted and deeply offensive to those who receive it.

The same appraisal is applicable on the college campus. Parents preparing to send children to college next fall must be assured that the campus will be a place of study instead of a battleground for insurrectionists. By the same token, there must be assurance that students will no longer be exposed to scurrilous and degenerate material now appearing in many official student publications.

Mr. Speaker, here I should like to include a recent article, "The Abyss of Chaos," from the Wall Street Journal, as well as the Glaser column. They follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 25, 1969]

THE ABYSS OF CHAOS

The issue is academic freedom, not to mention a few other fundamental American rights such as freedom of speech and assembly. The question is whether the nation's colleges and universities are going to let neo-fascistic minorities, Negro and white, dangerously devalue the quality of higher education or indeed destroy the institutions themselves.

The question has poignancy as well as bitterness: Think of the parents now going through the spring agony of acceptance at a good school for their son or daughter; they are prepared to sacrifice to pay $8,000, $10,000, $15,000 for the four years but now must wonder whether the youngster will get an education worth having or one at all. Think also of the parents who look back on their own college years as a time of hard study but of tranquility as well; the spectacle today is utterly disgusting.

It is a spectacle, needless to say, that has no place on the American scene. The essence of the American political experiment and experience is that one's own rights, one's own freedoms, depend on respect for the rights of others. And that is so because the history of the ages hammers the message that without tolerance liberty is lost.

Yet here we have these totalitarian students, unfortunately with not a few sympathizers and fellow-activists on the faculty, forcibly preventing the majority from getting an education, doing assault to persons and property, in the case of Cornell strutting around armed to the teeth.

Why?

Most Americans have granted from the start that students do have certain legitimate grievances, that a lot is wrong with the structure and conduct of the contemporary university. Very well; grievances can be discussed, defects put right. But these student (and non-student) fascists are not interested in remedies. They are interested in destruction. Given the power they seek, they would not know what to do with it except to destroy the academic tradition, emphatically including academic freedom.

Somewhat paradoxically, it seems to us, the violence they are perpetrating stems from the sentimentality that has imbued much of the nation's political and sociological thinking for a generation or more. In this view, the child is to be "developed" but rarely disciplined (progressive education), the adult's individual responsibility is held to be minimal (society is to blame for aberrant or criminal behavior), and the people generally are to be shepherded and subsidized (the welfare state).

This is not just an instinctual development; it has been preached from many platforms, not least the very colleges and universities now in turmoil. It is not altogether surprising, therefore, that a number of young people flout authority and heap scorn on the pervasive sentimentality that lets them get away nearly with murder. They, you can be sure, are a much tougher breed.

In the special case of attitudes toward Negroes, some administrators and faculty members have expressed the sentimentality in an excess of guilt, trying to do literally anything to make up for past wrongs. Yet, as S. I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State has observed, it is one thing to accept responsibility for the consequences of slavery; it is quite another to go overboard on guilt for what our ancestors did. Guilt, unlike responsibility, can easily become a neurotic emotion.

The whole aura of sentimentality, emotionalism and romanticism helps explain the pusillanimous reaction to the violence on the part of many educators. Confronted with "non-negotiable" demands, they eagerly set up "black studies" courses, even acknowledging that the result is bound to be a double standard for Negroes and whites—what a service to the Negroes to give them an inferior education. Equally eagerly, they cave in to the demands of white militants.

It helps explain; it does not excuse. Those capitulating administrators and professors have demonstrated their abysmal inadequacy. Consider Cornell, where a majority of the faculty have reversed themselves and nullified disciplinary action against five law-breaking Negro students. What kind of way is that to run a university? In the pitiful words of one professor, "We felt we had to draw back from the abyss of chaos."

The abyss is at hand, all right, but capitulation is not how to escape it. The obvious, right, procedure is to keep the classes going, with the aid of police if necessary, and to suspend, expel or otherwise discipline the campus fascists who are making life hell, and education all but impossible, for the many more numerous serious students.

Unless the nation and its educators can overcome their emotionalism and return to common sense, not only the present but the future is full of peril. Education is not everything in life, but in our society it is a great deal.

If America lets the quality of its academic institutions be degraded or destroyed, it will become a second-rate nation, a nation of near-incompetents in the arts and sciences and all else that makes for civilized existence.

---

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, May 6, 1969]

SDS WILL FADE OUT, MITCHELL PREDICTS

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General John Mitchell expects the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which is inciting violence on the nation's campuses, to phase out and disappear before long.

"You saw what happened to the DuBois Clubs, didn't you? It will be the same with SDS," Mr. Mitchell told NANA.

The W. E. B. DuBois clubs, a Communist-dominated campus organization, had 36 chapters in early 1966, organized in many cases by sons and daughters of old-line party members.

Not too much has been heard of them since SDS took over the headlines, fomenting hostility at Columbia, Chicago, San Francisco State, Harvard and other universities.

SDS is active on 200 U.S. campuses, Mr. Mitchell said, giving them more than five times as many chapters as the DuBois Clubs.

PEKING ORIENTED

Moreover, according to the respected Spivack Report, SDS is dominated by Peking-oriented Communists.

The problem, as Mr. Mitchell sees it, is "separating the idealistic, impressionable young people in SDS from the hard-core revolutionaries manipulating them."

Money to support SDS and such other guerrilla groups as the Black Panthers and RAMs is coming from "outside the country," Mr. Mitchell said, but would not be more specific about the source.

"We have infiltrated them completely," he said. "The black groups are fragmented. They're kooky. They are not out to change our society, they want to destroy it. But they can't agree among themselves which way to go."

HOOVER PREDICTION

The campus disruptions were foreseen by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who warned a year ago that New Left leaders were planning a "widespread attack on educational institutions," relying on dissidents and militants to bolster their effort.

His prediction that "revolutionary terrorism" would invade college campuses has proved to be accurate.

Some of the explanation may lie in the Spivack analysis, which states that:

"The takeover of SDS by the Maoists has been a steady process. But in the wake of McCarthyism, nearly 15 years later, it still is considered unfashionable to label Communists as 'the enemy' or even to acknowledge that there are hard-core Communists (mostly of the Peking variety) deeply involved in everything from the March on the Pentagon to the takeover at Cambridge.

SADLY MISLED

Spivack quoted Harvard's Dean Ford as saying that the students who seized University Hall were "many of the usual earnest, confused, concerned students, but there were many others, and any one who thinks we were dealing only with a group of young people trying somehow to express their moral revulsion of bloodshed overseas is sadly misled."

Others at Harvard were said to have noted, almost casually, the role of the Maoist Progressive Labor Party in what happened there.

University officials who stood by and let it happen, probably to avoid accusations of neo-McCarthyism, have become casualties of their liberal credo.

In the circumstances, the attorney general's prediction that the SDS will dry up and blow away seems a bit optimistic.

---

## RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent a questionnaire to the people of the Sixth District of Maryland in order to have the advantage of their thinking on some of the important issues facing us today.

I think it is particularly significant that 40,000 men and women in the Sixth Congressional District took the time to complete this questionnaire and return it to us. This I think is indicative of the interest that our citizens have, not only in our Government, but in the questions before us for consideration in these trying times.

The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

[Answers in percent]

1. Should the Federal Government guarantee an annual income to citizens living in poverty?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 14.1 |
| No | 77.8 |
| Undecided | 8.1 |

2. Should the electoral college be abolished and the election of the President and Vice-President be based on popular vote?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 79.7 |
| No | 13.4 |
| Undecided | 6.9 |

3. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal for the A.B.M. project?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 46.1 |
| No | 28.9 |
| Undecided | 25 |

4. Do you favor the Federal Government spending money for the Super Sonic Transport plane?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 24.6 |
| No | 60.4 |
| Undecided | 15.0 |

5. Do you favor Federal registration of firearms?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 36.7 |
| No | 59.3 |
| Undecided | 4.0 |

6. Do you favor the Federal Control of the Potomac River?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 41.6 |
| No | 38.4 |
| Undecided | 20.0 |

7. Do you agree with the present course of action being followed in the Viet Nam War?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 17.5 |
| No | 69.3 |
| Undecided | 13.2 |

8. Do you favor the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertisements on television and radio?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 57.6 |
| No | 35.0 |
| Undecided | 7.4 |

9. Do you agree with the proposal to convert the Post Office into a government owned corporation to operate on a self supporting basis?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 60.3 |
| No | 24.0 |
| Undecided | 15.7 |

10. What action would most likely lessen the tax load on the lower and middle income taxpayer?

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Raise standard deductions | 25.2 |
| b. Raise standard exemptions | 48.2 |
| c. Set minimum limit under which no tax would be paid | 26.6 |

11. Do you favor:

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Reorganization of the present draft | 68.8 |
| b. Abolishing the draft and moving to an all volunteer army | 31.2 |

12. Do you favor:

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Continuing space budget at the present level | 46.5 |
| b. Decreasing space budget | 43.3 |
| c. Increasing the space budget | 10.2 |

---

## TURBULENCE ON THE CAMPUS

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from the distinguished Franklin W. Wallin, president pro tempore, of Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y., to the President of the United States on May 15, 1969:

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
*Hamilton, N.Y., May 15, 1969.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Student Senate and the Faculty of Colgate University have voted overwhelmingly to instruct me to send you this communication. We note with deep concern the press reports of recent statements by members of your Administration attributing the cause of recent campus disorder to a "small minority of students," or to a lack of "backbone" in administrators. Such statements, we fear, denote a grievous misunderstanding of these difficulties, and divert attention from their broader import.

The turbulence which afflicts the universities reflects only in part internal grievances within these institutions. The universities must immediately attend to those problems of internal policy and structure which aggrieve members of their communities. But in larger measure the turbulence reflects a more profound disaffection which may be traced to the state of the nation. The protests are directed at shortcomings not only of higher education but of the social order which it serves. At the roots of campus disquiet are the disillusionment of students and faculty whose ideals and hopes are affronted by the lamentable quality of our national life. Engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and the cultivation of humane sensibilities, they are acutely aware of the glaring gap between the promise and performance of American democracy. The protracted war in Vietnam, the persistence of poverty and hunger in affluent America, and the pernicious racial divisions within the society engender doubt and cynicism with respect to all of the society's institutions. The resulting despair and sense of impotence are manifest in the anger and belligerence of campus protest.

Unless national priorities are recorded and pressing problems are solved, campus unrest is likely to persist. Meanwhile, censure and reprisals by the government are likely to compound these difficulties. Official preoccupation with the symptoms rather than the causes of university turmoil threaten to deepen disaffection and disunity.

We at Colgate University have acknowledged the need for institutional reforms at all levels, and have initiated some measures to institute these changes. Additional measures are contemplated. It is urgent, also, that the nation's political leaders acknowledge the maladies of our national life, and act promptly to remedy them. Statesmanship in this task will alleviate the basic causes of campus disorder; it will also enlist the idealism and dedication of a college generation fervently committed to the nation's highest moral purpose.

Respectfully yours,

FRANKLIN W. WALLIN,
*President pro tempore.*

## GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

### HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest in and discussion of a guaranteed annual income for Americans, I thought it appropriate that my colleagues be able to read Editor Paul Durham's editorial of April 17, from the Diboll, Tex., Free Press. I feel the thoughts expressed by him are worthy of consideration.

The editorial follows:

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

The American people will never accept the idea of a guaranteed annual income, chiefly to replace our tottering welfare setup. Proponents of the measure—actually right now it's just an idea, not a measure—claim in effect that there is enough money for everybody to have a guaranteed annual income.

The welfare system we have now is antiquated, they say, in that it perpetuates the "fatherless" family. That is, families with large numbers of children can't get welfare payments if there is a husband-father on the premises. So, to skirt the issue, we have what are called "fatherless" families. The list grows by leaps and bounds each year.

Intellectuals claim that the system should be changed, and possibly replaced by the guaranteed annual income. Giving low-income citizens a taste of good money on a guaranteed basis will make them want more of it and result in their getting a job. This, in essence, is what we understand the proponents of the guaranteed annual income are saying.

We agree that the welfare system needs considerable overhaul. It simply is not working. Welfare rolls are getting longer, and at a frightening pace. We agree, too, that it doesn't make much sense to make liars of low-income people, which is what we do when we force them to disclaim the existence of any man around the house.

But we fail to see how the guaranteed annual income will correct the situation. It will only make matters worse.

How, for instance, will you explain to the average working man that it is justifiable to pay anyone $3,000 or $5,000 a year for not working? How can you justify one man getting out of bed and going to work six days a week, while some other guy who is able to work doesn't work a day the whole year, yet is "guaranteed" a specific annual salary?

The average American will not accept that, not in theory and certainly not in practice. Even if the plan were workable, it would do incalculable harm to the great American dream and to the morale of our people.

You will find few Americans who object to feeding hungry children or hungry adults. At the same time, you will find few who are sympathetic with another American who is able to work and will not.

Politicians who think the guaranteed annual income will work had better get out of their overstuffed chairs and find out the peoples feelings on the matter. It simply will not work.

We are not suggesting that the welfare dilemma has any easy answer. It is a terrifying problem, to say the least. Our only suggestion might be to tighten the pocketbook in an attempt to break the welfare "chair"; to upgrade education in areas most beset with the problem; to pay few checks to the people who are able to work.

These things are being done, of course. We suggest we do more of this, and talk less about guaranteeing anybody anything—other than his freedom and the right to make his own way in the world.

—P. D.

## VANDALISM

### HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Southside Sun, my hometown newspaper recently carried an editorial concerning vandalism at a local elementary school which, in my judgment, expresses the concern and dismay of all responsible citizens about acts of violence and irresponsibility being done either in the name of some cause or for sheer abuse.

During the course of this vandalism, black paint was smeared on the flag of the United States. The newspaper rightly states that the physical damage at the school can be repaired and adds:

But what can be done to right the mind of the child in the classroom where the flag of the United States was stained by the hand of the vandal?

The editorial is so well written and so well expresses the thoughts of many Americans that under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southside Sun, May 15, 1969]

VANDALISM

Vandals went through the Parklane School Thursday breaking windows, turning over desks, throwing paint on the walls and destroying anything their hands fell on.

As a final insult they threw black tempera paint on the flag of the United States. This single act of defiance, of destruction, of pointless vandalism is symbolic of the damage to the school and in a larger sense of the trend of events in our country.

The destruction at the Parklane school looks as though it is the work of children. There was apparently no attempt to steal anything from the building, television sets and musical instruments which could have been sold were not taken.

The school was in such disorder that no classes could be held on Friday and the students were sent home for the day. The vandals had stopped up the sinks and left the water running all night. The fire department was called and spent all morning pumping water out of the building.

Walking through these rooms left in shambles you could only wonder who could do this type of thing and the answer keeps coming back—children.

But why would they do it? Was it purely for fun? It seems incredible that they would resort to tearing up a school room for entertainment. East Point has an excellent Recreation Department. There are community playgrounds available. East Point is not a concrete jungle. The playground at Parklane School has been made available for children and has been used by them after school. There are literally dozens of Little League teams, with adults offering an outlet for youthful energy.

Parklane is a modern school with modern equipment and cheerful, sunny rooms. Why should a group of children tear up a schoolroom for fun when there is ample organized recreation or just playgrounds for small groups to organize their own playtime. . . . It seems that there is only one answer to this question.

As surely as the fabric of the American flag was stained by the paint thrown by the vandals at Parklane School, there is a tear in the fabric of American morality. Children hear of campus take over and of destruction by college students. But worse they hear that the Deans give in to the student demands. Campus rioters tear up administration buildings and then are turned loose without even a slap on the wrists. Faculty members and administrators are kidnapped and subjected to abuse and ridicule by students and no action is taken by the police.

The minds of children are impressionable and they are quick to learn. It seems that the vandals of Parklane School have learned their lesson too. Tear up a schoolroom just for fun. It is the thing to do now. Don't worry about the police they will not do anything.

But the police do not deserve the blame. Their hands are tied by laws designed to protect the criminal, not to protect the citizen or his property. Fingerprints were taken at the Parklane School, but no child may be fingerprinted. There are suspects in this case of vandalism, but they can not be questioned except in the presence of their parents or lawyers. Should they ever be brought to the bar of justice there are hundreds of technicalities that will, and have, allowed the guilty to walk away from his crime completely free.

There is a tear in the fabric of American justice as surely as there are stains on the flag in the classroom at Parklane School. Prayer is banned from the classroom where the vandals ran riot by a court that has ruled that pornography is legal.

But the physical damage at Parklane School can be repaired. The overturned desks can be righted. The paint can be washed from the walls. Textbooks damaged by water can be replaced.

But what can be done to right the mind of the child in the classroom where the flag of the United States was stained by the hand of a vandal. This is not the first time this school year that vandals have done their work in the school and have made their impression on the minds of the students.

Will they understand why they were sent home for a day? Will they understand why the poor sap, the taxpayer, will continue to pay his school taxes to repair the damage of the vandals? Or will these children join in the trend toward anarchy, to violence and disrespect for the flag of the United States?

## STATISTICS ARE VALUABLE IN CRIME CONTROL AND UNDERLINE THE NEED FOR DRUG LEGISLATION


### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am most interested in examining the value of creating a National Crime Statistics Center to help us achieve a clearer understanding of crime and those who are responsible for its soaring increases. One aspect of crime which has had a tremendous increase within a few short years is the unlawful use of drugs. Accordingly, I have sponsored H.R. 9313 to supply drug education materials for young people in our schools, and H.R. 11166 to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana and Other Hallucinogenic Drugs.

The need for these pieces of drug legislation has recently been statistically underscored by the California Department of Justice's Bureau of Criminal Statistics in their advance report on 1968 drug arrests in California. I submit this report because I think it demonstrates the usefulness of statistical compilation in helping us to comprehend the degree of severity in crime increases in various areas of the country and because it also underlines dramatically the need for realistic legislative responses to the increasingly serious drug situation in the United States today.

The report follows:

[From the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics]

1968 DRUG ARRESTS IN CALIFORNIA ADVANCE REPORT

The Bureau of Criminal Statistics has made several important changes in the gathering and presentation of drug arrest data shown here.

Total drug arrests are shown by county as reported to the Bureau by the policing agencies in California. To develop detail beyond these gross counts, the Bureau analyzed the arrest reports, rap sheets, court disposition documents and other source materials for 30 of each 100 individuals arrested on drug charges. Details of the sample are shown in the first two tables and, for ease of comparison, data for earlier years were re-cast on a sample basis also.

Data here are based on preliminary figures. Some minor changes may be made in refining the information. These changes will be shown in the annual report, *Drug Arrests and Dispositions in California.*

ADULT OFFENSES

Based on police counts, adult drug law violations rose from 39,246 in 1967 to 64,639 in 1968; a 65 percent growth quite close to the 66 percent increase recorded for 1967. Thus, drug arrests continue to grow at about the same rate as before. The most noteworthy feature of the sample data in Table 1 is the drop shown in the proportion of marijuana offenses from 56.5 percent in 1967 to 49.5 percent in 1968. Conversely, dangerous drug law violations for adults rose from 20 to 32 percent.

Table 3 shows that Riverside and San Bernardino counties have joined the ranks of those reporting more than 1,000 arrests.

JUVENILE OFFENSES

Juvenile arrests totaled 29,947 in 1968 in contrast to 13,911 recorded in 1967. This 115.3 percent growth of juvenile arrests for drug offenses is also based on totals submitted to the Bureau by the police. The sample on juvenile arrests reflected much of the same tendencies as the adult arrests. As marijuana lost ground, dangerous drug arrests increased and now represent a larger proportion of the total juvenile arrests than before.

Seven counties not listed in 1967 reported juvenile arrests in 1968—Amador, Mariposa, Modoc, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity and Tuolumne.

Among the major counties, only San Francisco shows virtually no increase—520 as against 503 in 1967. Most of the other counties had increases—some well over the 100 percent mark: San Diego, 160.7 percent; Fresno County, 235.6 and Kern, the largest growth of all, 382.6 percent.

The smaller counties recorded more extraordinary fluctuations because of their smaller 1967 totals. Glenn County, for instance, rose from 1 to 8 arrests or a 700 percent increase; Shasta rose from 8 to 37 or a 362 percent growth.

TABLE 1.—ADULT DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DURING 1968 COMPARED TO 1960 AND 1967

[30 percent sample data]

| Area and offense | 1960 | | 1967 | | 1968 | | Percent change 1968 over 1967 | Percent change 1968 over 1960 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | | |
| Statewide | 5,300 | 100.0 | 13,986 | 100.0 | 20,824 | 100.0 | 48.9 | 292.9 |
| Marijuana | 1,282 | 24.2 | 7,900 | 56.5 | 10,297 | 49.5 | 30.3 | 703.2 |
| Opiates | 2,755 | 52.0 | 2,489 | 17.8 | 2,549 | 12.2 | 2.4 | —7.5 |
| Dangerous drugs | 1,054 | 19.9 | 2,820 | 20.2 | 6,645 | 31.9 | 135.6 | 530.5 |
| Other offenses | 209 | 3.9 | 777 | 5.5 | 1,333 | 6.4 | 71.6 | 537.8 |

TABLE 2.—JUVENILE DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DURING 1968 COMPARED TO 1960 AND 1967

[30 percent sample data']

| Area and offense | 1960 | | 1967 | | 1968 | | Percent change 1968 over 1967 | Percent change 1968 over 1960 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | | |
| Statewide | 484 | 100.0 | 4,411 | 100.0 | 9,787 | 100.0 | 121.9 | 1,922.1 |
| Marijuana | 259 | 53.5 | 3,294 | 74.7 | 5,698 | 58.2 | 73.0 | 2,100.0 |
| Opiates | 43 | 8.9 | 86 | 1.9 | 162 | 1.7 | 88.4 | ---------- |
| Dangerous drugs | 168 | 34.7 | 849 | 19.3 | 3,323 | 33.9 | 291.4 | 978.0 |
| Other offenses | 14 | 2.9 | 182 | 4.1 | 604 | 6.2 | 231.9 | ---------- |

Note: Percentages not computed on bases less than 50.

TABLE 3.—ARRESTS OF ADULTS FOR DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, JANUARY–DECEMBER 1968, AREA AND COUNTY BY OFFENSE

| Area and county | Total | Marihuana | Opiates | Dangerous drugs | Other offenses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 64,639 | 33,573 | 10,411 | 13,459 | 7,916 |
| Southern California: | | | | | |
| Los Angeles | 32,910 | 13,779 | 6,577 | 6,843 | 3,711 |
| Imperial | 246 | 127 | 34 | 69 | 16 |
| Orange | 4,777 | 2,791 | 350 | 1,108 | 528 |
| Riverside | 1,327 | 774 | 64 | 294 | 195 |
| San Bernardino | 1,385 | 640 | 207 | 417 | 121 |
| San Diego | 6,114 | 3,198 | 106 | 2,175 | 635 |
| Santa Barbara | 487 | 292 | 62 | 65 | 68 |
| Ventura | 1,265 | 657 | 191 | 203 | 214 |
| San Francisco Bay: | | | | | |
| San Francisco | 3,857 | 1,945 | 1,294 | 384 | 234 |
| Alameda | 3,761 | 1,714 | 910 | 685 | 452 |
| Contra Costa | 918 | 588 | 89 | 135 | 106 |
| Marin | 478 | 312 | 25 | 91 | 50 |
| Napa | 109 | 89 | 2 | 5 | 13 |
| San Mateo | 690 | 332 | 145 | 128 | 85 |
| Santa Clara | 1,335 | 940 | 118 | 138 | 139 |
| Solano | 208 | 169 | 3 | 9 | 27 |
| Sonoma | 283 | 231 | ---------- | 35 | 17 |
| Balance of State: | | | | | |
| San Joaquin Valley: | | | | | |
| Fresno | 484 | 266 | 45 | 93 | 80 |
| Kern | 383 | 233 | 12 | 79 | 59 |
| Kings | 12 | 6 | ---------- | 4 | 2 |
| Madera | 30 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Merced | 57 | 49 | ---------- | 5 | 3 |
| San Joaquin | 251 | 160 | 17 | 37 | 37 |
| Stanislaus | 258 | 147 | 15 | 67 | 29 |
| Tulare | 141 | 76 | 15 | 20 | 3 |

TABLE 3.—ARRESTS OF ADULTS FOR DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, JANUARY–DECEMBER 1968, AREA AND COUNTY BY OFFENSE—Continued

| Area and county | Total | Marihuana | Opiates | Dangerous drugs | Other offenses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Balance of State—Continued | | | | | |
| Sacramento Valley: | | | | | |
| Butte | 109 | 99 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| Colusa | 2 | 2 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Glenn | 8 | 7 | ---------- | 1 | ---------- |
| Placer | 135 | 129 | ---------- | 5 | 1 |
| Sacramento | 657 | 384 | 76 | 96 | 101 |
| Shasta | 52 | 38 | 1 | 10 | 3 |
| Sutter | 25 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Tehama | 7 | 6 | ---------- | 1 | ---------- |
| Yolo | 105 | 94 | ---------- | 5 | 6 |
| Yuba | 26 | 22 | ---------- | 2 | 2 |
| Other counties: | | | | | |
| Amador | 6 | 5 | ---------- | ---------- | 1 |
| Calaveras | 23 | 23 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Del Norte | 3 | 3 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| El Dorado | 199 | 130 | 8 | 27 | 34 |
| Humboldt | 115 | 89 | ---------- | 11 | 15 |
| Inyo | 21 | 15 | ---------- | 1 | 5 |
| Lake | 17 | 11 | ---------- | 4 | 2 |
| Lassen | 6 | 5 | ---------- | ---------- | 1 |
| Mariposa | 34 | 28 | ---------- | 6 | ---------- |
| Mendocino | 77 | 59 | ---------- | 13 | 5 |
| Mono | 21 | 21 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Monterey | 464 | 343 | 17 | 42 | 62 |
| Nevada | 699 | 38 | 1 | 22 | 8 |
| Plumas | 15 | 12 | ---------- | 3 | ---------- |
| San Benito | 6 | 5 | ---------- | 1 | ---------- |
| San Luis Obispo | 338 | 254 | 14 | 51 | 19 |
| Santa Cruz | 291 | 170 | 9 | 50 | 62 |
| Sierra | 1 | 1 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Siskiyou | 19 | 12 | ---------- | 7 | ---------- |
| Tuolumne | 22 | 15 | ---------- | 2 | 5 |

TABLE 4.—ARRESTS OF JUVENILES (UNDER 18 YEARS) FOR DRUG LAW VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY CALIFORNIA LAW-ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1968

[Area and county by offense]

| Area and county | Total | Marihuana | Opiates | Dangerous drugs | Other offenses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 29,947 | 16,754 | 838 | 8,240 | 4,115 |
| Southern California: | | | | | |
| Los Angeles | 14,133 | 7,208 | 394 | 4,588 | 1,943 |
| Imperial | 66 | 34 | | 13 | 19 |
| Orange | 2,790 | 1,571 | 39 | 758 | 422 |
| Riverside | 680 | 400 | 7 | 161 | 112 |
| San Bernardino | 823 | 404 | 22 | 261 | 136 |
| San Diego | 2,573 | 1,284 | 81 | 1,068 | 140 |
| Santa Barbara | 340 | 237 | 23 | 34 | 46 |
| Ventura | 843 | 413 | 37 | 182 | 211 |
| San Francisco Bay: | | | | | |
| San Francisco | 520 | 398 | 63 | 35 | 24 |
| Alameda | 1,600 | 1,075 | 97 | 259 | 169 |
| Contra Costa | 658 | 483 | 5 | 109 | 61 |
| Marin | 412 | 323 | 3 | 40 | 46 |
| Napa | 57 | 44 | | 12 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 582 | 400 | 5 | 95 | 82 |
| Santa Clara | 927 | 732 | 12 | 112 | 71 |
| Solano | 132 | 70 | 1 | 13 | 48 |
| Sonoma | 136 | 85 | | 18 | 33 |
| Balance of State: | | | | | |
| San Joaquin Valley: | | | | | |
| Fresno | 443 | 173 | 2 | 107 | 161 |
| Kern | 415 | 230 | 2 | 100 | 83 |
| Kings | 19 | 16 | | 3 | |
| Madera | 6 | 4 | 2 | | |
| Merced | 51 | 36 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| San Joaquin | 165 | 114 | 4 | 25 | 22 |
| Stanislaus | 139 | 64 | | 32 | 43 |
| Tulare | 93 | 44 | 1 | 10 | 38 |
| Sacramento Valley: | | | | | |
| Butte | 56 | 44 | | 7 | 5 |
| Colusa | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Glenn | 8 | 7 | | 1 | |
| Placer | 29 | 27 | | 1 | 1 |
| Sacramento | 314 | 199 | 15 | 63 | 37 |
| Shasta | 37 | 27 | | 2 | 8 |
| Sutter | 18 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| Tehama | 8 | 3 | | | 5 |
| Yolo | 66 | 59 | | 2 | 5 |
| Yuba | 22 | 22 | | | |
| Other counties: | | | | | |
| Amador | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Calaveras | 4 | 2 | | | 2 |
| Del Norte | 1 | | | | 1 |
| El Dorado | 62 | 40 | | 6 | 16 |
| Humboldt | 75 | 44 | | 20 | 11 |
| Inyo | 7 | 6 | | | 1 |
| Lake | 9 | 7 | | 2 | |
| Mariposa | 5 | 3 | | 2 | |
| Mendocino | 37 | 33 | 2 | | 2 |
| Modoc | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Mono | 8 | 4 | | | 4 |
| Monterey | 206 | 150 | 6 | 29 | 21 |
| Nevada | 51 | 9 | | 24 | 18 |
| Plumas | 21 | 17 | | 4 | |
| San Luis Obispo | 88 | 60 | 1 | 12 | 15 |
| Santa Cruz | 189 | 134 | 6 | 20 | 29 |
| Siskiyou | 6 | 1 | | | 5 |
| Trinity | 4 | 4 | | | |
| Tuolumne | 8 | 3 | | 1 | 4 |

Source: Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Sacramento, Calif.

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF STEUBEN SOCIETY

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, May 19, 1969*

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Steuben Society of America on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The Governor of New York has proclaimed this week "Steuben Society of America Golden Jubilee Memorial Week" and I am pleased to join in this tribute.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the outstanding job done by the general chairman for this golden jubilee—the Honorable Albert H. Bosch, a former Member of Congress and my predecessor as Representative for the Seventh District in New York.

I also wish to congratulate Mr. Ward Lange on his reelection to a seventh term as national chairman of the Steuben Society.

The strength of the society lies in its commitment to protect politicial liberty by preserving equal opportunity for all Americans.

The major legislative goal of the society for this year is an amendment to the U.S. immigration law to secure fair treatment for all northern Europeans who have found it more difficult to come to the United States since passage of the 1965 act.

In this connection the Steuben Society has joined forces with the American Irish National Immigration Committee to support this legislation.

As a cosponsor of this bill to amend the immigration law, I look forward to working for the same legislative goal and I wish the society continued strength to represent Americans of German descent during this golden jubilee week.

## YOU CANNOT PACKAGE CONSUMERS

### HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have always maintained that consumers choose one product over another for a wide variety of reasons, and not on the basis of price alone. Our husbands would think us mad, indeed, if we asked them how much per pound they paid for the new car.

In effect, though, there are some well-meaning individuals who think that the judgments we housewives make in the supermarket are based on the wrong things, and they have set out to "correct" all of this. They seem to think that our value judgments are somehow inferior to their own, and that we housewives can, by the stroke of legislation, all be neatly packaged and labeled. Well, I for one, do not believe it. Neither, I am happy to note, does Don Robinson, editor of NAM Reports, published by the National Association of Manufacturers.

In the May 19 issue of NAM Reports, Mr. Robinson has done a particularly good job of illustrating the difficulty in making flat statements about comparison shopping and the choices made by consumers. I recommend the article as good eye-opening reading to my colleagues, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

SENATOR'S 60 LADIES AND THE SURPRISING EXPLANATION OF WHY THEY FLUNKED TEST ON SHOPPING CHEAPEST

Sen. Gaylord Nelson is on the warpath again, introducing a new packaging and labeling law to do what he says the present one has failed to do. That is, it hasn't made price comparisons between sizes and competing brands any cinch.

The Senator's bill, familiarly known as "S. 1424," aims at making such comparisons as easy as filling out a Federal income tax form. The Senator asserts that a high order of mathematical ability is required now to make price comparisons, notes that housewives can't tote computers around in their shopping carts, and therefore in practice would require Joe the corner grocer to buy or rent a computer of his own.

For the retailer would be required when he marks his price on merchandise to mark also the price per ounce or other basic unit.

Why not, the Senator asks, when they do it on meat and fish?

There are special scales that so label meat, fish, cheese and such items for supermarkets, but such marking is confined to items with short shelf life. Any good store disposes of unsold fresh goods like this very quickly. But the retailer has a problem with, say, corn flakes. Suppose a certain size box is put on the shelf at 27 cents. The grocer finds his competitor is selling them for 26, so he lowers his own price. Come Thursday, his co-op grocers' association has them advertised three days special at 24. Monday they go back to 26 again. Tuesday, our friend discovers that due to the routine Russian crop failure there is a routine corn shortage, and the wholesale price rises, requiring him to mark up to 27.

Such a series of changes (not uncommon at the retail level) is troublesome enough now, and such changes can happen daily at many places in every aisle. Imagine what chaos if Joe the grocer had to mark his boxes with the cents and hundredths of a

cent per ounce that such changes would bring about!

The good Senator was anguished to learn that five California ladies were unable to chose the cheapest-per-unit offerings among lists of 70 items any better after the Packaging and Labeling law had been put into effect than before. In fact they did a little worse.

One reason, Senator, is that women shoppers haven't had much practice in choosing the cheapest items in their regular shopping, because the cheapest is seldom what they are seeking. Your obedient servant discovered this by going through four incoming bags of groceries and asking why the items were chosen.

The hand dishwashing detergent was chosen because it smells wonderful and is easy on the hands. It also seems to do more work per squirt than a cheaper brand.

The dishwasher detergent was chosen because it was cheapest and there are no troubles with the dishwasher no matter what is put into it. Any trouble finding out which was cheapest? No. There were these big boxes on special to introduce a new brand.

The sirloin steak was selected because yr. obd. svt. said he was hungry for steak. It was chicken which was on sale.

The paper towels were chosen because they match the kitchen. The bathroom paper was chosen because it has flowers on it and what the heck it's Spring.

The scouring cleansers were chosen: 1. Because the itty bitty plastic cans with removable labels fit on the medicine cabinet shelves. 2. The big ugly cans are cheap and guests don't look under the kitchen sink.

Five pounds of granulated sugar was bought because we needed sugar.

A similar purchase was 10 pounds of flour.

But also in a bag was two pounds of a special flour that won't congeal, clot, lump or whatever. It was purchased without regard to the price of any other flour because "I've always wanted to try some."

There were eight number 10 cans of string beans. They were bought because they were eight for a dollar, and we can always use string means. Nobody in our house knows how many ounces or how much per ounce this is, but we all know that number 10 cans of string beans usually are much more.

There was a pound of margarine of a brand acceptable to this family (not the cheapest) because Mr. Nelson's cohorts have supported butter to a price level milady finds excessive.

There were five pounds of California table grapes, because the store was being picketed by SDS types trying to get everyone to boycott table grapes. (The kids enjoyed them.)

The cereal was selected by a headstrong four-year-old because there was a Wacky Racer in the box.

Some pompano was purchased because everyone will eat it, and you can't get fresh pompano around here too often.

The store's own brand of facial tissues were bought because they were cheapest, and the boys use them for everything.

A premium brand of facial tissues (pink) was purchased for use in the baby's room, because she's the first girl and we haven't gotten over that joy yet.

Six cakes of soap were selected because they 1. smell good. 2. irritate no family member's skin. 3. match the color of the bathrooms. 4. seem to last better when the kids forget to fish them out of their bath water, as they've been told to do a thousand times if they've been told once.

A washday detergent was chosen because there were two cold water brands on the shelf and the other one gave some of us the itch.

A gallon of fabric softener seemed a good idea, with a baby in the house, and all.

So it went. The lady was completely satisfied that she had bought well for this family in these circumstances. Given a list of 70 items to be bought for price alone, the lady's whole thinking processes for shopping would have to be altered.

No matter what Joe's computer works out about prices per ounce on detergent, our house will still contain the one that doesn't itch any of us. No matter what price the soap may be per ounce, it had better smell good and not dissolve too quickly in the bath water.

Does the Senator want to quarrel with the lady?—Don Robinson.

---

## LET US END RESTRICTION ON OIL IMPORTS FROM CANADA

---

## HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the national system of oil import quotas has been in operation since 1955 and its establishment was justified as essential to national security.

Is the quota system still necessary? Is it still essential to national security? This is a matter which is now under expedited study by a cabinet-level force.

I am well aware of the pressures pro and con for the oil quota program and I am convinced that modification is in order, preferably on a gradually reduced control basis.

Of most concern to my home area of Buffalo and western New York, however, is the restriction which has been imposed upon the importation of oil from Canada. This limitation is by executive action outside the import program. Canada is exempt from the national quota system.

The limitation on imports from Canada has worked a particular hardship upon the petrochemical industry in my area. Indeed, we stand to lose two important industries unless the arbitrary limitation is eased.

Regardless of whether changes are made in the basic oil import program, it is essential that the administration take into careful account the effect upon other American industries of its executive action on Canadian oil imports.

The oil flow allowed from Canada not only is inadequate, but also has been fluctuating in a manner that creates serious instability in the petrochemical industry.

As I have said, Canadian oil was exempted specifically from the Federal oil import control program and yet the administration has seen fit to impose arbitrary restrictions which have had devastating effect upon our area.

I have again brought this matter to the attention of the administration, and I hope sincerely that the task force will give it due consideration, although there is real reason to wonder whether we can wait much longer for a change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks editorials from two local newspapers:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, May 12, 1969]

EASE OIL QUOTAS

Forty-six members of Congress have proposed that the national system of oil-import quotas be gradually eliminated, and there is increasing evidence that this subsidy for the domestic oil producers should be substantially modified at least.

To most Americans, this system of protective quotas, which shelters domestic oil producers from broad foreign competition, is about as clear as nuclear physics or abstract art. But the sole justification under a 1955 law is national security.

Under that law a President is authorized to restrict the amount of imported oil when its volume would impair national security. Since 1962, this has meant that the amount of imported oil couldn't exceed 12.2 per cent of domestic production.

Recent testimony by economists and others before a Senate subcommittee suggests, however, that the national-security rationale is now very fragile indeed, and that the quotas may have spawned more problems than they solved—except for the oil producers. It has been argued that these quotas, by restricting competition from abroad, have lessened competition here at home, thus keeping the prices American consumers pay for oil and gasoline and other products artificially high; that it encourages production in the U.S. of less efficient wells; and that it damages the competitiveness of domestic oil and chemical industries in world markets.

As to the central contention that these protective quotas serve the national security, there have been several persuasive rebuttals.

The 1968 discovery of oil reserves in Alaska lessens the need-to-conserve argument, to some degree. And Wayne A. Leeman, economics professor at the University of Missouri, made the rather obvious point to the Senate subcommmittee that quotas restricting foreign imports might even hasten now, in peacetime, the depletion of U.S. reserves which could prove more needed later in times of conflict.

If the aim is to conserve oil for times of crisis moreover, then that aims seems to be contradicted by such tax incentives as the overly generous oil-depletion allowance, which spur the exploitation of domestic reserves.

President Nixon in late March named a Cabinet-level task force to review oil-import policy. Probably Congress should hold off on any revision of these policies until the administration has had a chance to shape its own recommendations.

On the basis of what Congress has already heard, however, it should be skeptical of any proposals that don't seek to considerably ease a quota system which dulls competitiveness, contributes little to national security, prolongs a protective and elaborate subsidy structure in a nation committed to free trade—and forces American consumers to pay unnaturally high prices for oil products.

---

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, Apr. 9, 1969]

USE OF CANADIAN OIL HERE IS IMPERATIVE

On the premise that federal policy ought to be geared primarily to benefit the economy of any area of the United States at a geographical disadvantage in obtaining resources to promote its industry, the Niagara Frontier is justified in pressing for an easing of restrictions the U.S. imposes on Canadian crude oil imports.

The Interior Dept. hardly will make much sense if it does not allow additional import allotments to a region whose oil refining and petrochemical industries are in need of supplies that cannot be provided economically from U.S. sources.

A sound case on economic grounds for the allowance of greater use of across-the-border pipeline facilities has been made by the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation. That case merits the sympathetic attention of the federal government despite any other considerations that led to the import controls imposed in 1960.

The production, distribution and refining of oil is a gigantic, highly competitive and complex business in which the geography of oil production is a factor. The finished products are in such universal demand and constitute so great a prerequisite for economic health in every community that usual limits fixed by government on supplies of raw material are peculiarly onerous in the case of crude oil.

The Niagara Frontier should be allowed to capitalize on its proximity to Canadian facilities. If the opportunity continues to be denied it, some tall explaining backed by more than a mere policy statement is due it.

## AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is one item in the USDA budget I want to call tc the attention of the Congress. This is the agricultural conservation program which is authorized in the basic legislation of 1936 at $500 million annually. While the program has gone through several name changes, it is now known as the ACP and is administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. After several reductions in the size of the program, the appropriation stabilized at about $250 million in the mid-1950's. The program has operated at this level since that time until the last 2 years when the recision cuts reduced the figure to $195.5 million exclusive of the administrative funds. It seems to me that if $500 million were needed for this program in 1936, when each dollar bought much more in goods and services than the dollar does today, we certainly need as much today.

However, on several occasions in the past decade and a half, the President's budget to Congress has contained about a 50-percent cut in funds for the agricultural conservation program, a cut from $220 million to around $100 million, plus the administrative funds. This year President Johnson's budget proposed to cut the program from $195.5 million for the 1969 program to $100 million for the 1970 program, and President Nixon, in his recent budget message to Congress proposed that the program be eliminated entirely.

This is a program under which the Government shares with the farmer the cost of carrying out needed conservation practices usually on about a 50–50 percent basis. Many conservation practices are of no immediate value to the farmer. They protect soil and water for the future good of all the people and farmers just cannot afford to perform them completely on their own. For these reasons Congress has consistently restored the authorization for this much-needed program to $220 million and as soon as the budget permits, it is imperative that we do so again.

In 1968, for example, over 4 million acres were seeded to permanent cover crops such as grasses, over 1 million acres were seeded to additional crops for rotation cover, over 3 million acres were seeded to cover for soil or watershed protection, 1.1 million acres of improved cover on rangeland were established and 4 million acres were seeded to winter cover crops. All of these help prevent wind and water erosion of valuable cropland. Almost 2.5 million acres are served by wells drilled for livestock water to aid in distribution of livestock to prevent overgrazing, 3.2 million acres are served by reservoirs built in 1968 for agricultural use. About 2.6 million acres are served by reorganized irrigation systems which conserve water and prevent washing and seepage. Stubble mulch to prevent erosion of summer fallow land was carried out on 2.7 million acres and other wind erosion measures were carried out on an additional 800,000 acres. These are but a few of the conservation practices carried out with the aid of this program in the 1 year, 1968.

Many counties have special practices to meet particular and often peculiar local problems. Many of these are designed especially to assist low income farmers carry out conservation practices and in such cases the cost share provided by the Government can be as much as 80 percent of the cost of performing the practice. Other practices, in addition to conserving soil and water, are especially beneficial to wildlife or enhance natural beauty.

ACP is used in every agricultural county in the United States. In 1968 about a million farms participated in the program. During the 5-year period 1964–68 more than 2,291,000 different farms carried out practices under the program. Requests for assistance in carrying out these conservation practices greatly exceed available funds even with a $220 million program. There is a national limit on payments to a person of $2,500 per farm—except under pooling agreements the limit is $10,000. Many States and counties establish lower limits so they may assist more farmers. The average payment under the regular ACP in 1968 was $210.

The ACP is administered by elected farmer community and county committeemen and by appointed farmer State committeemen. The authority for these committeemen is contained in the basic legislation establishing the agricultural conservation program. These committeemen also administer other assigned programs such as the emergency ACP to assist in drought, flood, et cetera, the voluntary wheat and feed grain diversion programs, the cotton programs, programs for peanuts, tobacco, rice, naval stores, sugar cane and sugar beets, wool, price support loans, and so forth. The chairmen of State and county committees are chairmen of State and county USDA Disaster Committees. The county office managers and the State executive directors are chairmen of the respective defense boards. All of these activities would be jeopardized if the program—ACP—which provides basic legislation for the committee system itself, were abolished.

In the interests of agriculture and of the entire population, present and future, we cannot permit the program to be dropped. We should, instead, be restoring the program to the authorized level in order to preserve the soil for future generations in a condition needed to supply the rapidly expanding population with adequate supplies of mineral-rich food.

## SOVIETS GREATLY INCREASING MILITARY STRENGTH

### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is presently carrying on a crash program to greatly increase its military strength.

Mr. Richard Wilson discusses this Soviet military buildup in a May 2 article in the Washington Evening Star entitled "Soviets Greatly Increasing Military Strength." Mr. Wilson quotes Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover as having stated:

> By the end of this year [1969], we face the prospect of losing the superiority in nuclear submarines we have held for many years. The Soviet Union is surging forward with a naval and maritime program that is a technological marvel.

These words are particularly significant coming from the man generally credited with having created our nuclear Navy.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Wilson's article, which I am inserting in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks.

SOVIETS GREATLY INCREASING MILITARY STRENGTH

(By Richard Wilson)

Nothing enrages the antimilitary groups in Congress more than to be accused of advocating unilateral disarmament. This, of course, is what they do propose in effect but unilateral disarmament sounds empty-headed, and it is.

The Soviet Union is greatly increasing its military strength. We would call it a crash program in this country. The expansion's most ominous phase is in the means of delivering nuclear weapons. At the same time, the anti-military groups in Congress are advocating reductions in critical military programs including the deployment of anti-ballistic missiles. If this does not amount to unilateral disarmament then the words have no meaning.

In response to an inquiry from Sen. John O. Pastore, D-R.I., Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, whose stubborn advocacy is credited with having created our nuclear Navy, has given a chilling prospectus of growing Soviet strength in the seven seas. Rickover quotes Admiral Gorshov, commander-in-chief of the Soviet navy, as having recently said: "The flag of the Soviet navy now flies proudly over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later, the U.S. will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

The Soviet Union has decided to gain its own kind of naval superiority over the United States and is in the process of doing it through a major expansion of its submarine forces into the world's largest underseas navy. At the present rate the Soviet force of nuclear submarines of the Polaris type will overtake and exceed the United States force by the end of 1970.

"By the end of this year," Rickover wrote, "we face the prospect of losing the superiority in nuclear submarines we have held for many years. The threat posed by their sub-

marine force—with their new ballistic and cruise missile launchers and new attack types, is formidable. If more sophisticated types are added in the near future, as is likely considering their large number of designers and extensive facilities, the threat will rapidly increase."

Rickover says the Soviet Union is "surging forward with a naval and maritime program that is a technological marvel." "They now have," he continued, "a new submarine force of about 375; we have 143, which includes 61 diesel submarines, most of which are of World War II vintage. Thus the Soviets have a net advantage of about 230 submarines."

To achieve this, Rickover said, the Russians greatly expanded and modernized submarine building facilities, with one of their numerous yards with several times the area and facilities of all U.S. yards. They use modern assemblyline techniques under covered ways, permitting large-scale production regardless of weather conditions.

From Rickover's report and other sources it can be fairly concluded that at about the time Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was deposed central decisions were made in the Soviet ruling apparatus on a large military expansion. Resources were diverted from the farm sector of the Soviet economy to defense. Outlays for defense rose sharply in 1966–67 after remaining static since 1962.

At about this same time decisions must also have been reached on the deployment of the SS9 super rocket which could theoretically give the Soviet Union a first-strike nuclear capability. President Nixon has stated that after the decision in 1967 to deploy the American Sentinel antiballistic missile system it was discovered that the SS9 deployment in Russia was 60 percent greater than had been thought. It was also discovered that estimates of Soviet strength are much more precise today than formerly owing to aerial reconnaissance from orbiting satellites with their fantastic cameras which have photographed a man walking down a Moscow street. When Rickover describes the huge Soviet submarine yards he can do so confidently because they have been photographed.

What President Nixon has been saying, and Defense Secretary Laird has been emphasizing, and Admiral Rickover has been documenting is either a morbid fairy tale or there have been significant military developments in the Soviet Union of an extremely ominous nature.

These developments do not give much encouragement to future attempts at unilateral disarmament, or they will not when the Nixon administration decides to tell all that it knows about the Russian expansion.

Rickover's final comment is worth noting. "I suggest," he wrote, "that by keeping secret our knowledge of Soviet strength at this time we may lose more than by confiding the truth of the danger we face to the American people."

## SAFEGUARD IS NEEDED

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, radio station WHBL in Sheboygan, Wis., recently broadcast an editorial in support of President Nixon's decision to deploy the Safeguard antimissile system. I recommend it to my colleagues.

SAFEGUARD IS NEEDED

A Congressional showdown on the proposed Nixon Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System is shaping up.

More and more, the pros and cons of this defense system plan are being clarified.

Critics of the plan, including Wisconsin Senators Proxmire and Nelson, contend that the ABM would provide very little protection for the U.S., trigger a new round of arms escalation, hinder negotiations for disarmament, and cost too much money that should be used to meet domestic needs.

Proponents of ABM say that it would provide a phased beginning of a full ABM defense, protecting our strategic nuclear weapons. Initially, the objective is to protect defense systems at two Minuteman missile bases where about one-third of our deterrent force is located.

Such a system would provide protection from possible attack by the Red Chinese in the mid-1970's, prevent a possible unintentional launch of missiles by the Soviets, and preserve our deterrent force thereby preventing a nuclear attack from succeeding.

Proponents also assert that the Soviets have already built their own ABM system which is much more extensive than ours and that we have assurance that any negotiations with the Russians will not be impaired.

As for the cost of the program, the Administration says the top figure would be six billion dollars, not the considerably higher figure which the critics use.

We believe that the proponents have proved their case for ABM beyond a shadow of a doubt. We believe in the interests of national security that it is far wiser to rely on the advice and judgment of our defense experts, both civilian and military, than on the politicians.

But the politicians will decide the fate of ABM and the future security of the United States. You can make your voice heard by writing to your U.S. Senators and Congressman and urging them to approve expenditures of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

We cannot hide our heads in the sand. The ominous threat to our security is all too clear. The ABM system must be approved.

## MARITIME DAY

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today is Maritime Day—although I doubt that we have very much to celebrate, in view of our waning position on the oceans of the world. I do not know what day the Soviet Union sets aside to honor its maritime achievements—but certainly they have a lot more to boast about than we do.

Less than a quarter century ago, Mr. Speaker, this country was the world's maritime leader in shipping and shipbuilding. Today we are fifth in shipping, and ninth or 10th in shipbuilding. The Russians, on the other hand, have come up from being a maritime nonentity to a position where they threaten to surpass us in the size of their fleet. What is more, 80 percent of the Soviet fleet is less than 10 years old—while 80 percent of the American-flag fleet is more than 20 years old. So in addition to size, the Russians can boast a newer, faster, more efficient fleet.

It may be that the Soviets will never dominate world shipping. It may be that we need never fear that American imports and exports will some day be moving in ships flying the "hammer and sickle." But the fact that the Soviets are moving ahead at flank speed in the development of their merchant fleet capabilities is an ominous sign. It shows the reliance—economically, militarily, and politically—that the Soviet Union places on its maritime capabilities. Contrast this to our failure as a nation to exploit our technological skills and our failure to exploit the edge we held over everyone else at the end of World War II. One would be justified in assuming that the United States sees no economic, military, or political advantage to having a strong merchant fleet—even though history repeatedly has demonstrated that a nation can neither be strong nor free unless it is a maritime nation.

Someday, Mr. Speaker, we may substitute action for words, and get on with the job of rebuilding our merchant marine. I trust that that time will not be too far off—or otherwise it might be too late to try to rescue our sinking merchant fleet.

## THE NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE ACT OF 1969

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, there are few realities in life more repugnant to consider than the abuse of a child by his own parents. Yet the social monster of child abuse can be found today among people of every educational, religious, socioeconomic, and geographical background in America. All 50 States have now enacted laws providing for mandatory reporting of suspected cases of child abuse; but the problem remains formidable. Not only must we provide better protection and rehabilitation for the children who have been mistreated, we must also see to it that their parents receive the professional help they need to accept and perform their normal parental roles.

Despite the steps already taken to prevent abuse of children, there is still a long way to go. The legislation I am introducing today known as the National Child Abuse Act of 1969, would help us cover the distance still remaining. It would provide the framework necessary for State and Federal Governments to coordinate a national attack on this terrible problem. The strength of this legislation comes from several powerful sources.

First of all, it provides that as soon as a case of child abuse is reported to the appropriate police authority, the protective services of the State are automatically brought to bear on the welfare of the child. It also would mean that any doctor, social worker, schoolteacher, or welfare worker who knowingly or willfully neglects to report suspected cases of child abuse, would be guilty of a misdemeanor.

The bill also provides immunity from civil or criminal liability for any person, who, in good faith, makes a report pur-

suant to this act. These provisions are particularly important because some State laws still single out the medical profession as the only reporting group. My bill not only requires reporting from all groups which have occasion to observe cases of child abuse, but from any individual who makes a report in good faith. The broader provisions of my bill would therefore increase reporting effectiveness many times over.

Some State laws on child abuse have unwittingly created a strong deterrent to medical reporting by allowing a reporting doctor to become enmeshed in extensive litigation. Any reporting doctor, once burned, is likely to be twice shy. By providing legal immunity for any person reporting in good faith, my bill would effectively remove such a deterrent.

Other provisions of this legislation strike out in new directions. In cases where parents who receive welfare payments are found guilty of child abuse, the bill provides for an immediate cutoff of Federal welfare funds. Funds would also be stopped immediately if it is determined that those parents receiving welfare payments are also drug addicts. Welfare funds involved would then be transferred to the person or agency responsible for the care of the child or children involved. Further, in homes where either parent is a known or reported drug addict, there would be mandatory removal of an abused or neglected child.

The bill also requires that the abused child or children be provided specific legal representation, and it allows a child's legal representative to appeal without delay if he is dissatisfied with the judge's decision. In addition to medical examinations, color photos showing injuries received by the child or children would be allowed as evidence. For parents accused of mistreating children, mandatory psychiatric examinations would be required.

The final, and in some respects most important provision would establish a child-identification system by requiring the Federal Government to issue social security numbers to all newborn babies. It would also be mandatory for hospitals and/or doctors to file the social security number of all children who are being treated because of abuse or neglect. Upon enactment, the provisions of this act would be effective immediately.

The hideous spectre of child abuse has assumed many guises throughout history. For centuries the physical maltreatment of children has been justified on grounds which have ranged from expelling evil spirits and pleasing certain gods, to transmitting educational ideas and maintaining discipline. Modern man, however, is repelled by the savagry of these ancient beliefs, and is reluctant to admit that such cruelty could be practiced today. The tragic evidence, however, is to the contrary. Despite existing legislation, more than 9,000 cases of child abuse were reported in 1968. According to a recent report of the New York Medical Society, the neglect and abuse of children is actually increasing. Only 2 weeks ago, Dr. Vincent Fontana, medical director of the New York Foundling Hospital, stated that: "One or two children are killed—actually killed—by their own parents every day in this country." Dr. Fontana has called the shocking increase of child abuse an "epidemic which deserves immediate attention."

Though child abuse is an old human phenomenon, what is new today is the increase and violence in the attacks on infants and young children by their parents or other guardians. Beginning in about 1960, evidence documenting this has been steadily accumulating. In 1961 the American Academy of Pediatrics sponsored a symposium on "The Battered Child" which served to focus the spotlight of national attention. A few months later, the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare drew up a statement of principles and guidelines for State legislation on reporting cases of child abuse. The gruesome toll continued to rise, and in 1964 the American Medical Association stated that parental abuse of children was probably "a more frequent cause of death than such well-recognized diseases as leukemia, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy."

Today we realize that the term "child abuse" describes many kinds of maltreatment. But whether we say "battered child," or "neglected child," or "abused child," or simply use the word "cruelty," they all add up to the horrible truth that thousands of children in this country are being killed and maimed with calculated finesse. The American Hospital Association has described some of the major causes of infant deaths:

On record are thousands of cases of "falls." Strangulation followed by passing a pillow against the child's face until death happens frequently. Little ones have been placed on windowsills with the hope that the plunge will be fatal. Bathtubs have long been favorite vehicles for infanticide. Placing babies in ice cold water with a stay in the refrigerator is an effective killer as is boiling water. Sexual assaults are not uncommon. Starvation is resorted to frequently. Children are chained to beds to keep them out of sight.

The unwillingness of normal human beings to face the brutal facts of child abuse is understandable, but it must not be permitted to blunt the force of our concern. The incidence of child abuse is neither isolated nor accidental, but occurs with a terrible regularity.

Congress has both the power and the means to combat this problem. The legislation I am introducing today would permit the final battle to begin. As the noted psychiatrist Robert Coles has observed:

It is nothing short of a scandal that we allow crushed and terrified parents a continuation of their misery in their own children. Surely here there can be no real disagreement about the need for immediate action. Lives are in the balance.

## HONORING ED EDMONDSON

### HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Muskogee area region of the National Congress of American Indians on May 9, 1969, adopted a resolution honoring our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON). The sentiments expressed by this group, representing many thousands of American Indians, are shared by his colleagues in the Oklahoma congressional delegation and by all who know of ED EDMONDSON'S many contributions in behalf of American Indians. Under the unanimous-consent agreement I include the resolution honoring Mr. EDMONDSON:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congressman Ed Edmondson of Muskogee, Oklahoma, was elected as Congresman for the Second District of Oklahoma in 1952 for the 83rd Congress, and

Whereas, Congressman Edmondson has continuously rendered outstanding service to the Indian people, and

Whereas, Congressman Edmondson has worked tirelessly and unselfishly to improve the social and economic status of the Indian people.

Now therefore be it resolved that Muskogee Area Region of the National Congress of American Indians goes on record commending Congressman Ed Edmondson for his unexcelled service to the Indian people, not only of his own District of Oklahoma, but for all Indians throughout the entire United States.

Adopted this 9th day of May 1969 at Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

HAMPTON W. ANDERSON,
*Regional Vice-President.*

Attest.

ELIZABETH SMITH,
*Recording Secretary.*

## THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM TO FIGHT HUNGER

### HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 20, 1969*

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with many of my colleagues in commending President Nixon for his strong and effective program to fight hunger. As the President said, "That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable."

Despite our vast material abundance and agricultural wealth, many Americans suffer from malnutrition. It is absolutely unacceptable for us to tolerate this situation any longer. It is unacceptable that young children, through no fault of their own, should be stunted in their physical and mental capabilities because proper food is not available.

The President's recommendations are the culmination of several years of study and debate here in the Congress. Last year many of us called on President Johnson to make major improvements in the food stamp and food distribution programs and introduced legislation to create a Special Commission on Hunger. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I was especially concerned about the importance of food programs for the future of our Nation's young. But no support was forthcoming from either President Johnson or Secretary Orville Freeman.

It is gratifying that we now have a President who is concerned and who is

willing to do more than just talk about solving the problems of our poor.

The major thrust of the President's program will be toward improvement in the food stamp program. Under the program poor families will be provided with enough food stamps to purchase a nutritionally complete diet. The Department of Agriculture estimates this to be $100 per month for a family of four. The cost will be no greater than 30 percent of the income of the recipients and, for the very poorest they will be provided on a free basis. The food stamp program will be expanded into the 440 counties in the country which do not presently have programs.

Concurrently, there will be a special effort to provide nutritionally rich foods for mothers during pregnancy and for infants. Malnutrition during this period can cause irreparable harm to children. Needy pregnant women and mothers of infants will be issued vouchers, redeemable at food and drug stores for infant formulas and other highly nutritious special foods.

The President has taken an enormous stride forward in our efforts to assure equal opportunities for all our citizens. I hope that we in the Congress will promptly provide him with the legislative tools to make his program effective and, at the same time, provide sufficient funding so that it will not be an empty promise.

We simply must no longer tolerate hunger in this the most abundant nation of all.

## NEGLECT IS SINKING NATION'S FLEET

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is observing National Maritime Day, yet our merchant fleet is a sad sixth in the world. The state of our fleet and the problems facing this mighty industry have been well documented by Helen Delich Bentley in the Baltimore Sun.

I insert Mrs. Bentley's article from today's edition of the Sun at this point in the RECORD:

AROUND THE WATERFRONT—NEGLECT IS SINKING NATION'S FLEET

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

As National Maritime Day, 1969, is observed today throughout the United States, all facets of the sadly divided, bitterly segmented industry agree on one point—namely, that the U.S. must determine whether its merchant marine is to become an instrument of national policy.

If it is, a course of rehabilitation and revitalization should be followed.

COLD WAR WEAPON

If it is not, then no one should worry any longer whether there are merchant ships on the high seas flying the American flag.

Among the leading nations who use their merchant marines as instruments of their national policy are: the Soviet Union, Japan, Norway and the United Kingdom.

There are many others, but these are the nations one can place at a level with the U.S., nations whose merchant fleets are important to the U.S. in one way or another—either from the standpoint of friendly competition, or as weapons in the cold war.

RUSSIAN POLICY

The Russians have been very blunt in telling the world that they expect to double their present 12,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant shipping by 1980. As they have built up their present tonnage—80 per cent of which is less than ten years old—they have clearly used their merchant ships as instruments in a drive to win over as many nations as they can and to carry out their national policy.

Their small passenger ships are used to transport students from developing countries to Russia to learn, and to bring to them experts and soldiers offering first-hand aid. Their tankers are still built on a small scale so that they can transport Soviet petroleum products directly into the shallow ports of these nations.

The Soviets want more freighters and other cargo carrying vessels so they can increase their own trade, and also to enter more third-flag trade routes in order to earn dollars.

Vikto Bakayev, Minister of Mercantile Marine in the Soviet Union, has stated that his country has taken into consideration the growth of population and the development of world industrial and agricultural production, along with the expansion of trade among the countries of the world. It has reached the conclusion that the scope of international shipping by water will reach 3 to 3½ billion tons by 1980, up from the 2 billion tons in 1968.

JAPANESE POLICY

The Russians intend to have enough ships on hand to more than carry their share of that cargo.

The Japanese have prescribed that their merchant marine should carry 60 per cent of the Japanese exports and 70 per cent of the Japanese imports by 1975. To meet this target, it is planned that 2,050 ships of 29 million gross tons will be built in Japanese shipyards between now and 1975.

The Japanese reached that determination after the Ministry of Transport and the Shipping and Shipbuilding Rationalization Council called upon a specially created industry advisory group, the Shipping Policy Division, to "conduct studies on a policy from the National economic viewpoint for the growth of the Japanese shipping industry."

Among the conclusions reached, according to a Tokyo publication, were the following:

1. It is essential to expand the Japanese merchant marine for improvement of the shipping payments position.

2. It is necessary to work out measures for having access to funds needed for expansion of the Japanese fleet of ocean going ships, and for the training of more seamen.

3. Government subsidies are needed to strengthen the Japanese shipping industry's business standing, and to augment its international competitiveness.

The entire existing Japanese merchant marine is less than 15 years old.

On this Maritime Day, 1969, this is the position of the U.S.:

1. The U.S. today is carrying only about 5 per cent of its foreign commerce on American-flag bottoms. This percentage has been dropping sharply every year—from a high of 37.6 per cent in 1960.

2. The U.S. ranks a weak 11th in merchant ship construction in the world.

3. The average age of the U.S. fleet is 23 years; in another 2 years, more than 2 out of 3 ships in the American fleet will be over 25 years in age and totally uneconomical.

4. The U.S. fleet is plagued with critical inter-union bickering.

5. The U.S. active fleet ranks a weak 6th in status in the world.

DECISIONS ESSENTIAL

If the U.S. determines that the American merchant marine is to be an instrument of its national policy, the nation must be sold on the idea that a healthy maritime industry not only provides major employment opportunities, but also greatly aids the balance of payments opportunities, while assuring the economy a steady flow of world trade, and the country a necessary defense weapon.

One thing for certain on this National Maritime Day is that the U.S. must soon come to grips with the problem of whether it intends to make the merchant marine an instrument of national policy, or whether it intends to turn over all of its maritime commerce to foreign interests and depend solely on them.

## MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON SCHOOL BOARDS

### HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a discussion paper entitled "Minority Representation on School Boards," by Dr. Howard A. Matthews, director of the Division of Manpower Development and Training of the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. Matthews recently presented his paper during a panel discussion at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association in Miami, Fla., on April 14, 1969. Its contents were highlighted in the education section of the May issue of Government Executive magazine.

In his presentation, Dr. Matthews points out the need for overhauling the procedures of school boards so that they might be more responsive to the needs of the people the boards are designed to serve. He makes concrete suggestions as to how this can be accomplished by suggesting various methods of involving people from all segments of the community in the administrative processes of school boards. Dr. Matthews' suggestions not only relate to the operation of school boards, but to the functions of similar administrative bodies which require community involvement as a necessary part of their operation.

The text of the paper by Dr. Matthews is as follows:

MINORITY REPRESENTATIONS ON SCHOOL BOARDS

People react to all government in terms of the governmental agency with which they have the most frequent and intimate contact. The public school is that agency for most people. The public reaction to poor administrative practices or procedures of any school board has an erosive effect upon the attitude of the public toward the rapidly proliferating assortment of other local agencies of government, which I shall discuss in a few minutes. This is especially true where the public in general, and minority groups in particular, have little or no real opportunity to participate in making the policies and rules for programs affecting them.

Subsequent to the "poor people's march" on Washington, numerous Federal, State, and local administrative agencies adopted a policy of soliciting minorities to serve on a host of existing or newly created advisory committees. Such committees generally are

oriented to a specific problem area like new school construction, vocational education, etc. The school board, however, is not bound in any way to accept the recommendations of such committees; hence, meaningful participation in the decision-making process is remote at best by this means.

Prominent leaders representing minority groups at the recent White House Conference on Civil Rights asserted that the problems of the Negro and other minorities in the blighted neighborhoods of large city school districts were attributable in large measure to lack of membership on policymaking boards which run the schools. As a solution, several minority group leaders suggested in press interviews that the composition of school boards be altered by the appointment or election of representatives from the minority groups to the boards.

I am not sure the solution to the problem of participation of minorities in running schools really lies in placing a voting member from each minority group or sub-group in a community on all school boards. In Washington, D.C., if each minority group or faction which results in sub-groups were to have voting representation on the school board, the size of the board would be colossal. In fact, the board would probably have to rent Constitution Hall for meetings just to seat its members.

The real issue, it seems to me, is making the school board policy formulation and rule making procedures such that minorities are actually participants in both the form and substance of the policies and rules. This is not to say, however, that one should operate at the exclusion of the other. Certainly other members of this panel will address the problems of recruitment, election, and/or appointment of board members from the minorities of the community. However, with no change in the current practices of policy formulation and rule making by many administrative boards, or where a board has no written codes, or where a board does its business in executive sessions, such membership will be nothing more than a facade. It is to this aspect of the problem that I will address my remarks.

In 1955 the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) issued a joint publication entitled, "Written Policies for School Boards." The impressive agenda for this conference has several sessions devoted to the subject of written school board policies. When all school boards do this, they will have taken a faltering step toward making possible minority participation in management and operation of the schools.

The AASA and NSBA statement said, among other things, that there should be a clear-cut delineation between school district policy and the rules and regulations which implement school district policy. They are two separate functions. The AASA and NSBA, however, stopped short of saying how the board and the superintendent should go about implementing their recommendations. It is with the implementation of these recommendations that a relevant role for minorities (and for all citizens, for that matter) can be found.

Modern students of school board operations and of administrative law agree with this publication of nearly a decade and a half ago. They argue, however, that the school board should devote its energies solely to establishing a broad framework of written policies within which school administrative personnel can function. This frees the school board from having to consider a specific problem and ruling repeatedly on it. This broad framework of policies guides the superintendent and his staff as they make rules and regulations to give effect to the policies. It also provides an orderly mechanism for minorities and others who deal with the board and its agents.

Policymaking is, and rightly should be, a board responsibility. The responsibility for policy implementing rules is usually the ultimate legal responsibility of the board because a board cannot delegate its power to delegate. However, the authority to develop specific rules and regulations must by the very nature of the technical competence required, fall upon and be delegated to superintendents and other professional staff who are constantly available to the public. The oldtimers who write in school law and in school administration theory, as a general rule, reject this concept of delegation to superintendents and other employees.

Over the years, gallons of ink have been spilled in the professional educational journals on the subject of delegation by "experts" in school law (usually professors of school administration). They have meticulously drawn a heavy line of demarcation between the duties of superintendents and the authority of boards to delegate discretionary functions to superintendents. The usual authority cited for this position is court of record cases dating back nearly a century. Some of these cases were concerned with fact situations, not actually involving the school community, which occurred when the office of superintendent was something analogous to the modern day secretary of the school board.

These traditional school law experts would restrict the superintendent, as an agent and/or employee of the board to purely ministerial functions. They argue that boards are without authority to delegate any discretionary authority to superintendents in establishing policies or in making rules and, in addition to archaic court cases, cite piously in support of their position the time honored doctrine of "constitutional limitation."

According to this doctrine, there is imposed constitutionally (Federal and State) a separation of powers into the trifurcation—legislative, judicial, and executive. The basic manifestation of this separation doctrine is the maxim against delegated power. This means that what the people have vested in a legislative body by State or Federal constitution cannot be delegated to a subordinate body, let alone redelegated to an administrative officer. Therefore, there has grown over the years a considerable body of theoretical support in the school law and school administration community for the notion that boards of education have no authority to allow superintendents or other administrative officers to promulgate rules having the force and effect of law within the broad framework of written school board policy statements. Superintendents who attempt to work in opposition to this concept frequently find it occupationally hazardous.

It is a matter of historical fact that proscription of such delegated power as well as the rigid separation of constitutional powers of which it is an offshoot have simply failed to survive the ravages of time. The delegation of legislative power, though frequently softened by some authors and jurists with the appellative "quasi," is at this time uniformly acknowledged by students of administrative law as proper and, in fact, as a necessary ingredient of modern government. The demands of citizens for local units of government have simply required the doctrine of separation's virtual emasculation from the national and State scenes, pious pronouncements in a few old court opinions, outdated State constitutions, and articles on school law to the contrary notwithstanding.

As one studies recent legislative enactments, Federal and State, he cannot help but be impressed with the declining specificity in the laws which add necessary new services for people and/or new units of local government.

As life continues to become increasingly more complicated, citizens at the local level demand more specialized services to protect them from each other, pollution, ignorance, land use, etc. For the most part, State laws create local units of government of all sorts. State laws usually authorize such units to establish rather narrowly specified programs of services. Generally, Federal interest is expressed through "grants-in-aid" or "purchases of services" legislation which use local units of government as "multipliers" to carry out any Federal interest in such services. Specificity in program implementation is accomplished by local agencies through the rule making process. The net result over the past 20 years has been a fantastic proliferation of overlapping local governmental administrative units with rule making powers.

The most recent census of governments indicates that over 90,000 such local units of government operate among the 50 States. These include general purpose units for cities, counties, boroughs, towns, villages; and, special purpose districts presided over by administrative boards which appoint administrative officers responsive to the board, but not directly responsive to the voters. This latter class of agencies is sometimes referred to as a "headless fourth branch of government." The latter group includes such entities as school districts; water, soil, and conservation districts; urban renewal districts; health districts; water pollution districts; sanitation districts; dog abatement districts; mosquito abatement districts; etc. Almost without exception these entities have taxing authority. Most of these local agencies are presided over by an elected or appointed board or commission which is authorized by law to prescribe ". . . such reasonable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the law as may be necessary. . . ." (I do not remember ever reading an enabling statute authorizing such a new unit of government to make "policies".)

These administrative rules and regulations, having the force and effect of law, control more of the daily activities of the American citizen and occupy more shelf space (those that are written) than do the total statutes at large of the Federal and State governments put together.

Countless such rules and regulations are made daily in all parts of the country by these administrative boards and commissions, often with little regard for the rights, interests, and privileges of the parties affected, and often in "star chamber" executive sessions from which the public is excluded. In legal theory these administrative rules are actually "administrative laws" because, as we have mentioned, they have the full force and effect of a statute.

To illustrate the profusion of local agencies of government, let us examine a single community near Chicago. In it can be found two counties, three townships, a village, four school districts, a sanitary district, a mosquito abatement district, and a tuberculosis sanitarium district. All of these units have differing boundaries. Each was created by a distinct law or set of laws passed by the State legislature, and not one is controlled by any other centralized or coordinating agency of government. Each is managed by one of these administrative boards or commissions whose rules and regulations have the force and effect of law. Each board or its administrator can invoke sanctions that are as valid and binding on minorities, and others, as laws passed by the legislature of the State or the Congress of the United States.

Within the overall Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of Chicago (a Bureau of Census term for a socially and economically describable area) there were, at last report, six counties, 246 municipalities, 114 township governments, 340 school districts and 354 special districts and the community I described. This intergovernmental complex involves over six million people!

A recent census analysis shows that more than half a million elected public officials preside over local units of government throughout the country. Over half of these units serve fewer than 1,000 persons. The National Commission on Urban Problems in its report to the Congress and to the President on December 12, 1968, found that most of these local governmental units—particularly those related to large urban areas—were extremely small, geographically. Among other things, the report says that about one-half of the municipalities in the average Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) have less than a single square mile of land area. Probably 60 percent are smaller than two square miles, and four-fifths have a land area less than four square miles (corresponding to a square two miles on each side). Fewer than 200 SMSA municipalities in the United States include as much as 25 square miles of land. The average SMSA central city has more than four overlaying local governments.

On the average, there are about 90 units of government per Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, and the average resident of any metropolitan area is served by at least four separate local governments, i.e., county, municipality or township; one or more school districts, plus from one to perhaps a dozen separate special districts concerned with rats, sewers, mosquitoes, dogs, pollution of some sort or another, zoning regulations, etc. In addition to differing population size, boundaries, and purpose, seldom do local units follow the same procedures and practices in exercising their rule making powers.

The racial, ethnic, religious, or other characteristics which identify minority groups tend to complicate the problem by creating a geographical dispersion of minority groups called "de facto segregation." A different minority group mix is found as one moves across local jurisdiction boundaries.

Imagine the confusion that exists when citizens attempt to struggle through this administrative agency labyrinth. Suppose that a member or leader of a local minority group wanted to question a rise in his property taxes in terms of the programs of his school or those he thinks are somehow related to the school. With property taxes levied upon him by three to six separate local taxing units, to which should his protest go? On which board (or how many boards) should he serve to solve the problems?

The following are a few of the simple problems which suggest the frustration, possible indecision and delay he might experience. They are typical of situations which simply having a minority member on one local school board (or any other board for that matter) is not going to completely solve:

1. Police protection in or near schools: Might involve one or more different school districts (some people live in as many as three types of school districts, such as high school, elementary, area vocational school) a municipality; or, in suburbia, perhaps also a county or township.

2. The interrelated neighborhood effects of street cleaning and refuse collection; location of schools and/or public playgrounds; placement and maintenance of public housing; locations of health clinics and welfare service centers; etc. Functions generally handled separately or alternately by municipalities; school districts; special districts for each different type of service; county governments; and/or, one or more combinations of any of these.

3. Health care for school children or the school's relationship to community social welfare and recreation programs. Functions involving school districts; welfare boards; recreation boards; municipal governments; or, perhaps State and federal governmental agencies merely housed locally.

At this time the Congress and various associations of State and local officials are searching for the coordinating mechanism. Until this mechanism can be found to minimize the uncoordinated operation and overlap of local governmental agencies, it seems to me more important to achieve some consistency in the practices followed by these entities in doing the public's business than to attempt to place one or more "minority" representatives on each governing board, council, or commission.

About ten years ago the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws suggested one solution. Generally, the Commissioners as well as other authorities in administrative law agreed that to protect the righs, interests, and privileges of all citizens the process of policy development and rule making should at least provide:

1. Notice of the proposed policies and rules, amendments, or repeals, to the public, and particularly to interested parties, or parties likely to be affected.

2. Legislative type hearings to afford individuals an opportunity to be heard, both orally and in writing, on proposed policies and rules, amendments, or repeals.

3. Publication and systematic revision and updating of all policies and rules affecting the public. Policies and rules not published and filed with appropriate officials such as chief State school officers, county recorders, clerks of the court, or others having custody of public documents, would have no force or effect.

4. Delayed effectiveness of a policy or rule, amendment, or repeal to allow adjudicative review and an opportunity for affected parties to challenge proposed policies and rules, amendments, or repeals in a court of competent jurisdiction and stay their becoming operable if substantial and material rights of affected parties would be prejudiced because the administrative process or decisions are (a) arbitrary; (b) outside the powers of the board; (c) accomplished without proper regard for the procedure required in policy setting or rule making; (d) in violation of the law or, (e) unsupported by competent evidence in view of the record.

Local public school boards (and all other administrative boards and commissions) should be required to follow a similar orderly and systematic administrative procedure in policy setting, and their agents in rule making, particularly where the rights and privileges of individuals are concerned. In this way, all persons dealing with rule making bodies would have at minimum a simple consistent pattern they can understand and follow.

Much of the unrest among students, teachers, and others in the school enterprise today results from their lack of meaningful involvement in developing policies, rules, and regulations. Additionally, they resent a multitude of "unwritten rules." Something similar to policy and/or rule making (or is rule making) takes place when a particular course of action is repeatedly followed. An administrative practice or policy, even when unannounced or wholly negative, may have the practical effect of a formal written rule—the "this is the way we do it here" kind of thing. The lack of a formal, well-organized rule making process is bad enough without the frustration that exists as citizens, and particularly those from the disadvantaged community, try to wend their way through a choking underbrush of unwritten rules and regulations.

I am convinced that it is highly unlikely that meaningful involvement of minorities with regard to establishing policies and rules and regulations relating to school integration, curriculum innovation, personnel systems, board-superintendent relationships, teacher and student militancy, etc., will be permanently improved on the current piecemeal pressure point basis. They will only begin to approach solutions when clear-cut administrative procedures are established which boards of education (and other local administrative agencies that I have identified above) must follow in establishing policies or implementing rules that affect the rights, privileges, and interests of citizens, and particularly the parties likely to be affected directly by such policies and/or rules.

There is undoubtedly no more tractless morass in the whole legal bibliography than rules and regulations of the local public administrative boards and agencies.

The problem takes its origin in large measure from the fact that when legislatures have created these various local administrative units in response to the demands of citizens for specialized service of one sort or another, legislatures have not at the same time set forth firm standards by which such agencies exercise their legislative and adjudicative functions. The typical grant of authority to a school board concludes something like this, ". . . and such board is authorized to make such reasonable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the law and with the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education as may be necessary for its own conduct and for the conduct of the school system."

In some States there are statutes (or court decisions) which require a regular monthly meeting of the school board on a specified date. Only at such meeting may the board pay bills, call for bids, open bids, etc.

"X" number of board members must be present to have a voting quorum, etc., but for the most part, few States tell a local administrative school board, public utility district, mosquito district, or any other kind of an administrative board, the process it must follow in developing policies or in making rules and regulations having the force and effect of law. In other words, there are few (if any) standards prescribed by law (except some derived from a few court cases) which boards must follow in exercising these important legislative and adjudicative functions.

In order to bring about improvement in the practices and procedures of boards in the exercise of the rule making powers and to guarantee protection to the rights, privileges, and interests of minorities, serious conideration should be given by all boards of education (and other administrative boards, for that matter) to the following recommendations:

1. Policy statements should be broad and general. There should not be included within the policy statement the rules setting forth the conditions of policy application, related penalties, enforcement, etc. This should be accomplished by rules and regulations issued by the school administrative staff in the manner outlined in the following statements.

2. All policy statements should be in writing and should be codified by subject matter area, and published. The actual wording of board policy statements should be accomplished by the superintendent or other appropriate school administrative staff members with legal assistance from the school attorney and, where feasible, the State education agency. Policy statements should become final and effective only when established according to the administrative procedures outlined in paragraphs 6 through 14.

3. The rules for implementing board policies should be promulgated by the superintendent or other appropriate administrative school officials. Rules should be codified by subcode numbers which identify the policy statements implemented by such rules. Rules should become effective only after they have been reviewed by the school board for consistency with the policy statements they implement.

4. Each school board should have written by-laws or rules of procedure pubished in a special publication and available to the

school board, school district employers, and the public. Included in the by-laws should be rules governing both formal and informal procedures the board uses in setting policy and its administrators in developing the rules to implement such policies. All such by-laws, or rules of procedure, should also be filed with the chief State school officer and with local public officials such as the county recorder or clerks of the courts who have general custody of public records in the geographical area served by the district. They also should be placed in all school libraries and in the public libraries in the community, and should be free of charge.

5. To assist persons dealing with the school board or its administrative officials who exercise rule making powers, each board should insofar as practical, supplement its by-laws with descriptive statements of the procedures individuals, organizations, or agencies should follow in dealing with the board, or its administrative officials, in proposing policies to the board or implementing rules to the administrative staff. All contact by such parties with the board should be through the superintendent.

6. At least 30 days prior to the final vote and adoption of any proposed board policy statement (or amendment or repeal) which involves the rights, interests, or privileges of employees, pupils or the public, unless otherwise provided by law, each school board through the superintendent should publish or otherwise circulate in the school district notice of the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal) and afford interested parties, or persons likely to be affected by the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal), an opportunity to submit data or views, orally or in writing, concerning the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal). Such interested or affected persons should be afforded an opportunity to be heard informally before the superintendent or other appropriate administrative hearing officer, if a request for such hearing is filed with the superintendent in writing at least 20 days in advance of the effective date of the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal). Affected parties should be afforded a formal hearing before the board only under circumstances outlined in paragraphs 10 and 11 below.

7. The final voting action upon board policy statements, unless otherwise provided by law, should be in an open public meeting and the vote recorded by member.

8. Policy statements should be adopted by the school board only after the rules to implement such policies have been prepared by the superintendent or other appropriate school administrative official and reviewed by the board to insure consistency with board policy.

9. Each policy statement adopted by the school board and implementing rules promulgated by administrative officials should be filed with the public officials named above. Unless otherwise provided by law, policy statements and proposed rules involving the rights, interests, or privileges of employees, students, or the public should take effect not earlier than 30 days following such filing except that emergency policy statements and rules concerning health, safety, and morals may take effect immediately upon filing.

10. Regarding informal hearings, any person likely to be affected by the provisions of a proposed policy statement (or amendment or repeal) who desires to contest the provisions or intent of the proposed statement, and who requests a hearing in writing delivered to the superintendent at least 20 days in advance of the proposed policy statement, should be afforded an opportunity to appear before the superintendent or other hearing official (other than a school board, or member thereof). The superintendent or other hearing official should make a finding of fact and prepare a written report and proposed written statement of decision for the school board. Such report and statement should be delivered to all board members and handed or mailed to the party contesting the proposed policy (or amendment or repeal).

11. Concerning formal hearings, any affected party who desires to contest the report of the superintendent provided in paragraph 10, and/or statement of decision prepared by the superintendent or other hearing official for the board and who so requests in writing 10 days following receipt of such materials from the superintendent, should be afforded a formal hearing before the school board, provided, however, that his written request for such hearing shows how such person will be adversely affected or his rights, interests, or privileges impaired or prejudiced by the proposed policy statement of decision for the board prepared by the superintendent or other hearing officials.

12. The affected party contesting the proposed policy statements (or amendments or repeal) should be notified in writing of the formal hearing date, time, and place and the facts at issue at least 10 days in advance of the formal hearing. At such hearing, the complainant should have the right to legal counsel, to examine witnesses, and to present evidence.

13. The decision rendered by the board should be in writing and stated in full in the board minutes. It also should be delivered or mailed to the complainant within five days following the final action of the board.

14. The superintendent and/or other appropriate school administrative officials responsible for the issuance of rules to implement contested policy statements should defer issuing rules implementing a contested policy statement pending adjudicative action by the school board.

15. Any policy statement (or amendment or repeal) involving rights, interests, or privileges, of employees, students, or the public not adopted in conformity with the procedures enunciated in paragraphs 6 through 14, should be void and of no effect.

16. After the complainant has exhausted the remedies described above or otherwise provided by law, he should be able to seek judicial review of the proposed policy statement or rules and regulations, (or amendment or repeal) by filing an action in a court of competent jurisdiction. The reviewing court should be able, at its discretion, to stay the effectiveness of the policy statement or rules and regulations, (or amendment or repeal) upon such terms as it deems proper. The final action of the court should be either to affirm the decision of the board or reverse or modify the decision if substantial rights of the affected party would be prejudiced because the administrative findings, inferences, or decisions are: (a) arbitrary; (b) outside the powers of the board; (c) accomplished without regard for the administrative procedures required in policy setting or rule making; (d) in violation of the law; or (e) unsupported by competent material and substantial evidence in view of the entire record as submitted.

17. The superintendent of schools or other appropriate school administrative official should cause to be published annually a compilation of new policies, and amendments, or repealed policies resulting from board or court action. Such compilations also should include new or amended implementing rules for such policies as a separate section and should be filed with the officials named in paragraph 4, as well as with all administrative officials of the school district, libraries of the community and the school district, and such other individuals, organizations, or agencies as may request these compilations, which should be free of charge.

18. Policy statements of the school board and implementing rules of its officials should be reviewed and revised at least every three years for the purpose of incorporating the content of the annual compilations described in paragraph 17, above.

19. The traditional curriculum for the preparation of the superintendent of schools and other administrative positions should be drastically overhauled to lessen the emphasis upon "court law," increase the emphasis upon administrative law and update archaic statutes.

20. The position of the superintendent of schools should be strengthened by legislation, if necessary, making him an administrative officer with rule making powers to be exercised in the manner described earlier.

The model administrative procedures process which I have suggested may sound a little unwieldy, especially in a society which ambivalently asks for efficiency, speed, and complicated services all at once. What I have suggested is an interim process. It should be refined and become part of any long-range plan to bring order to expanding local governments which have grown like "Topsy."

Because most of the local units of government are creatures of the State either in response to citizen demands for services, or to obtain demands for services, or to obtain the advantage of funds derived from federal sources, the State should take the initiative to eliminate the small and inefficient units of government, and otherwise bring about some degree of consistency in the way units of local government serve the public. Uniformity should not be an end in itself. The strength of a free society lies not in its uniformity but in its diversity. There can be consistency, however, in the procedures employed by such a society in its perfection and perpetuation.

SELECTED REFERENCES


American Association of School Administrators, and National School Boards Association. *Written Policies for School Boards.* Washington, D.C. The Association, 1955.

Burrus, Bernie R. *Administrative Law and Local Government.* Ann Arbor; Legislative Research Center, University of Michigan Law School, 1963.

Colvin, A. Howard. *Administrative Procedure Laws in the United States: A Comparative Study.* Austin: Texas Judicial Council, 1957.

Davis, Kenneth Culp. *Administrative Law Treaties.* Vol. 1, St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1958.

Gruening, Ernest H., Senator from Alaska. "Rules Versus Policies in Education, The Views of Howard A. Matthews". Statement on the Floor of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States. *Congressional Record—Senate.* Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. June 27, 1967. Vol. 113, No. 102.

Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States. "Employment and Manpower Problems in the Cities; Implications of the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders". *Hearings Before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States.* 90th Congress, 2nd Session, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. May 28, 29, June 4, 5, and 6, 1968.

Matthews, Howard A., "The Rule Making Power of Public School Boards—An Analysis of the Practices and Procedures of Selected Boards". *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.* The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. June 1964.

———, "Differentiate Between Policies and Rules", *The American School Board Journal,* May 1967.

Muskie, Edmund S., Senator from Maine, "The Challenge of Creative Federalism". Statement on the Floor of the Senate of the Congress of the United States. *Congressional Record—Senate.* Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C., March 26, 1966. Vol. 112, No. 52.

National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. *Uniform Laws Annotated.* Brooklyn: Edward Thompson Company. Vol. 90, 1957.

National Commission on Urban Problems, Paul H. Douglas, Chairman; "Building the American City. Report of the National Commission on Urban Problems to the Congress and to the President of the United States". *House Documents No. 91–34, 91st Congress, 1st Session.* Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. December 12, 1968. 500 pages.

Netzer, Dick. "Impact of the Property Tax—Effect on Housing, Urban Land Use, Local Government Finance". Supplied by the *National Commission on Urban Problems* to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States. 90th Congress, 2nd Session. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1968.

Reuss, Henry S. Congressman from Wisconsin, "The State and local Government Modernization Act of 1969; A Program of Federal Grants to States which Take Steps to Modernize State and Local Government". Statement on the Floor of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States. *Congressional Record—House.* Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. January 8, 1969. Pages 328–331.

Ways, Max. "Creative Federalism and the Great Society". *Fortune:* January 1966, page 121 ff.

## THE DETERIORATION OF OUR MARITIME FLEET

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, once again the observance of Maritime Day finds us facing a crisis in terms of our merchant marine capabilities. The deterioration of our fleet has reached the point that we soon may have to consider that the United States no longer has a fleet.

This fact is especially alarming in light of the present state of international affairs, for the importance of sea power, particularly in time of emergency, cannot be underestimated.

It is essential that we have adequate sea transportation resources in times of crisis. But we cannot expect to have a merchant marine capable of reacting to world crises unless we develop that fleet in peacetime.

Yet what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? We have so ignored this fact that today, nearly 95 percent of our trade moves in foreign-flag vessels. And we have no assurance that these vessels—which profit so handsomely from our peacetime trade—would be made available to us in time of crisis. In fact, Mr. Speaker, past history suggests quite the opposite.

Presently, our most formidable rival in world affairs—the Soviet Union—is engaged in a massive merchant marine expansion program. Unless we do something, it is quite apparent that the Russian merchant fleet will easily outrank ours in the next few years.

I feel it is in the national interest for the United States to restore the merchant marine to its proper place among the fleets of the world. This will insure our Nation's security against any future crisis—it will help us improve our balance-of-payments position—and it will add to our domestic economic strength.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that there are bills pending in this session of the Congress to achieve the goal of a healthy, balanced merchant marine; in fact, I have the privilege of being a cosponsor of several of the bills in question. It is my urgent hope that we get moving on this legislation, so that our actions in support of our merchant marine more nearly parallel our words of praise for the role this industry plays in war and peace.

## JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DIOCESE OF PITTSBURGH,
*Pittsburgh, Pa., May 14, 1969.*

Hon. JAMES FULTON,
*New Federal Building,*
*Pittsburgh, Pa.*

DEAR MR. FULTON: Enclosed please find a copy of a brief biographical sketch of John Cardinal Wright.

Your office had asked for some biographical information that might be used as an introduction in conjunction with the news articles carried in the New York Times. This biography was put together by the Cardinal's office for just such purposes.

I hope this suits your purposes and is of some help.

Many thanks, again, for joining the Cardinal and his party in Rome at the time of his elevation to the College of Cardinals.

Sincerely yours,

REV. DONALD W. WUERL.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1969]

POPE NAMES WRIGHT, NEW U.S. CARDINAL, TO OVERSEE CLERGY

(By Robert C. Doty)

ROME, May 2.—John Cardinal Wright, Bishop of Pittsburgh, was named today by Pope Paul VI to head the Vatican congregation dealing with the problems of an increasingly turbulent Roman Catholic priesthood.

The 59-year-old prelate becomes prefect of the Congregation of the Clergy, which is responsible for the supervision of the spiritual welfare of priests. He replaces Jean Cardinal Villot, the Frenchman who was named Wednesday as the new Vatican Secretary of State, in effect its Premier and Foreign Minister.

Pope Paul also published today an apostolic constitution consolidating and making definitive the changes in the missal, the Catholic prayer book, that were decreed by the Ecumenical Council Vatican II and further refined by the 1967 meeting of the Synod of Bishops.

A Vatican spokesman, presenting the document, answered a question whether it foreclosed further liturgical experiment by saying that the constitution was "definitive."

The changes in the missal, the first major ones since it was promulgated in 1570, deal mainly with the wording of the liturgy and the celebration of the Eucharist.

The Pope also ended the 1,900-year-old rule that women must cover their heads in church. He did this by not mentioning the practice, an omission that Vatican spokesmen said repealed the rule.

The Boston-born Cardinal Wright is the third United States churchman to reach prefectorial rank in the central administration of the Catholic church. The late Samuel Cardinal Stritch of Chicago was named prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1958, but died before assuming the post, and Francis Cardinal Brennan, a Pennsylvanian, was briefly head of the Congregation of the Sacraments before his death in Rome last July.

FOUR WERE ELEVATED

Cardinal Wright was one of four United States prelates elevated to the Sacred College of Cardinals this week.

After his appointment today, Cardinal Wright, in a speech to the clergy of his titular Roman church, Jesus the Divine Master, declared his position to be one of social openness and theological caution.

"In our moment of history," he said, "the history of the church and the history of mankind, a 'liberal' social attitude and 'progressive' spirit are the need of the hour. But these require as an indispensable condition of their health and effectiveness a jealous regard for doctrinal soundness, a commitment to the faith that is unqualified save for human frailty."

Far from being incompatible, he said, theological and doctrinal conservatism and social progressivism were natural allies, "particularly in the crisis of our present culture, our political order, our very civilization."

U.S. PRIESTS IN MOVEMENT

With United States priests contributing a large share of the clerical "contestation" of authority, it is considered here to be appropriate that an American prelate should be charged with responsibility for their spiritual welfare.

Discussing the changes in the missal, one expert said that the over-all effect of the Pope's document was to "promote the whole idea of a simpler, unified approach, a single ceremony involving closely priests and faithful."

Such profound changes as the turning around of altars so that the celebrant priest faces the communicants and the authorization of masses in vernacular tongues instead of Latin have been in effect since the end of the Ecumenical Council in 1965.

Other changes have been the subject of authorized experiment—and sometimes unauthorized, as in jazz masses—pending the final codification published today.

EBULLIENT, INTELLECTUAL PRINCE OF THE CHURCH: JOHN JOSEPH WRIGHT

(By Damon Stetson)

Several years ago John Joseph Wright, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Pittsburgh, was asked how many people he had in his diocese.

"More than two million," he replied, causing a reaction of disbelief in his questioner, who knew that there were not two million Roman Catholics in the Pittsburgh area.

"No," the Bishop agreed, "but there are more than two million souls, and a bishop is not just the bishop of the Catholics."

The stocky, gregarious prelate, who was elevated to the College of Cardinals this week and was named yesterday as prefect, or head, of the Vatican Congregation of the Clergy, demonstrated during his years in Pittsburgh his belief that every person in his diocese had a claim on him. Nearly every aspect of the city's religious, civic and cultural life felt the impact of his intellect and strong personality.

No sectarian shepherd, Cardinal Wright, who is 59 years old, brought a vision to his flock that embraced national Catholic problems, a deep concern about peace and an ecumenical spirit. He has been described as both a theological conservative and a social militant.

A FOE OF RACE DISCRIMINATION

Last fall he headed the committee drafting a pastoral letter at a meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in Washington. Some liberal priests were dismayed because the letter supported Pope Paul VI in his reaffirmation of the ban on artificial means of birth control.

On the other hand, the new cardinal has been a leader in campaigns to eliminate job discrimination and to achieve social justice and civil rights for Negroes. In the summer of 1967, he spoke out strongly against the Vietnam war, calling it "a morally dubious mess" and urging the end of the bombing. He was equally vehement in condemning Vietcong "atrocities."

Cardinal Wright has the heavy build and hearty ebullience of a long-distance truck driver that belie the manner and intellect that won him a reputation as one of America's most brilliant prelates. He has always derived pleasure from simply mingling with people and he delights in plunging into a crowd and indulging in small talk. (He speaks fluent Italian and French.)

The oldest of six children, Cardinal Wright was born in the Dorchester section of Boston on July 18, 1909.

Nights and summers he worked as a stock boy at the Hyde Park branch of the Boston Public Library for 25 cents an hour. That job and another in the city room of The Boston Post helped him pay his way through Boston College, where he won more academic and debating honors. The class of 1931 voted him the member who had done the most for the college.

He then entered St. John's Seminary in Brighton, Mass. At the end of a year he was one of the top two in his class and was sent to Rome to finish his studies at the Pontifical Gregorian University.

He was ordained a priest in the chapel of the North American College in Rome on Dec. 8, 1935, and remained to continue his studies at the Gregorian University. In 1939, he received the doctorate in sacred theology after having done voluntary parish work abroad in England, Scotland, and France.

Returning to Massachusetts, he became a professor of philosophy at St. John's Seminary, Brighton, and in 1943 was appointed secretary to the Archbishop of Boston, William Cardinal O'Connell. Named a monsignor in December, 1944, he rose to the rank of domestic prelate in 1946 and was consecrated Titular Bishop of Aegea and Auxiliary Bishop of Boston in 1947. In 1950, Worcester, Mass., became the see city of a new diocese and he was appointed to head it.

When Bishop John F. Dearden, who also became a Cardinal this week, was appointed Archbishop of Detroit in 1958, Cardinal Wright was named as his successor in Pittsburgh and was installed as the eighth Bishop there on March 18, 1959.

While in Pittsburgh, Cardinal Wright formed the Catholic Diocese Commission on Human Relations, initiated the policy of having laymen on the Catholic School Board and got the diocese involved in Project Equality, an interfaith group to promote equal employment.

He also urged greater attendance in Catholic schools by Negro children and initiated the Labor Day Mass, now an annual event.

---

BIOGRAPHY OF HIS EMINENCE JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT

Ever since he first began his priestly work in Boston, Cardinal-Designate John J. Wright has been revered by all who have come in contact with him and who have heard him speak. In many of his memorable talks it has been difficult at times not to feel that there was something unconsciously biographical about them. At any rate, the years seem to have proved it to be so for he now is to become a Cardinal.

Perhaps one could find this unconsciously biographical sense in an address he made in Boston just before becoming the first Bishop of Worcester and just nine years before he became the eighth Bishop of Pittsburgh. In that address he described the life and times of Boston's first Catholic Bishop, John Cheverus. He related that Bishop Cheverus was a man of letters, a preacher extraordinary; an ecumenist before the word was even known as it is today; that he was a tireless traveler in ministering to his people; that the distressed and the poor were his continued preoccupation; that he became a beloved figure in his community; and that he was remembered long after he left Boston—and that his Church named Bishop Cheverus a Cardinal.

The same fits Cardinal Wright. The biography of Bishop Cheverus which he related could be the exact description of the life and times of Cardinal Wright. For the nine years Cardinal Wright labored in Worcester and for the last ten years that he has been Bishop of Pittsburgh, he has left his indelible mark on the hearts of all he has served. A man of prodigious activity, his energy has seemed boundless and his wide scope of interests has been all-encompassing. Pope John XXIII found in him the right man in the right place in the preparatory work of Vatican II. Pope Paul VI found in him, too, the right man to continue in a permanent capacity much of the actual work of Vatican II. His influence there was probably greater than that of any other American. In the Council's conduct and ultimate results his hand was very much apparent. Since the days of the Council he has pre-occupied himself with the search for lasting peace among nations—one of his earliest interests—and the ways in which the Church can both serve and save man in a world perilously close to the chaotic. He only recently attended an interim World Conference for Religion and Peace in Istanbul, Turkey, where it was established that a permanent Conference will be held in Kyoto, Japan, in September, 1970.

One of his former students in the seminary, Monsignor Francis J. Lally, in a profile for the Boston *Pilot*, said that it has been Cardinal Wright's style that has set him so much apart over the years. His work has been done impressively, but the manner in which it was done has added to its special quality, for his has been a work of joy because it has rested in faith. Long recognized for his intelligence, his industry and administrative ability and often for his wit, he has made a singular, although often lonely, attempt to interpret to Americans generally the meaning of the Church and its message, in terms that would have contemporaneous comprehensibility. He has met with wit—but always with wisdom—the issues of the day in the pulpit, on the platform, and in the press, focusing upon them the revealing light of the traditional faith and illuminating the options available to the committed Christian. In his more than 20 years as a Bishop, he has offered a leadership in the ancient tradition of the Church Fathers which does not fear to judge the world even while evangelizing it.

The many accomplishments of Cardinal Wright in Boston and Worcester have been repeated in his all-too-short 10 years as Bishop of Pittsburgh and its diocese of 900,000 souls. His work in the ecumenical field has been predominant in that he willingly appeared with Protestant and Jewish programs very frequently. He established the Labor Day Mass at St. Paul's Cathedral and it has become an annual feature now held in the Civic Arena because of the vast crowds that attend. He established the Diocesan Ecumenical Council in 1964 and also introduced the Institute of the Person and the Common Good in Western Pennsylvania in cooperation with the Council of Churches and Jewish organizations of the area. The crowning point to most was the Cardinal's dialogue sermon with Bishop Nichols of the Methodist Church during the 1969 Prayer Service for Christian Unity. His work in Project Equality for Western Pennsylvania is well known. He has been active day and night in all human relations efforts and in all civic and humanitarian programs, particularly those for children, the poor and the babies of unwed mothers.

These works have extended even beyond Pittsburgh—to the extreme poor of Chimbote, Peru, where today Pittsburgh has a contingent of priests and nuns assigned to work in the mission that is closest to the Cardinal's heart. The fruits of their accomplishments take bud in the same zeal at work in Pittsburgh where dozens of parish groups, the Diocesan Council of Catholic Women and a special active group of active laymen called the Chimbote Founders, stand behind the missionaries with material and moral support. Cardinal Wright has made four personal visits to Chimbote since 1962.

During his tenure in Pittsburgh Cardinal Wright has ordained 152 seminarians to the priesthood, established 21 new parishes and merged three others to give the diocese of six counties 319 parishes and 26 missions in all. His work in the field of education, too, has brought him commendation from Catholic and public educators throughout the country. He has established 25 new elementary and 10 new secondary schools. He also established St. Paul's Seminary in Crafton, founded the Pittsburgh Oratory and established the Lay Volunteer Apostolate; converted McGuire Memorial Nursing Home at New Brighton to a facility for retarded children from birth to seven years of age.

From the time of Cardinal Wright's student days in the Eternal City to these last few years centering around Vatican II, he has never been more at home than when he walked Roman streets, prayed in Roman churches and lived under Roman skies.

He is first and foremost Boston, although not of the "proper" Bostonians as the Cabots and the Lowells, but the bright, confident and immensely practical Irish-Catholic Bostonians who have left their mark on the city.

He also is a son of Paris, but not the Paris of today, as the Greensburg *Accent* noted; rather, the 17th Century Paris with its great theologians and preachers—the Paris of Bossuet, Bourdaloue and others, the capital that still echoed the faith of the people of the little villages such as Domremy and Chinon, of which city on the Loire the new Cardinal is an honorary citizen (as was Rabelais!).

Above all, Cardinal Wright is a son of Rome where he was mostly formed; Rome, which he identifies with civilization. In Rome and what it stands for he sees abiding values, rising phoenix-like above depredations of barbarians, new and old. He is a son of Rome that produced such Cardinal-theologians as Bellarmine, Franzelin and others.

If it be true that Cardinal Wright now goes to Rome to serve, Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania will have lost a Bishop and Worcester and Boston a friend. But the Church throughout the world will have gained a leader.

---

## QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, 1969

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have recently tabulated the returns from my 1969 congressional questionnaire which was sent to all boxholders in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

I found the answers to these questions very interesting and most helpful to me.

Because I think my colleagues, too, will find this tabulation both interesting and helpful, with your permission, I hereby insert the tabulations of results in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ZWACH 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, SIXTH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA, MAY 22, 1969

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you believe social security and veteran's benefits should be increased to keep pace with the cost of living?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 76 |
| No | 19 |

2. Do you favor expulsion of students who violently disrupt the academic life of colleges and universities?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 93 |
| No | 5 |

3. Do you favor lowering the voting age from 21?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 31 |
| No | 64 |

4. Do you favor returning to the States and local governments, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 81 |
| No | 12 |

5. Do you approve the President's order to take politics out of the Post Office?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 90 |
| No | 6 |

6. Should the Federal Government provide programs of incentives and aid to help create jobs in the countryside?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 64 |
| No | 27 |

7. Do you believe economic equality for agricultural producers can best be established by—

| | |
|---|---|
| Maintaining present price support policies? | 22 |
| Returning to free market operations? | 26 |
| Providing increased bargaining power for farmers? | 39 |
| Long-term retirement of crop acres? | 13 |

8. Do you favor placing a limit on farm crop diversion payments?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 75 |
| No | 11 |

9. Do you favor increased Federal aid to private and parochial schools?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 38 |
| No | 55 |

10. Do you believe the Voyageurs' National Park would be an economic asset to Minnesota?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 62 |
| No | 24 |

11. Do you believe the U.S. Post Office Department should have the authority to declare printed matter obscene, thus nonmailable?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 74 |
| No | 19 |

12. Do you believe the 10 percent surtax should be—

| | |
|---|---|
| Continued until inflation is under control? | 53 |
| Removed this year under any circumstances? | 37 |

13. In regard to the electoral college, would you—

| | |
|---|---|
| Keep present system? | 11 |
| Abolish it and elect the President by direct popular vote? | 69 |
| Apportion the electoral vote of each State on the basis of each candidate's vote in that State? | 14 |
| Award electoral votes by congressional districts? | 6 |

14. Which selective service proposal do you favor—

| | |
|---|---|
| Continuing the present system? | 28 |
| A draft lottery at age 18? | 26 |
| A volunteer career military service? | 43 |

15. Do you favor the appointment of Federal judges for a definite term of years, subject to reappointment?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 76 |
| No | 14 |

16. Do you believe legislation is needed to properly protect automobile insurance policy holders?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 80 |
| No | 11 |

17. Do you feel the President is exercising good leadership in his efforts to reduce world tensions?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 71 |
| No | 13 |

18. Considered the greatest problems facing our Nation today were, in order: Vietnam, Inflation, Law & Order, Student Unrest, and Low Rural Income.

---

## PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD HOLD ASSAULT ON JOB CORPS

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, when the Nixon administration first leaked its intent to smear those Job Corps centers scheduled for closing, I issued my challenge for the President to reveal his information rather than just hint at the shocking extent of scandal in an effort to frighten off persons interested in saving the program. The matter of scandal in the Job Corps was handled in the same "if you only knew what we knew" strategy being perpetrated by this administration.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent comment of Columnist Carl T. Rowan who addressed himself to the subject of the Nixon assault on the Job Corps. The column appeared in the May 18 Sunday Washington Star.

The column follows:

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD HALT ASSAULT ON JOB CORPS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

It surely reflects no credit on the Nixon administration that it has begun to leak "horror" stories to the press to justify closing 59 Job Corps centers.

But, just as many Job Corps supporters expected, the governmental hatchet artists have leaked "secret" reports of rape, narcotics use, homosexuality, larceny, and theft by Job Corps trainees. The obvious ploy is to build up enough resentment among "decent" Americans to force silence on the part of Congressmen who are trying to convince President Nixon to leave the centers open.

Now what about the "secret" reports that are so full of horror stories?

As director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver was acutely aware that Job Corps trainees had not been recruited directly from Sunday school. Many of these youngsters were from the toughest ghetto areas where violence, theft, sexual assault are not exactly a rarity. Knowing that some serious misbehavior was inevitable, Shriver set up inspection teams to uncover it immediately so that the Job Corps and OEO could take necessary corrective actions.

This is the information that Labor Department officials were referring to in what Rep. Carl D. Perkins, D.-Ky., called "the lowest-down press release I ever saw in my life."

Labor Department officials have subsequently disavowed the leak, no doubt because instead of producing a sanctimonious cry of outrage against the Job Corps it produced angry indignation on the part of people who consider the "rape-homosexuality" ploy a shabby way to buttress a bad decision.

The National Council of Catholic Women, Church Women United, the National Council of Negro Women, and the National Council of Jewish Women issued a statement saying that "circulation of such stories is an immoral tactic which blatantly damages the reputation of every young woman who ever attended the Job Corps." They commended "the courage and compassion of those Senators who have introduced a resolution to prevent the mass shutdown of Job Corps centers."

Even the National Police Conference on Police Athletic League and Youth Activities, hardly a "bleeding liberal" organization, jumped into the fray with both feet.

Capt. Harry Untereiner, executive director of the group, referred to 200 boys enrolled in a police training school at the Camp Kilmer, N.J., Job Corps center. He said not one of the "horror" incidents described in the Labor Department leak had occurred at this school.

He said the Police Athletic League has dealt with socially deprived and economically depressed boys and girls for over 25 years and it knows that early misbehavior stems from their social environment.

Noting that "Job Corps was not formed . . . to train the upper middle class, the wealthy or rich," Untereiner said that, nonetheless, "if we look at the suburban areas of our metropolitan centers, we will find there is more drug addiction, homosexuality, and other sex offenses committed proportionately in those areas than there is on or near Job Corps centers."

At the Kilmer center in 1967 there were no rape cases; the FBI reported 5,306 rapes among 16 to 21-year-olds in the nation as a whole. There were 22 narcotics violations at Kilmer as against 48,806 in the same age group as a whole. There were 71 assault cases among the 2,100 Kilmer trainees and 25,875 in the general 16-21 population. There were 65 cases of larceny-theft at Kilmer and 142,995 in the broader population, estimated at 20,640,300 in the 16-21 category.

While the Administration fumbles for ways to defend its decision, thousands of youths are drifting back to areas where they are really likely to produce some horror stories. Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz has said only 800 youngsters have dropped out since the announcement that 59 centers would be closed. An OEO source says 4,500 have dropped out.

Shultz says 1,400 Job Corps enrollees have been placed in other manpower programs. Telegrams going to Perkins's office say it isn't so and isn't likely to be so because many of the youngsters cannot qualify for other manpower programs.

All this disruption comes just when the Job Corps was making inroads with the craft unions, long an impregnable barrier to the entry of newcomers, Negroes especially, into various trades. The Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America has entered contracts with 38 centers, guaranteeing apprenticeships for Job Corps trainees. Similar pacts had been made with the AFL-CIO Marine Cooks and Stewards Union, the

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the International Union of Operating Engineers, and the Kentucky State Building Trades Council.

In the name of economy, or puritanism, or something, someone has sold President Nixon a very bad bill of goods. He ought to renounce it immediately.

## TRIBUTE TO THE STEUBEN SOCIETY

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben Society of America, celebrating its 50th anniversary, has a long and proud history of service to our Nation. Composed of Americans of German descent, it was formed on principles emulating those of Gen. Freidrich Wilhelm von Steuben, for whom the society is named.

The organization was formed in 1919 for the purpose of promoting everything that is good in German character and culture, and that might accrue to the benefit and welfare of the whole American Nation. Its basic principles are on the highest level of loyalty, patriotism, and devotion to the American Nation. Its creed perhaps best illustrates the principle to which this organization has been devoted:

One country—A country so fair, tolerant and just that all who live in it, may love it.

One flag—An American flag for American purposes only.

One language—The language of truth spoken in any tongue in which one chooses to speak it.

The aims and purposes of this society are on the highest plane of patriotism, of devotion, and of service to America. They stand for the aid and support of the American Constitution, for aid in defending the independence and sovereignty of the United States, for urging its members to participate in all phases of national life, for offering guidance to its members in making them better citizens.

The society has adopted the name of General von Steuben in continuation of the principles and ideals of this great general. Often referred to as "maker of the American Army" General von Steuben was a Revolutionary War hero who became Inspection General of the American Continental Army.

General von Steuben was born and educated in Germany and served in the forces of King Frederick the Great of Prussia. Recruited by Benjamin Franklin in Paris, he traveled to the American colony in 1778, and immediately joined George Washington at Valley Forge. There he undertook the training of the American forces, and prepared the "Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States," which became the handbook of the Continental Army.

The year before his honorable discharge from the Army in 1784, he was made an American citizen by the Pennsylvania Legislature. Through his influence in converting the American Army into an effective and highly disciplined military force, he was an indispensible figure in the achievement of American independence. Because of his dedication to America and to the principles of liberty, the German-American society adopted his name, and, during a half century of loyalty, patriotism, and love for the United States, it has brought additional honor to this great man's memory.



## DOUGLAS TAX FRAUD

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Justice Bill Douglas' involvement with tax-exempt foundations and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions finds his tax-free income source jeopardized by tax deficiencies and fraud penalties. "Good behavior" can hardly be construed to include this.

There is only one solution for Mr. Justice Douglas—follow the example of his brother, Fortas, and resign.

When a Supreme Court Justice has disgraced the Court, why should he insist on such formalities as impeachment?

I include in the RECORD a news clipping from the Washington Daily News:

[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 crops," 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 determination 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 has 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.

## LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS PROTESTS JOB CORPS CLOSING

### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Bartlesville, Okla., has joined the growing number of individuals and groups who believe 59 of our Job Corps centers should not be closed.

Mrs. Walter Cox, president of the league in Bartlesville has written me to express the league's position, and some very good points are made. I would like to have this statement by the League of Women Voters of Bartlesville appear in the RECORD, and I would particularly like to call attention to the league's concern that provisions be made for all enrollees if the centers are to be closed.

The letter follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF BARTLESVILLE,
*Bartlesville, Okla., May 16, 1969.*

Re opposition to abrupt closing of Job Corps centers.

HON. ED EDMONDSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. EDMONDSON: The League of Women Voters of Bartlesville opposes the abrupt

closing of 59 Job Corps Centers on July 1. We are aware that these centers have been experimental but have supported them as a means to try to provide equal opportunity for education and employment to the disadvantaged. It seems unrealistic to assume that adequate replacement facilities could be set up by July 1. We feel that it is important that the training programs which have been started be continued and that all enrollees have a place to go when the present centers are closed.

We know that you have opposed closing of the two centers in Oklahoma. Your concern for this program and the other anti-poverty measures has the support of the Bartlesville League.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. WALTER COX,
*President, Bartlesville League of Women Voters.*

## SERIOUS GAPS IN OUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

### HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the great lipservice that is being paid to educational goals on all levels, the squeeze grows tighter in the educational field. There must be a greater understanding on all levels of the problems involved. Recently, I touched upon some of these matters in an address to the Student Financial Aid Administrators of the State and City Universities of New York.

The text of my address follows:

SERIOUS GAPS IN OUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS

(Address of Hon. BERTRAM L. PODELL, before the Student Financial Aid Administrators of the State and City Universities of New York, State University Conference Center, Oyster Bay, L.I., New York, May 16, 1969)

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be with you this morning. And I am particularly pleased to be addressing an audience which shares so deeply with me the interest and involvement in higher education as you do. Never have the problems of our colleges and universities been more critical than they are today. Enrollments have increased by nearly 4 million students in the past decade. Today some 7.5 million students are attending our colleges and universities and more than 700,000 of these students are here in New York. The expression "college squeeze" can now be taken literally.

But the rapid increase in numbers is only one aspect of higher education's growth. The functions and the activities of the colleges have greatly expanded. We expect our colleges and universities not only to train the professionals needed in government, industry, education, science and medicine, but we expect them to invest greater energy in public service functions, to concentrate more of their resources on the solution of many of our social problems. We also expect them to conduct research in nearly every possible area, especially those areas considered to be of national interest.

As you know, this expansion of higher education in terms of both quantity and quality has been expensive. Inflation has aggravated the problem. And it is likely that higher education costs per student will continue to rise. It is true that tuitions have been raised at a startling rate. But it is also true that income from tuition and fees is paying for a smaller and smaller percentage of overall college costs. I think that it has become apparent that institutions can not realistically look to this source of income to meet their costs. As one college president put it, mounting tuition costs are "pricing us out of the market . . . we are reaching a point of diminishing returns." The effect is, of course, that of putting college beyond the reach of a larger and larger segment of our college-age population.

The institutions rightfully look to the State governments and to the Federal government for greater levels of support. The States are making an impressive effort. In 1968–69 the States appropriated some $4.5 billion for colleges and universities. This is nearly a 40% increase over 2 years ago and a 224% increase over an 8 year period. New York kept pace with a 37% increase over 1966–67 expenditures.

There are, of course, the private sources of support and it has not been proven that these have been tapped to their fullest. Corporate philanthropy currently represents a small percentage of institutional income. Apparently alumni, and presumably those in corporate positions as well, are fairly ignorant of the financial situation of our institutions of higher learning.

A special study conducted by the council for financial aid revealed that "82 percent of persons in managerial positions or the professions do not consider American business to be an important source of gift support for colleges and universities. 59 percent of persons with incomes of $10,000 or over do not think higher education has financial problems. 52 percent of college graduates apparently are not aware that their alma mater has financial problems." This is certainly a discouraging revelation but I think it gives the institutions an indication of a serious communications gap which needs to be corrected.

Some publicity has been given to the opportunities some institutions have to increase their endowment income substantially through bolder investment policies. Attention has also been given to the effectiveness of successfully employing stricter management practices in higher education administration. There probably is room for improvement in both of these areas, but neither is going to provide the broad base of support which our institutions are going to require.

It is not surprising that the Congress recognized some time ago that the Federal Government had the responsibility to assist substantially in the financial support of colleges and universities to assure the Nation with an increasing supply of highly educated manpower resources. Through the assistance provided under the Morrill Acts and related legislation the State universities and land grant colleges developed into some of the most outstanding institutions in the world. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 grants and loans were made available for the construction of graduate and undergraduate academic facilities.

But I believe that colleges and universities and the respective higher education associations made their strongest case and elicited the broadest support in 1965, with the passage of the Higher Education Act. It is, to be sure, something of a piecemeal approach but it attacks some of higher education's most pressing problems. It also demonstrates to an unprecedented degree the realization that higher education constitutes a precious national resource essential not only to the achievement of our national goals but also to the achievement of the personal aspirations of our individual citizens.

The purpose of this legislation as set forth in the law is "to provide financial assistance for students in post-secondary and higher education." It is the latter part of this statement which I would like to examine, the provision of financial assistance for post-secondary and higher education. The student assistance programs of title IV of the higher education act are not the first, although I do think they reflect a new direction.

For 10 years graduate and undergraduate students have been taking advantage of NDEA loans. Graduate students have also had the availability of NDEA fellowships. The purpose of both of these programs was to make higher education and post-baccalaureate education available to a greater number of young people. But I've always had the impression that it was the need, underscored by the Russian sputnik success, for the more college trained people and better elementary and secondary teachers which was the primary reason for which these programs were enacted.

The tone of the discussion on broadening the access to higher education seems to have changed during the 60's. It seemed to become more generally accepted that equality of opportunity was impossible without equality of educational opportunity, that equality of educational opportunity does not truly exist when it depends on family income.

Russell Thackery, the executive secretary-treasurer of the association of State universities and land-grant colleges used these words:

"What I hold as an article of educational faith, of faith in democracy, of faith in this country, is that we ought to provide the maximum degree of equality of opportunity. No man or group of men is wise enough to judge the heights to which an individual may rise, the contributions he or she may make, if given the chance . . . the men and women of a century ago, in a country torn by internal dissension to the point that its existence was threatened; bankrupt and dependent on printing press money, had the courage to give away vast areas of the public domain in the faith that education of young people was a better investment by far than the hope that a huge land speculation might some time balance the budget. I hope and believe that we have the same courage and faith to meet the opportunity of the 1960's."

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson lent the weight of their support to the movement to expand educational opportunity and made numerous recommendations to the Congress some of which have subsequently been enacted into law. The major programs, of course, were included under title IV of the Higher Education Act. The work-study program, initiated by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was expanded by the law and transferred to the U.S. Office of Education. A new program of insured loans was introduced as well as a program of educational opportunity grants. I think that there is a certain validity to this "package" approach which you would certainly be able to verify. But it seems to me that the availability of several different forms of student assistance gives greater flexibility in meeting the individual financial needs of the students.

There have been many legitimate questions asked about the effectiveness and operation of our present programs of student assistance, I have heard people ask, for example, about the NDEA student loans. I, personally have heard little but praise for this program. It appears to me to be highly successful. By fiscal year 1968 over 400,000 students were receiving student loans. And a study of Federal student loan programs last year, conducted by the college entrance examination board, indicated clearly that the NDEA loans are being utilized by students from the lower income groups as was intended. In 1966 over half of the student borrowers came from families with incomes of less than $6,000 a year.

Regarding the teacher "forgiveness" provisions of the program it appears to be a fairly popular aspect of the program. There have been some recommendations that the cancellation provision be eliminated and others that it be expanded. The 1968 amendments leave existing law unaffected except

that while the NDEA loan program was extended for 3 years, the loan forgiveness feature was only extended for 2. Until more effective means are developed to encourage the entrance of qualified students into the teaching profession I would strongly urge the retention of the loan forgiveness provision. However, over the long haul I am convinced that educational excellence will not be achieved until we are able to pay teachers the high level salaries their professional services require.

Another aspect of student assistance programs which was discussed in regard to the higher education amendments of 1968 and which I imagine is of no little concern to you is the allotment formulas for these programs. The distribution of educational opportunity grant and NDEA student loan funds is based on the number of full-time college students enrolled in the State. One-third of work-study funds are also allotted on this basis. I am pleased to report New York has not done badly under this system. In fiscal year 1968 under the educational opportunity grant program more institutions in New York received more money to assist more students than any other State in the country. 147 of our schools received allocations of nearly $11 million and aided nearly 21,000 students, as compared with 121 institutions in California which received $8.2 million to aid 16,000 students.

That the use of a State's full-time enrollment as a basis for the distribution of student aid funds is not the only or necessarily the best formula as suggested by some of the proposed higher education amendments in 1968. The House version of the higher education amendments would have changed the present State allotment formula to an allotment based on institution requests. It seems to me that so doing would help to eliminate the disparity which exists between the amounts institutions are requesting and the amounts they are actually receiving. Under existing law when allotted funds are insufficient to meet all approved institutional requests, institutions in some States receive a greater proportion of their approved requests than institutions in other States. How successfully a distribution of funds on an institutional request basis would have worked is a moot question because the proposal did not survive the House-Senate conference on the bill.

A House amendment which did survive the 1968 conference and one which must simplify many lives is the new institutional matching requirement. The '68 amendments consolidate the maintenance-of-effort provisions of the College Work-Study and the Educational Opportunity Grant programs. Previously each program had separate provisions governing maintenance-of-effort requirements. Effective July 1, 1969 an institution participating in these 2 programs need only provide assurance that it will continue to spend in its scholarship and student assistance programs not less than the average annual expenditure for such purposes during the most recent 3 year period prior to the date of agreement.

I am pleased that colleagues like myself exhibited forceful enough strength so that the 1968 amendments also took action on a problem which has plagued all of our educational institutions for years—the uncertainty as to when and how much Federal funds would be available to them under the various education programs. The 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments authorized advance funding of ESEA programs and on an academic year basis. The '68 higher education amendments provide for one-year advance funding for all programs under the Higher Education Act, the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act. They also provide that appropriated funds be made available for expenditure by the institution on a school year rather than a fiscal year basis. Of course in order to make advance funding accomplish its purpose, Congress is going to have to make 2 appropriations in one year. That should take place this year for all education programs. Unfortunately, it is proposed by the administration in only one major program for 1971.*

One problem relating to the funding of education programs generally, including the student aid programs, is the authorization *versus* appropriation problem. When Congress authorizes funds for a given year and for succeeding years an effort is made to indicate the extent of educational needs. It is disappointing to me that the appropriations never seem to approach the sums indicated as the level of need in the authorizing legislation.

Now the President has offered a budget for the fiscal year beginning this July 1st which takes a step backward. I am very disappointed that we are asked to maintain last year's level of funding of student aid programs. The time is not for maintenance but for desperately needed expansion and extension of educational opportunity as a national goal.

The budget cuts are especially disappointing to those of us in Congress who have worked hard for expanded educational opportunity. In March of this year I introduced a measure, H.R. 9626, later refined by H.R. 11275 to help lower the financial barriers which prevent many capable and deserving students from pursuing their educations. My bill would amend the Higher Education Act to double the maximum amount of an educational opportunity grant from $1,000 to $2,000 and would reduce the minimum grant to $100 a year. In terms of rising tuition costs and the limited financial capability of low-income students I believe that this expansion is of absolute necessity.

In regard for my concern in the serious gaps that exist for student assistance I have introduced legislation paralleling that introduced by Senator Mondale in the Senate.

This bill would among other things add to title IV of the Higher Education Act a new program of student opportunity grants. As I propose it this program would differ from the educational opportunity grants in a number of ways. The maximum student opportunity grant would be $1,500 as opposed to the maximum educational opportunity grant of $1,000. Also it would be for part-time as well as full-time study at not only the undergraduate level but also at the post-secondary vocational, and the graduate and professional levels. In addition, the new program would not require the 50–50 matching of Federal funds which the educational opportunity grant program does. However, the new program would provide cost-of-education allowances to the institutions which enroll student opportunity grantees. This is intended to alleviate somewhat the need of the institution to increase tuition charges.

It would further establish a higher education loan bank as a private nonprofit corporation whose purpose would be to provide loans guaranteed by the Federal Government for post-secondary vocational, undergraduate, graduate, and professional study. The bank would make loans directly to the students, unlike the NDEA and guaranteed loan programs. At present it is difficult for students to obtain guaranteed loans from banks and other lenders. Students under this program would have 30 years to repay the higher education loans.

There is one last point I would like to mention briefly and it concerns the current student unrest which is plaguing so many of our colleges. I believe that it is very easy to overreact to the tactics and violence of these outbursts and be so indignant that we fail to investigate with a clear head the underlying causes for such outbreaks. I hate the classifications of "hard-liner" and "soft-liner" because I firmly believe that there is no room within the academic community for violence or the destruction of property or the denial of the rights of others to continue their educations. I do believe that students who place themselves outside of the academic community through the use of such tactics are subject to appropriate discipline and I believe that such discipline must be determined and administered by the institution, or where appropriate, the local law enforcement agencies.

I hate to see the Federal Government intrude into the internal workings of the university to punish students or local misdemeanants. I rather align myself with the remarks of President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard that if there is an answer to prevent disorders "the answer to this has to come from within the university community itself . . . I think it has to come from the students and faculty primarily and it will come only as these groups, themselves, come to see that this kind of disrupting activity is something that can't be tolerated. . . ." To add to Pusey's wisdom I would say that I conceive a resolution of the student unrest issue in the actions and behavior of the 97% of the student body who will and are cooperating in the academic thrust of institutional life. I really do not see that the withholding of Federal student assistance will prevent future disorders.

You, as professionals in direct contact with student and faculty efforts are, of course, indispensable if order is to be achieved. And I applaud what I have perceived of your dedication. Within the university we have always encouraged the frank expression of views and cherished freedom of speech and opinion. I am confident that order will be restored to the academic community without sacrificing educational opportunity.

* Title I ESEA.

## MASONIC DAY—A MOMENTOUS OCCASION

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on a stormy day, April 19, 1969, at Richmondtown, Staten Island, I was privileged to be the principal speaker at an otherwise colorful pageant held by several thousand Masons. The historic conclave marked the dedication of the Richmond Masonic Museum and Masonic Library which will be a cultural, educational, and historic facet to the people of the State of New York. Freemasonry is one of the world's oldest fraternities and Masons have played an important part in the formation of our Nation. Therefore, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program from that momentous day and a revealing history of Freemasonry on Staten Island.

On April 19, 1969, Saturday afternoon, a large Masonic Conclave took place in the Richmond Masonic District (Staten Island, N.Y.). This convocation of Free and Accepted Masons was the first in a year long program of auspicious events which would culminate in the dedicative ceremony of the Richmond District Masonic Museum and Library sometime in 1970. Both the conclave and the mu-

seum were and will be respectively located in the Richmondtown restoration area. The program included the opening of a meeting in the old courthouse on Center Street by the American Lodge of Research F. & A. M. under the acting master, R.W. Arthur Brown, and R.W. Dominick M. Rufulo, Sr. Warden. The general chairman of the Masonic conclave and the museum-library project was R.W. Alexander A. Bleimann, the present district deputy grand master of the Richmond Masonic District. There were present the M.W. Charles Francis Gosnell, grand master of masons in the State of New York, with his grand marshall LaVerne W. Getman; the deputy grand master R.W. William R. Knapp with his deputy grand marshall (acting) R.W. Albert G. Pfluger; the grand secretary R.W. Wendell K. Walker. The metropolitan district deputy grand masters association was represented by R.W. Arthur W. Julier, R.W. John F. Dams, R.W. Max L. Kamiel, R.W. Alexander A. Bleimann, R.W. Calvin Raff, R.W. Milton R. Goldman, R.W. Harold F. Presley, R.W. John V. Flockhart Sr. Several grand lodge officers were also present with grand representatives.

Director of arrangements R.W. Pasquale J. Lombardi, grand steward of the grand lodge of New York; program director and master of ceremony Alfred J. Cawse, Jr.; protocol chief W. Victor D. Lederhandler; chief of security William Reycraft and W. Milton Jirak; historian R.W. Wilbur L. Decker; director of finance W. Phillip DePaul.

The masonic conclave was under the sponsorship of the Richmond Masonic Association whose officers are: W. John W. Wall, president; W. Samuel T. Weening, vice-president; W. Victor D. Lederhandler, 2nd vice-president; R.W. Wilbur L. Decker, secretary; W. John W. Davis, treasurer.

Also present were the sitting masters of the nine masonic lodges. W. Paul T. Framhein, Jr., Richmond lodge; W. Everett M. Hannah, Huguenot lodge; W. Melvin L. Kirby, Tompkins lodge; W. Harrison J. Laemmerhirt, Beacon Light lodge; W. Michael Daum, Aquehonga lodge; W. Nathan Giventer, Great Kills lodge; W. H. Arnold Johnson, New Dorp lodge; W. Fred Cericola Jr., LaGuardia lodge; W. Conrad H. Eriksson, Klopstock lodge.

The famous Daniel S. Tompkins Holy Bible was used to adorn the altar during the opening and closing ceremonies of the meeting of the American Lodge of Research F. & A.M. The Bible is at present owned by Tompkins Lodge of Masons. The Tilers of the Lodgeroom were Asa Eick, Joseph Andriulli, and Emil Baker. The Grand Marshall LaVerne Getman escorted in the Grand Master; the Acting Deputy Grand Marshall A. Pfluger escorted in the Deputy Grand Master; and Bro. Eugene R. Bleimann escorted in the District Deputy Grand Master of the Richmond District.

The Richmond Masonic Glee Club, under the Director, O. William Erikson, and the President David Olson Sr., provided several vocal selections both in the Lodge meeting and during the outdoor public ceremony.

After the closing of the Lodge meeting, a processional began on Center Street directly outside the Old Courthouse led by the Tottenville High School Band under the leadership of Bro. Ray Kirschmeyer. The Tall Cedars of Lebanon, Richmond Forest No. 66, whose Grand Tall Cedar is Rocco D'Angelo, and the Staten Island Shrine Club, whose President is Ruppert Minick, dressed in full organization regalia formed an Honor Guard for the Grand Master.

During the entire afternoon hundreds of Masons and Masonic dignitaries wore masonic regalia and the aprons of highest rank.

At the outdoor ceremony, Mr. Arnold V. Schwartz, President of the Staten Island Historical Society, officially accepted the Masonic Order to create the Masonic Museum and Library under the Director of the Richmondtown Restoration Program, Mr. Loring McMillen.

Congressman John M. Murphy was one of the principal speakers as was the Honorable Robert T. Connor, Borough President of Richmond, who also presented the Richmond Masonic Association with a Borough Presidential Proclamation, designating April 19, 1969, the first day of Masonic Week. Other speakers were R.W. Alexander A. Bleimann and M.W. Charles F. Gosnell. After the program was completed, a Grand Chaplain of the Grand Lodge of New York, Navy Commander and Rabbi William Kloner pronounced the benediction.

The following treatise is the historical account and background of Masonic activities on Staten Island for nearly two hundred years, as summarized by the Historian; on April 19, 1969:

Most Worshipful Brother Charles F. Gosnell, Officers of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, Honorable Robert T. Connor, Borough President, Honorable John M. Murphy, Congressman, brethren and friends.

We are gathered here today for a momentous occasion which will long be remembered by all and in the annals of Freemasonry throughout the State of New York.

Freemasonry is one of the oldest fraternities which has existed since Biblical times reverting to the building of King Solomon's temple, on Mount Moriah by Operative Masons.

The modern era of speculative Masonry began with the formation of the Grand Lodge of England in the year of 1717.

In the history of our country, Masons have played an important part in its formation.

Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 53 were Masons.

During the War of Independence—Staten Island was a tory stronghold, on which over 75 regiments of British soldiers were stationed at various times. Every regiment with one or two exceptions had their own Masonic lodge working under warrants granted by the Grand lodges of Ireland, Scotland and England.

The following British military Masonic lodges were stationed on Staten Island, New York after 1754:

*Royal Regiment of Artillery, 4th Battalion*—Composed of nine companies, five of which were stationed on Staten Island: Company No. 35, Company No. 36, Company No. 38, Company No. 39, Company No. 42.

The Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients") issued warrant No. 209, Feb. 16th, 1779 to establish a lodge in this battalion. There is no record of the lodge after 1779.

The Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients") also issued a warrant No. 213, July 3, 1781 to brethren in this battalion, and the lodge was constituted in New York on October 18, 1781.

*The 17th Light Dragoons (Duke of Cambridge's Own Lancers)*— Stationed on Staten Island 1776, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, Oct. 5, 1769 as Lodge No. 478. Joined Provincial Grand Lodge of N.Y. in 1782, and continued in existence until 1795; warrant cancelled in 1817.

The *7th Regiment, Royal Fusiliers*—Stationed on Staten Island in 1777, Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, April 1, 1752, No. 231.

The *10th Regiment, Lincolnshire Regiment*—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant on August 3, 1758, No. 299.

The *17th Regiment. The Leicestershire Regiment*—Stationed on Staten Island 1776. Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant June 24, 1743, No. 136. Grand Lodge of Scotland Warrant Nov. 12, 1771, No. 168/169. "Unity Lodge." The warrant, now in possession of Union Lodge No. 5, G. R., Delaware, at Middleton, bears the number 169.

The 22nd Regiment. The Cheshire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island 1776—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, Nov. 28, 1754, No. 251, and a duplicate of this warrant was issued on Na. 6, 1791, to replace the original which according to the Grand Lodge Register was lost in 1759 on the Mississippi River. The warrant was lost probably at Roche D'Avons in 1764, when the regiment was ambushed by Indians and practically exterminated.

The 23rd regiment. Royal Welch Fusiliers.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Grand Lodge of Scotland Warrant Jan. 11, 1751, No. 63. Another warrant No. 131 was issued to replace No. 63 which was lost in the Seven Year's War. Captain Edw. Evans was the master in 1767.

The 26th regiment. The Cameronians.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1777—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant, Dec. 7, 1758, No. 309. No. 309 was exchanged for No. 26, in 1823.

The 27th Regiment. Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant in 1733, No. 23, and another warrant on Feb. 7, 1749–1750, No. 205, was issued because No. 23 was probably lost, but turned up when the regiment was in St. Lucia after 1783, and remained on the Grand Lodge Register until 1801.

The 37th Regiment. Hampshire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients" Warrant May 19, 1756, No. 52. The lodge was represented at the inauguration of the Provincial Grand Lodge of New York on 5th December 1732, and at metings of the Provincial Grand Lodge held on Jan. 2 and Feb. 5, 1783.

The 40th Regiment. South Lancashire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Grand Lodge of England ("Ancients") Warrant: 1759, No. 42.

The 44th Regiment. Essex Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Provincial Grand Lodge of Quebec in 1760–1762 Warranted, No. 14. Provincial Grand Lodge of Quebec Warrant Sept. 12, 1784, No. 18, registered by Grand Lodge of England ("Moderns") Nov. 15, 1784, No. 467, "Rainsford Lodge", named after a colorful and active Mason, Colonel Charles Rainsford Commander of the Regiment in 1781, and who was Grand Steward of the Grand Lodge of England in 1769.

The 46th Regiment. South Devon Regiment, later the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776—Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant March 4th, 1752, No. 227.

The 52nd Regiment. Osfordshire, Light Infantry.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Grand Lodge of Ireland Warrant August 6, 1761, No. 370.

The 64th Regiment. The North Staffordshire Regiment.—Stationed on Staten Island in 1776. Grand Lodge of Scotland Feb. 2, 1761, No. 106 "Duke of York's Lodge."

In the Period of the Revolution, A Provincial lodge convened in the Old Guyon-Clark Homestead at New Dorp, the Lodge was composed of British Officers and Soldiers, and a few residents of the Island. Meetings were held at intervals until the Evacuation of the British in 1785. These officers, together with Prominent Masons of the City, were entertained at Nautilus Hall. A few years later, a meeting was held at the Home of Governor Daniel D. Tompkins, who was also Grand Master of the State of New York. He had established his Residence on Staten Island and attempted to start a Masonic Lodge on Staten Island. More than a year later a meeting was held at the Home of General Van Buren, in Tompkinsville.

As a result of the meetings and a picnic held on the Lawn of Old Nautilus Hall—Richmond Lodge was formed, the First of the Ten Lodges to be formed on Staten Island.

The First Regular Communication of Richmond Lodge No. 384 was held in Nautilis Hall,

on July 6, 1825, after a few years moved to a Building owned by General Van Buren.

In 1832, Cholera and Yellow Fever scourged the Island from end to end, and it was necessary for the Lodge to close its Doors until the frost removed the Epidemic.

In 1839 Richmond Lodge was Granted a New Charter and became No 66 instead of 384.

In 1849 Richmond Lodge surrendered its Charter but did not entirely disband. Meetings were held in Members Homes and Reorganization was discussed.

On March 21, 1851, Richmond Lodge Reorganized and met at the home of Bro. George T. Swaine, opposite the Dutch Reformed Church in Port Richmond. The Lodge erected a Temple at the corner of Richmond Avenue and Bennett Street, Port Richmond which was dedicated in 1898. Here the Lodge remained until a New Temple was erected on Anderson Avenue, Port Richmond in 1925. Hit a fatal Blow by the Depression, the Lodge was forced to give up the Temple and moved to "The Odd Fellows Hall" on Harrison Avenue, Port Richmond and now meet in their own Temple located at 789 Post Avenue, West Brighton, Staten Island.

TOMPKINS LODGE NO. 471

The Second of the Lodges on Staten Island was Tompkins Lodge No. 471. A Warrant was issued on December 6, 1853 authorizing the opening of the Lodge at Stapleton, Staten Island. The First Meeting was held in the Old Tompkins Lyceum located at a spot later occupied by the German Club Rooms. In 1856, they moved to Masonic Hall located at what was then Front & Minthorne Streets in Tompkinsville. A year later the Building was destroyed by fire and the Lodge lost everything. On March 31, 1859, a new Dispensation was granted and a meeting was held on April 5, 1859, in Tompkins Lyceum. In the following year it moved to the Weed Building on the West side of Griffin Street and in May 1966 to Egbert Hall and on May 1, 1876 into the Tynan's Building and Occupied the present Temple at Bay and Sands Streets Stapleton Staten Island in 1901.

HUGUENOT LODGE NO. 381

The Third of the Lodges on Staten Island was Huguenot Lodge No. 381. It was instituted on May 19, 1855 and met in the Odd Fellows Hall, on Amboy Road. In 1859 the Lodge moved to the Chapel of St. Pauls Methodist Church until 1883 when rooms were procured over Fisher's Drug Store at Main & Arthur Kill Road, then met in the Knights of Pythias Hall and in 1909 moved to their present Temple on Main Street, Tottenville, Staten Island.

AQUAHONGA LODGE NO. 685

The Fourth of the Lodges on Staten Island was Aquahonga Lodge No. 685, (Not to be confused with Aquehonga Lodge No. 906) was granted a Charter in 1868, and surrendered it in 1887. The First meeting place was in the Grand Jury Room at Richmond. Later the Lodge moved to New Dorp to a Building owned and occupied by Henry A. LaVaud at New Dorp Lane and Richmond Road, later moved back to Richmond in a building opposite St. Andrews Church. There is no record of the reason for the surrender of the Charter.

BEACON LIGHT LODGE NO. 701

The Fifth of the Lodges on Staten Island was Beacon Light Lodge No. 701, on June 15, 1870, Beacon Light Lodge was awarded its Charter and met at the "Old Athletic Club Building" located on the waterside of Richmond Terrace approximately 85 feet East of Broadway, West Brighton, Staten Island, and in 1872 moved into "Village Hall" Lafayette Street, New Brighton, Staten Island until 1942 during the Second World War was forced to find new Quarters and moved to Tompkins Temple, Stapleton, Staten Island and moved to Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island in 1966, its present meeting place.

KLOPSTOCK LODGE NO. 760

The Sixth Lodge located on Staten Island was Klopstock Lodge No. 760, Instituted in 1875, first met in Tynan's Building and later moved to Tompkins Lodge Room, Stapleton, Staten Island and presently meets at Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island.

Although a Part of the Ninth Manhattan District, Klopstock Lodge has played an important part in Staten Island Masonry and has always been considered one of our Group.

AQUEHONGA LODGE NO. 906

The Seventh Lodge located on Staten Island was Aquehonga Lodge No. 906, Instituted on May 13, 1913 and met at Tompkins Masonic Temple, Stapleton, Staten Island now meet at Richmond Masonic Hall, West Brighton, Staten Island.

GREAT KILLS LODGE NO. 912

The Eighth Lodge located on Staten Island was Great Kills Lodge No. 912, Instituted on January 12, 1914 and met at 22 Hillside Terrace, Great Kills, Staten Island until their own Temple was completed in 1926. Like Richmond Lodge the Depression put too great a strain upon their finances for them to be able to hold the Building. Heroic effort on the part of the Officers and Members happily brought it back into their possession.

NEW DORP LODGE NO. 1092

The Ninth Lodge located on Staten Island was New Dorp Lodge No. 1092, Instituted on June 18, 1928 met at Miller's Hall on Amboy Road. At the time of its Institution it was known as "Sojourners" Lodge, a name later changed to Fort Wadsworth Lodge and still later to "New Dorp Lodge". In 1929 moved to Koch's Hallon New Dorp Lane and Second Street until 1947 when it moved to Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island.

LA GUARDIA LODGE NO. 1130

The Tenth Lodge located on Staten Island was LaGuardia Lodge No. 1130. In 1949, nearly a Century and a quarter after the beginning of Organised Masonry on Staten Island, a Dispensation was granted to form a New Lodge to be known as LaGuardia Lodge after Fiorrello LaGuardia former Mayor of New York City. It was instituted on June 17, 1949 and met at Great Kills Temple, Great Kills, Staten Island and later moved to Richmond Masonic Hall, West Brighton, Staten Island.

We have a number of Masonic Landmarks on Staten Island but we consider the following as most important:

Stapleton Masonic Temple, 514 Bay Street, Stapleton, Staten Island.

Tottenville Masonic Temple, 236 Main Street, Tottenville, Staten Island.

Great Kills Masonic Temple, 4095 Amboy Road, Great Kills, Staten Island.

Richmond Masonic Hall, 789 Post Avenue, West Brighton, Staten Island.

CYO Building. Formerly "Richmond Masonic Temple," Anderson Avenue, Port Richmond, Staten Island.

Village Hall, Lafayette Street, West Brighton, Staten Island (Home of Beacon Light Lodge for over 70 years).

The Garibaldi-Meucci Memorial Museum, Rosebank, Staten Island.

Our National Landmark is the "George Washington Memorial" in Alexandria, Virginia, to which every New York Mason supports.

The nearest thing to a New York Mason's heart which is supported by all, is our "Masonic Home in Utica," New York for our Elderly Brethren, their wives and widows and the Orphans of Masons, by our contributions to the "Masonic Brotherhood Fund." On the Grounds of the Home we also have a Research Laboratory, researching the diseases of the aged on "Geriatrics."

WILBUR L. DECKER,
*Historian, Richmond Masonic District Museum and Library Historical Society.*

## HOUSING PROGRAM

## HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we Members of Congress get letters from constituents that demonstrate such a clear understanding of a particular matter and make such an urgent and rational appeal to the Congress to be concerned with the problems that we are tempted to share the letter with other Members.

I have received such a letter from Mr. Robert L. Kahn, Multifamily and Special Projects Division of the United Homes Corp. His concern is one that a great many of us in this Congress share; making a program work to assure adequate housing for the elderly, the infirm, the poor and, very importantly, the families in the $5,000 to $8,000 income bracket. As Mr. Kahn points out, we have a promising program. But the program is of only minor value if it is not funded adequately.

Mr. Kahn also underlines a point that is of increasing concern to me; the way in which Congress will authorize programs that hold out great hope for solving some of our emergent social problems and then renege on the "promise" when appropriations time comes. We do it again and again.

Finally, this letter points up the real dilemma that we Members of Congress have to deal with. If we must cut Federal spending in order to help fight inflation, what do we cut and how much? It is not an easy problem as we all know. Many, on the outside looking in at us trying to make these decisions, do not understand the complexity of the problem.

But Mr. Kahn's letter presents an argument on behalf of his program that is worth attention.

For all these reasons, and because Mr. Kahn has done his homework, I insert his letter in the RECORD and urge each Member of Congress to take the time to read it with care:

UNITED HOMES CORP.,
*May 10, 1969.*

The Honorable LLOYD MEEDS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: We are now processing an application for an F.H.A. Section 236 rental housing, interest subsidy, loan through the Seattle F.H.A. Insuring office for a 220 unit project at Everett, Washington, within one mile of the new Boeing Plant. In addition, we are in process of having zoned a 35 acre parcel in Portland, Oregon, which we have under option, for 500 units of similar housing. We are also studying the possibilities of erecting two high rise buildings, one in the Northgate area of Seattle and the other in downtown Tacoma, Washington, for housing for the elderly under Section 236. The total number of units contemplated at this time is over 1200.

By the application of Section 236 we are able to bring well designed rental housing to families in the $5,000–$8,000 earnings bracket within the proper economic limits of not more than 25% of their annual income.

Our most pressing problem at this time is to obtain the letter of feasibility from the F.H.A. on the Everett project. We have made

a proposal and a request for feasibility to the F.H.A. Insuring office in Seattle and according to word received from them they had made such a finding of feasibility substantially as proposed by us and forwarded our papers to Washington, D.C., by way of the San Francisco zone office, for allocations of interest subsidy funds, a prerequisite to issuing a formal letter of feasibility to us.

These papers were received in Washington on March 3, 1969, but prior to their arrival the available funds had been preempted by earlier applications (many of which were in existing 221(d)3 commitments which were being converted to Section 236).

Of 48 requests for feasibility which had been forwarded to Washington by the Seattle office, 35 of them were returned and letters were issued to the applicants similar to the one received by us. This letter notified us that processing had been discontinued and only at such time as new funding was available would the processing continue. This experience, of course, is paralleled throughout the country and there is now a tremendous backlog of applications waiting for new funding.

When the 1968 housing law was passed in August of last year, the Congress authorized $75 million dollars to cover the first year of interest subsidy for projects insured during that fiscal year. The law further stated that an additional $100 million was authorized in the 1969 budget and an additional $150 million in the 1970 budget. However, these are simply legal authority for appropriating the money but do not themselves constitute an appropriation. Congress saw fit last session to appropriate $25 million out of the $75 million allocated.

We are told that H.U.D. Secretary Romney has requested Congress that the additional $50 million dollars authorized for F.Y. 1969 be appropriated immediately and that the $100 million dollars for F.Y. 1970 be included in the new budget. We have received various reports that the supplementary appropriation is now under study and is contemplated to be voted on during the month of May.

It is now so well recognized that there must be some form of subsidized housing for people of low income that most of the large lobbying groups such as the Home Builders Association and the National Association of Real Estate Boards, who in the past have been opposed to public housing, have recommended not only the passage of Section 236, but the appropriations for it.

There have been a number of efforts made over the last 30 years to solve this problem, the best known of which, of course, has been Public Housing. This program has had many drawbacks in the past (which need not be explored at this time) and at the present time is going through the "Turnkey" phase which holds out good promise. However, this only answers the needs of the very lowest income group and does not affect at all that $5,000–$8,000 group which we are discussing. Public Housing pays only a minor portion of the normal Real Estate tax and for that reason is found objectionable by many people. Other avenues, which have been tried recently with some degree of success have been the F.H.A. Below Market Interest Rate Loans and the Rent Supplement Loans. These programs were beginning to achieve some good results but it was felt that the provisions under Section 236 went more directly to the heart of the problem and did not require the vast sums of special appropriations for buying the mortgages through FNMA. Therefore, they are being phased out and no new applications are being processed.

There are only a limited number of ways in which housing costs can be reduced. The end product, the rent which is charged to the tenant, is comprised of a number of factors, the profit to the operator being the least of these. The major items being:

(1) The original cost of construction.
(2) The interest rate.
(3) The real estate taxes.
(4) The operating expenses.
(5) Profit.

Let us explore each of these items:

(1) The cost of construction has been increasing steadily. There are no technological breakthroughs now available to us which will have the necessary impact on costs. The Editors of House & Home have pointed out repeatedly in their editorials that this cannot be looked to as the answer. The best that can be hoped for at this time is sufficient betterment of technique and products to enable us to stay even. For the past several years we have been involved with a 4% annual increase in construction costs.

(2) The interest rate subsidy is by far the best approach as this permits the total population to assist those in need of help on a national basis and does not place the full impact on those given communities where the need is greatest. There is nothing new in this approach as it constitutes the basis for many of the acts of Congress which provide subsidies for many special groups, which in the long run are paid for by the total population.

(3) The reduction of taxes, of course, has been applied in some special cases, notably in housing for the elderly sponsored by nonprofit groups and in the special programs of New York City and New York State where tax abatement is part of their program. If this process is carried too far many local communities having a large elderly population, or being situated in climatic regions which attract retired persons would soon find themselves with a much reduced assessment role resulting in much higher taxes for the relatively small population remaining on the tax roles. Therefore, this approach should not be used on less than a State-wide basis and local communities should receive reimbursement from the State Treasuries where tax exemption has been given.

(4) Operating expenses are a direct result of the costs of labor, utility charges and maintenance material in most cases such expenses are not susceptible to a great deal of downward adjustments regardless of the caliber of professional management. In those cases where better techniques of management are applied it is most likely to result in better maintained or more profitable property, but rarely in a rent reduction to the tenant.

(5) The last of these, the return to the investor is the smallest. In the case of Section 236 we are talking about a 6% limited dividend requirement.

I feel that the urgency of this problem must somehow be made real to the members of Congress. They must understand that their legislative efforts have brought forth a program which will work and which is responsive to the needs of the country, but only if the necessary appropriations are a reality. These appropriations must be compared with other items in the budget and on a proper scale of values a proper sharing of the available monies will result in the speedy passage of the supplementary appropriations bill.

Last week, I attended a Conference of Urban America, Inc., in Seattle. For two days the subject of low rent housing was discussed. Andrew Hess, one of the most productive FHA Directors in the country spoke. Robert Pitt, the Regional Administrator for Zone 6, H.U.D. spoke. All they could tell us was they are stymied—their hands are tied—they have no way of moving without funds being provided. Congress must understand the devastating effect that the on again/off again approach has on the morale of all people working toward solving the low cost housing problem, not only in Government, but also in the private sector. We must be able to plan and use our best efforts with the knowledge that there is some continuity to the effort. Land options must be obtained, plans and market studies must be arranged. Congress must understand the tremendous lead times involved in the production of housing and what a vital factor proper housing is to the solution of our most pressing social problems in the Urban environment. Allocating $200 million dollars to clean up the rubble after the riots is not the answer.

We can only hope that Andrew Hess, Seattle F.H.A. Director, was correct in his summation to his speech last Thursday at the Urban American Conference when he stated that he believes H.U.D. Secretary Romney to be a sincere man, who understands the problem and who speaks with full authority for the Administration in requesting the funds. His second point—The Congress of the United States as presently constituted is fundamentally the same Congress that passed the 1968 Housing Act and that, therefore, we must be optimistic that, in logical sequence, the appropriation of additional funds will become a reality. The audience response to this was, in effect "Well and good, but time is of the essence".

It is our sincere hope you will agree with this statement.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. KAHN,
*Multifamily and Special Projects Division.*

---

## GREATER KANSAS CITY'S CONSTRUCTION STRIKE

---

## HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months the construction industry in the Greater Kansas City area has been halted by crippling strikes. Negotiations have reached an impasse and each day the shutdown continues threatens further economic decline throughout the entire area. The gravity of the situation and some of the insoluble problems contributing to the work stoppage are outlined in a letter I received recently from the Builders' Association of Kansas City and in an editorial from station KCMO. I commend both to my colleagues for their serious consideration:

MAY 2, 1969.

Congressman LARRY WINN, Jr.,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR LARRY: As you are probably aware, we are entering our sixth week of the construction shutdown in the Kansas City area due to strikes by Ironworkers and Painters Unions, which have made exorbitant demands upon our industry.

The Ironworker demands constitute, on a conservative estimate, around $4.20 per hour increase for a one year period, which amounts to an increase in excess of 80%. The manner in which some of the demands are stated makes it quite difficult to put an absolute figure on certain items as they would not apply to every man and to every job situation across the board; but in terms of the overall costs to an employer, they must be taken into account in some form. Although they have stated they are negotiable on some of these items, after five weeks of strike they have not retracted or moved from any of these requests. The Painters have moved from their original demands, but are still seeking increases in excess of $1.35 per hour for one year, which

amounts to nearly 30% increase for a one year period. Under this set of circumstances, there is no likelihood of settlement even with the Painters, so long as the Ironworkers are still out on their impossible demands.

Our Association has felt that these demands were so exorbitant and unrealistic that we could not make an offer anywhere in the realm of what was being demanded. We have assured the Unions that we are willing to grant substantial wage and contract changes if their demands were altered to some degree, whereby meaningful negotiations could be conducted.

The work stoppage which is now occurring in our area has created a hardship on employers, employees, and buyers of construction, as well as the local units of government which have construction projects underway or scheduled under fixed budgetary or bond limitations. It becomes more difficult each passing year for employers, particularly those in the construction industry, to fend off large powerful unions in their quest for inflationary and unwarranted cost increases. It would be much easier and less costly for construction employers to accede to these demands on a limited deferred basis and in a sense "buy" their way out of this dilemma, for in the long run the contractors are basically "middlemen" between the unions and the consuming public. The chain reaction of these increases throughout the building trades in this area will amount to a 40% increase in the cost of construction to the public and to the private purchasers of construction.

In periods of nationwide manpower shortages, and a great volume of construction to be performed in most areas of the United States, there is some feeling of futility in attempting to hold the line against this form of inflation in a single given area at such a great cost and loss to individual small contractors. It would seem that if the Congress has any real intent of checking inflation that it should take some affirmative direct action to prevent such inflationary actions at the grass-roots levels, as well as through indirect filtering down measures of taxes, interest, etc. I am sure that the Kansas City situation is being repeated a number of times in other cities and areas throughout the United States, and our existing economic and bargaining system just does not permit the small businessman, which constitutes the bulk of the construction industry, to effectively cope with the powerful and monopolistic unions. We earnestly urge that the Congress do some soul searching to determine if our country can afford to pay the price of the present trends and insatiable appetite of organized labor if it remains unchecked.

Sincerely yours,

BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF KANSAS CITY.

---

CONSTRUCTION STRIKE

(By E. K. Hartenbower, KCMO vice president and general manager)

Everybody stands to lose in a prolonged construction strike. Weeks drag into months, and Greater Kansas City is now feeling a pinch from the prolonged construction strike by ironworkers, painters and truck drivers.

Although the numbers of strikers and payroll losses are not too accurate, estimates now range between ten and twelve thousand actual strikers, including walkouts at two major plants not involved in the construction dispute. Payroll losses may run as high as two million dollars per week. It must be remembered that numerous strikers have taken other jobs temporarily, and payroll loss figures are far from accurate.

An immediate side effect of the construction shutdown is loss of business by firms supplying material and services to the struck projects. Individual companies are beginning to see very serious losses unless the labor dispute is settled soon. Claims for unemployment pay are not running excessively higher than normal for this time of year. This, however, could change rapidly.

Despite uncertain figures, individual businesses in Greater Kansas City can report visible effects from the strikes. It is hard for general business to bear such effects while not being directly involved in the dispute. A prompt settlement is the only answer.

---

ROBERT D. MORAN

## HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Moran, the new Federal Wage-Hour Administrator of the Department of Labor, gave his thoughtful goals for his program as Administrator at his swearing in ceremony May 5. Mr. Moran, a respected attorney and experienced labor arbitrator is, at age 39, one of the Department's youngest Presidential appointees. I am highly pleased to include his views in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Moran's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT D. MORAN

Today, as I officially assume the position of the Federal Wage-Hour Administrator, I want to convey to those interested in its work my views on the role we will play in carrying out the goals of this Administration. As President Nixon has stated, it is not enough to have laws on the books. What we must do is give them meaning, make them work for the benefit of all our people. My goal as Administrator will be to implement this objective.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was landmark legislation when it was enacted in 1938. In the 31 years of its existence it has made giant strides towards its goal of eliminating "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers." The delicate balances which were incorporated into this law have had the overall effect of increasing the earnings of those working people most in need of help without curtailing job opportunities.

It is my opinion that the Fair Labor Standards Act has enabled more progress to be made in the continuing battle against poverty than any subsequent or previous congressional enactment. I fully support its high purpose and pledge to administer this law—and all others that have been assigned to the Divisions I now head—with vigor, enthusiasm, and impartiality. Effective implementation of the various statutes in this field requires the cooperative efforts of working people, management, government and the public generally. I plan to expend every effort to promote this cooperation.

The new Administration's goal of law and order with justice includes compliance with labor standards laws. We will be vigilant to see that the wages to which workers are entitled will be paid, that equal pay for equal work becomes more than a slogan and that every possible effort is made to eliminate discrimination in employment on account of age.

At the same time I expect to work closely with the vast majority of responsible employers who have readily complied with the minimum standards established by law in the interest of making compliance less of an administrative burden. It is gratifying to know that most employers maintain labor standards far better than those required by law. But we are still plagued with those who would gyp, swindle and shortchange low wage workers as well as many who are honestly uninformed as to their responsibility under the law. We shall strive to protect working people from both.

I shall also be seeking new approaches for improving the administration of the wage and hour laws and I will welcome suggestions in this regard from all interested parties. It will be our combined effort which will determine the effectiveness of this legislation and bring about those improvements which must be made if we are to meet the challenges of the future.

Finally, I want to pay tribute to the many dedicated and able employees of the Wage and Hour Divisions. Their reputation for professional skill, competence and solicitude is well known to me. The Wage-Hour investigators rank with the FBI and Secret Service in the elite of U.S. enforcement agents. I am very proud to join them and look forward to working with them in the months and years ahead.

---

UNREASONABLE WORLD

## HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in this age of violent actions and strident voices, it is reassuring to find in our newspapers the calm, rational words of Alan L. Otten. I would like to call to my colleagues attention his column from the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 1969, which deals with the difficulty of maintaining an objective viewpoint in today's world, and therefore include that column in the RECORD:

UNREASONABLE WORLD

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—Somehow, it seems to be getting harder all the time to know and follow the path of right and reason.

More and more, people tend to polarize on controversial issues. The man of good will, trying his damnedest to be rational and fair and decent, all too often winds up appearing absurdly naive or hopelessly out-of-date.

Abe Fortas, for example, obviously acted badly. The reason may have been incredibly bad judgment, lack of sensitivity, simple greed, a nagging wife, evil companions or merely misplaced confidence that he could get away with it. Whatever the cause, he acted badly, and every reasonable person must deplore his conduct and lament the damage it did to the court and to faith in government generally.

Yet comparatively few people seem even a little upset by the Justice Department's activity in the Fortas affair. Attorney General John Mitchell admits he privately gave Chief Justice Earl Warren additional information about Mr. Fortas—but refuses to say what this was, leaving suspicions possibly far worse than the facts. The Justice Department subpoenas Louis Wolfson to force him to talk about his relations with the justice, again implying considerable evil-doing; other stories quoting "high officials" suggest that the Wolfson statements are indeed damaging, and that the Attorney General warned he would make his information public by a certain time if Mr. Fortas hadn't quit the Court by then.

The department insists it leaked no stories, made no threats, is much maligned. Maybe so. But the stories certainly came from somewhere, and Chief Justice Warren has never been known as a blabbermouth. It would be nice to demand not only that an associate

justice show greater sensitivity for his job, but also that the Justice Department show greater respect for relations between the Executive Branch and the nation's highest court. Yet to suggest this, in the current emotional atmosphere over Mr. Fortas, risks denunciation as a far-out radical or a nut.

Similarly the man who believes in reasonable and steady progress toward racial integration and a concerted effort to improve the Negro's material lot has been made an unhappy anachronism by new militant Negro leaders preaching black separatism. He must continue to battle with die-hard segregationists still shouting "never" and with white power groups contending the Negro is being helped to move too far too quickly. But now he must also cope with far-out demands for unrealistic "reparations," for financial help to businesses that don't yet have the know-how to succeed, for Negro faculty and student quotas that can't possibly be filled. To the one side he's a nigger-lover, to the other just another hateful honkie.

The dilemma repeats itself endlessly. It's increasingly difficult to steer a middle course in the current campus controversy—to support some legitimate demands of the student activists and yet also insist they act legally and reasonably and not deliberately disrupt the college community. Yet more and more one is driven to choose one side or the other—for the authorities, whether right or wrong; for the students, whether right or wrong.

Editorial writers love to denounce Congressional trips as "junkets" wildly wasting taxpayer funds; lawmakers counter with a blanket defense. The truth is somewhere between. Many Congressional trips are indeed carefree vacations at taxpayers' expense; others are hard-working investigations earning their cost many times over.

So many factors make it difficult to be sensible and fair these days. There's a general disintegration of established authority—the family, the church, local government. The multiple annoyances and aggravations of urban society expose raw nerve-ends. Vietnam hardly provides a backdrop for easy, rational discourse. And the nonsense being talked by responsible political leaders sets a horrible example for the rest of us.

The President's recent Vietnam speech, for instance, was on the whole a valuable exposition of Administration thinking—skillfully combining standard U.S. positions with possibly just enough new flexibility to get negotiations moving. And yet Mr. Nixon jarred at least a few listeners by declaring early in the speech that one course open to him had been instant unilateral withdrawal—and that "this would have been an easy thing to do." Now if anything is clear, it's that this would not have been an easy thing to do, for reasons both strategic and political. Mr. Nixon contributed little to appreciation of the rest of his speech or to the general level of political dialogue by that remark.

Mr. Nixon's communications director, Herbert Klein, is quoted by the UPI to the effect that the Administration is concerned over Ted Kennedy's "effort" to make the ABM into "a campaign issue." What utter nonsense. How in the world does Ted Kennedy's opposing the ABM create a campaign issue any more than Richard Nixon's proposing it? This is not communication, it's noncommunication.

All last year, Democrats in the Senate and House were either conceding major flaws existed in the Job Corps or were conspicuously ignoring the program. Mr. Nixon now proposes to close a number of Job Corps centers, though, and the Democrats howl as though he were attacking motherhood itself. They make no serious attempt to look honestly at the criticism of the program, or the Administration's proposal for reshaping it. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina spends much of his Senatorial life fighting Federal efforts to deny funds to school districts dawdling on integration. Yet he finds nothing absurd in now demanding that the Government deny funds to student demonstrators.

Or consider Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, at the White House a few weeks ago, refusing to set forth his reasons for opposing Dr. John Knowles as assistant secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. "That matter has been, shall I say, adjudicated, in the sense that I have nothing more to say about it," the Senator declared. And when pressed to be a little more specific, he explained, "I have made all my discussions, and that is an adjudication for me."

Little wonder that, in such a world, reasonable men falter.

---

## SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT OPEN HOUSE

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Antonio, which forms an integral part of the 20th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, is a notable city in many respects. It has been the pacesetter with respect to human relations since the beginning of urban living in the State of Texas, in fact, in the Southwest United States. Not only is San Antonio the most historical city but it is also a pioneer in the most sensitive area, and that is the relationships between citizens. San Antonio is a cosmopolitan city and it long ago learned the secret of how to get along. Parenthetically speaking, this is the reason why I have been so sensitive about the disturbing and insidious activities of a small group of racists that I have been exposing for the past 2½ months.

Last Sunday, the San Antonio Police Department held a historical event: An open house between the hours of 2 to 6 p.m. More than 1,600 persons on that Sunday afternoon in those few hours poured through the unique San Antonio Police Headquarters, one of the most modern and up-to-date structures in the Southwestern United States. I had the great honor and privilege to have been invited to this event by Capt. H. L. "Hank" Antan, the executive officer of the San Antonio Police Department and the chief of police, George W. Bichsel. Both of these men have distinguished themselves by an illustrious career in law enforcement.

What I and my fellow San Antonians who visited Sunday during the open house saw was most gratifying. We were guided by polite and courteous uniformed members and officers of the San Antonio Police Department. The names they bore reflected every type of national and racial background that we have in our country. The most gratifying thing of all was that we saw no massive purchase of new equipment such as armored cars, tear gas, and all of the paraphernalia that so often and so unfortunately many of the cities have had to strain their budgets to acquire because of the unhappy conditions in those cities. On the contrary, what we saw in San Antonio was the reflection of a highly efficient, dedicated group of police officers. It was indeed a happy sight and it was the best proof of a happy and sound community.

I take this opportunity to commend to the Nation such outstanding public servants as Chief of Police George W. Bichsel and Capt. H. L. "Hank" Antan and the other notable and dedicated inspectors, officers, and men, as well as the secretarial workers and clerks. They were all present Sunday, and it was indeed a happy sight.

I offer for the RECORD at this point the program and schedule issued by the San Antonio Police Department on the occasion of the open house:

LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK IN SAN ANTONIO: MAY 11–17, 1969—OPEN HOUSE AT SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT—VISIT YOUR PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY

Police Open House: 214 West Nueva Street, Sunday, May 18th, 1969, 2:00 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Free parking.

Refreshments will be served in the snack bar by the San Antonio Police Wives Auxiliary.

The San Antonio Police Department is constantly aware of its obligation to our proud heritage and takes great pride in announcing an "Open House" in observation of "Law Enforcement Week" on Sunday, May 18, 1969, from 2:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Special features will include:

Tour guides of the Police facilities.

Firing range (Basement) Demonstration of Police Weapons and Equipment.

Uniform Patrol roll call at 2:30 p.m. (Assembly Room).

Traffic roll call at 3:00 p.m. (Assembly Room).

Narcotic Bureau display.

Juvenile Bureau display.

Robbery Office (Ident-A-Kit).

Training Bureau (Gym facilities and Cadet training).

Community Relations display.

Radio Maintenance facilities.

Records and Identification Offices.

Laboratory facilities.

Communications (Dispatcher's Office).

Accident Prevention Bureau (a short film).

Traffic Services Bureau display.

Vehicle Maintenance facilities (car wash facilities).

Corporation Court facilities.

The following vehicles will be on display:

Vehicle with radar unit, Motorcycle, Patrol car, Expressway car, Police wrecker, Paddy wagon, Community Relations Bus, Bexar County patrol car, State Highway patrol car, and Armed Forces Police Detachment Vehicle.

---

## INTERVIEW WITH GORDON LUCE

### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, California has long been credited with one of the finest transportation systems anywhere in the world. Our highway department, probably the best administered anywhere, has worked over the years to provide motorists the safest and most economical freeway and secondary systems available. Californians are proud of the fact that our toll-free roads have been paid for from user fees and not from general fund revenue.

The Reagan administration, when they took office in 1967, placed special emphasis on transportation. To head the all-important position of secretary of business and transportation, they found Gordon C. Luce of San Diego. Mr. Luce is 43 years old and holds a masters degree in business administration from Stanford University. Prior to joining the State service, he was a savings and loan executive in San Diego. As secretary of business and transportation, Mr. Luce serves as overall coordinator of the State's transportation network.

The April 1969 issue of Westways contains an informative interview with Secretary Luce. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the transcript of this interview:

INTERVIEW WITH GORDON LUCE

(By Paul Ditzel)

The Governor's Task Force on Transportation recently recommended ways in which California could plan and coordinate its current and future transportation requirements.

Major among the Task Force's recommendations was the suggestion that the state develop a transportation master plan that would include the encouragement of urban mass transportation and continued development of the state system of highways, roads and streets.

Formation of the Task Force was the idea of Gordon C. Luce, State Secretary of Business and Transportation. It included 24 business and professional leaders who were assisted by more than 100 transportation specialists. Chairman was architect and planner William L. Pereira, whose views appeared as the first installment (November, 1967) in Westway's recent series, "Transportation: What's Ahead for Southern California?"

In this interview, Secretary Luce discusses the report and related matters.

*Question. What is the significance of the Task Force report?*

LUCE. Let me say, first of all, that there is an unfortunate, but understandable, tendency to weary of discussions of the transportation problem and to vow to *do* something or to *build* something before we really know what it is that should be built or done to best serve our economic, social and environmental needs. To their credit, the Task Force did not lay out, in a neat pile, all of the state's transportation problems and then proceed to solve them. Rather, it pointed out that the most serious deficiency in our approach to transportation is our inability to identify and to evaluate our current and future requirements. There is little correlation of presently available information that could correct this deficiency, and even less coordinated planning among land, sea and air modes of transportation.

The Task Force recommended, therefore, that the legislature create and fund a California Transportation Board and an Office of State Transportation Planning and set up Regional Transportation Districts. By correlating present information and plans as well as other material that will be developed, these agencies will evolve a transportation master plan for California—one that would interlock with programs of our neighbor states as well as those of the federal government.

*Question. You mention other plans and there have, of course, been many of them. Is there a danger that this report, because it does not propose concrete solutions, will become another archival curiosity?*

LUCE. I hope not. California cannot afford to cast off the Task Force report as just another study. The Governor and the legislature appreciate that this report was the product of 18 months of study by as knowledgeable a group as has ever been formed anywhere to study transportation. The state could not have afforded to hire this combined expertise, which was voluntarily given to us. At the same time, I don't think we can say that past plans are necessarily bad because they are gathering dust somewhere. The master plan suggested by the Task Force could reactivate many of these plans, including, perhaps, the $100,000 plan that the state contracted with North American Aviation, Inc. to prepare several years ago.

*Question. What is being done to implement the Task Force recommendations?*

LUCE. Most of the recommendations must be implemented by legislative action. In the meantime, I have appointed Charles G. Beer to the post of Transportation Planning Coordinator for the state. He is helping to prepare the necessary legislation that would bring the Task Force's recommendations into reality. Beer served as a Task Force advisor and project director. For the past six years he has headed the Urban Planning Department of the California Division of Highways, so he is especially well qualified.

*Question. Will the creation of these state agencies result in the employment of large numbers of additional personnel?*

LUCE. No. The Transportation Board would consist of no more than seven members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the legislature. The Office of Transportation Planning would be small—probably a few planners from the Highway Department, the Finance Department and the Public Utilities Commission. This would be a coordinating team and would retain consultants rather than build a large "in-house" staff. Such an office could assist the Regional Transportation Districts.

*Question. What do you see as the first activity of these new agencies?*

LUCE. Transportation finance. We always seem to end up pondering how we are going to pay for whatever transportation improvement is suggested.

The state does not now have the ability to explore, in depth, how transportation can best be funded. The Planning Office could study other states and learn what they are doing. And it will work with various communities in an attempt to draw up guidelines on how other modes of transportation—rapid transit, for example—could be financed. The Planning Office would also be the focal point for the pooling, coordination and exchange of information, whether it be in regard to land-use planning, coordination of transportation facilities or standardization of equipment—all of which would help lower the cost of systems supplemental to freeways.

*Question. How else can the state encourage solutions to the transportation problems?*

LUCE. Chiefly by passing enabling legislation to permit communities to vote for a half cent sales tax—over and above present sales tax—to provide a fund for any form of transportation they wish, whether it be rapid transit, buses or additional street, highway and freeway construction. We are working on such a bill for presentation to the legislature this year.

Every city is unique in its history and its layout. The community knows—far better than the state does—what they must do to gear their transportation to the needs of their area. We are here to help. But the state must never go into the business of building transportation systems, other than our present and future involvement with highways, streets and roadways.

*Question. You obviously favor the sales tax over other approaches to financing transportation.*

LUCE. Very much so. The sales tax is a more equitable way for us to pay for rapid transit than, for example, further increases in the property tax. I think that most people misunderstand the benefits of a sales tax. This tax is paid by everybody. Whether or not each person in a community intends to use the transportation improvement, the facility benefits the area as a whole. There are some who argue that a sales tax is a hardship on low-income people, but I think the wealthier person certainly pays his share because his buying power is much greater. Sales taxes can, moreover, be turned off and on, quicker than any other form of taxation, a significant factor considering the urgency for solutions to public transportation problems. Another advantage to the sales tax is the slight cost to the state in collecting it.

*Question. Is this how the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) will be helped out of its present financial distress?*

LUCE. I hope so. There is a bill now that could result in a half cent sales tax—for four and a half years—in the three Bay Area counties that will benefit from BART. Another plan, which I strongly oppose, would double bridge tolls. This solution would require that BART's bonds be refinanced, thus resulting in added interest payments of around $100 million—almost as much as BART needs to get out of its financial trouble. Increased bridge tolls also would put off for many years the construction of another bridge that is so badly needed in the Bay Area.

*Question. Would you support a state constitutional amendment to permit diversion of highway user taxes for other purposes—such as building rapid transit systems?*

LUCE. No, I would not. Highway user taxes have worked successfully in California. You have only to compare our situation with other states—notably New York—to see just how well it has worked. In New York, the gas tax money has been used for other purposes. Consequently, that state has fallen behind in its highway program. New York now has a $2½ billion bond issue, which they hope will bring them back on schedule. The special fund for highways has worked well in California. It should not be tampered with.

*Question. Are there other sources of finance?*

LUCE. Yes. I would hope that we could obtain what I feel is due the state from the Federal Highway Trust Fund. When the fund was established in 1956, all the states contributed gas tax money to a national fund for building the Interstate Highway System. Four cents on each gallon of gasoline purchased by Californians still goes into that fund.

We have now put into the fund over a billion dollars more than has come back to the state; the federal government returns only 81 percent of our money. We are considered a "donor" state to help other states, such as Oregon, which gets back 126 percent; Arizona, which gets 138 percent; and Nevada, which gets 167 percent. The citizens of California are building roads in these other states.

While we recognize the validity of the concept and the need for the Interstate system, I believe that we should be getting back more than 81 percent of our money. Even the return of one additional percent of the over $400 million we annually send to the federal government in gas taxes could result in a sizable amount to further our transportation programs.

*Question. Do you foresee a gas tax increase? And if so, when?*

LUCE. I would hate to say to the taxpayer that we need another two cents on every gallon of gasoline he buys. An increase is, however, inevitable, if inflation and the population growth and transportation demands continue, which certainly seems likely. But I would not expect any increase for at least two years.

*Question. The Task Force recommended that the activities of these new transportation offices be funded by the state highway, aeronautics and general funds. Do you agree?*

LUCE. Yes. I am aware that there are some who are against use of the general fund and some who say all of the cost should be borne by the highway fund. I am, however, opposed to use of the highway fund to pay the whole bill. Funding must come from as broad a number of sources as possible, because so many forms of transportation are under consideration.

*Question. What role might the systems analysis approach hold for the transportation problems we face?*

LUCE. Transportation planning requires a great amount of input, and the only way you can do this is to computerize that input and develop systems from it. Private enterprise has demonstrated these skills. I hope that sometime in the future, after we get the Planning Office off the ground, we will utilize some of these systems analysis specialists.

*Question. To what extent do you see the private and academic sectors working with the state on its transportation problems?*

LUCE. They will play the major role in the years ahead, although they have in the past performed a relatively minor role, considering the state's virtual monopoly in highway work. The state will continue its highway activity, of course, but I think the overall problem in transportation is so broad, considering the other transportation modes, that we must go outside for expertise. Rather than have the state perform studies and do all the planning and building, we have to look to private enterprise and find out who can do the best job and then put them to work doing it.

*Question. Do you think our approach to urban transportation is lopsided in favor of highway, as compared to some other modes?*

LUCE. As I pointed out earlier, the state's role has been primarily in freeway activity, and not among the other forms of transportation. However, I believe the creation and work of the Governor's Task Force demonstrates an increasing interest in other forms of transportation to supplement the highway system.

Additionally, of course, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District is going forward with the development of rapid transit lines on a regional basis.

*Question. Ridership studies in the Bay Area Rapid Transit District are said to be among the best ever made. Does not the Bay Area's desire for rapid transit parallel that of southern California and suggest that a similar system should be built in Los Angeles?*

LUCE. Not necessarily. Rapid transit may be more attractive in certain areas, such as San Francisco, where people have become accustomed to high-density living and have learned to use various modes in addition to the automobile. BART's own prediction in San Francisco is that the completed system will make a 10 to 13 percent dent in motor vehicular traffic on the San Francisco Bay Bridge. Bridge traffic, however, is growing between 4 and 5 percent a year, so they're buying themselves only about two and one-half years of time before they are back to the present carrying capacity of the bridge. I'm not saying we should not try to make a dent, because a dent is better than nothing, provided the public wants it.

*Question. The Task Force said the state should determine the need or demand for mass transit. Do you think people really want to get out of their autos and ride mass transit?*

LUCE. The only way you can win the motorist away from his car is to provide him with a service that is more convenient and perhaps less costly. It remains to be seen whether any mass transit system will appeal to a sufficiently large number of people to really do anything more than make a small dent in the urban transportation problem.

*Question. What is your assessment of the expanded use of buses as a prelude to rail rapid transit systems?*

LUCE. It offers distinct and attractive possibilities. I think the first step before we make a major investment in a fixed rail rapid transit system is to work with something that costs less, can be laid out more quickly and seems to appeal more to the public. No doubt, if a modern type of bus were developed and used special street and freeway lanes, it would offer a flexibility of movement that would attract ridership.

*Question. Should a study, similar to that made by the Task Force, have preceded the recent rapid transit Proposition A proposal that was defeated in Los Angeles?*

LUCE. I believe so. While the rapid transit proposal had some outstanding citizen leadership, there were not enough leaders who were directly involved in its planning so that they could come forward and encourage everybody's support. With an overall involvement of business, professional, academic and transportation specialists—representative of the makeup of the Task Force—the outcome might have been different.

*Question. Some blame rapid transit's failure on the proposed sales tax increase to pay for it.*

LUCE. I doubt very much. People were not voting for or against a sales tax as much as they were not convinced that the system would solve their problem. Proposition A did better than some other measures that were far more financial in nature.

*Question. Noting that Californians are concentrating in three regional areas—Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco—the Task Force said it is the "definite responsibility" of the state to encourage, if not directly underwrite, urban mass transit. Do you agree?*

LUCE. No. The state should not underwrite transit. This is a regional issue and it is up to the people of the area to decide if they want it and how they will go about paying for it if they do. I do believe, however, that the state should enable and/or encourage the development of mass transit.

*Question. The Task Force raised the possibility of developing a system of single purpose toll roads in the State of California. How do you feel about this?*

LUCE. I am opposed to toll roads in California, except, possibly, for special uses such as the planned Mineral King Highway, tunnels or bridges. Toll systems are expensive in themselves because you must set up collection facilities and hire collectors. I think the public would prefer to pay a half cent more on their gas tax and have the freedom of driving toll-less highways.

*Question. High-speed train service is receiving much attention on the East Coast, in Canada and Japan. Do you see it offering advantages to the traveler along the San Francisco-Los Angeles-San Diego corridor?*

LUCE. Not particularly. In other areas, people have been train oriented for generations. In California, we are not. We are so accustomed to getting on and off airplanes serving this corridor that it is unlikely high-speed rail service would prove attractive—either in speed or in fares. Possibly it might when air congestion significantly worsens, but by then we will probably have developed the satellite airport concept, which would relieve the major air terminals.

*Question. If the Task Force's recommendations are carried out, would you speculate on the makeup of urban transportation in southern California by 1985?*

LUCE. Anything that is planned for the future in this area should be extremely conscious of environment, design standards, aesthetics and land use, in addition, of course, to mobility. In recent years we have emphasized a program of bringing the park people together with the planners, the architects with the highway engineers, so that some symmetry in transportation planning results. We must also have a system that serves the needs of all the people. It is to be hoped, moreover, that there will be overall planning and coordination of efforts so that all the transportation modes we decide upon will work together.

There is no doubt in my mind that freeways will continue to be the major mode. We must make better use of them, however. We have an experimental project under way now that uses electronic sensors to monitor traffic along part of the Los Angeles freeway network. Eventually, this could lead to a surveillance system that would benefit motorists by making driving easier and safer. Maybe, too, there are forms of rapid transit that will help southern California's problem. We must, nevertheless, strive for balance and coordination in our transportation systems.

---

## BOGUS MONEY, THE VERDICT OF AN AMERICAN JURY

---

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the age-old battle as to whether money as a medium of exchange must have intrinsic value or whether by custom and educated usage money can be a theoretical value was judicially resolved by a jury trial on December 7, 1968, in Scott County, Minn.

The jury found that credit called "instant money" through a bookkeeping entry by a bank was not lawful consideration to support a promissory note.

Perhaps the soaring trend of inflation and the ever-increasing manipulation by the money destroyers to remove the historical metals of intrinsic value are making it harder to fool the people.

The bank having lost the case and wanting to perfect an appeal tendered two $1 Federal Reserve notes which were refused with the statement that a $1,000 Federal Reserve note was worth less in value than a 10-cent trading stamp.

Mr. Speaker, I include two news editorials on the paper money case:

[From the Central Valley (Calif.) Valley Times, May 15, 1969]

A $1,000 BILL WORTH LESS THAN A 10 CENT TRADING STAMP

(By Jo Hindman)

A recent court ruling that affects your money reveals that Federal Reserve credit and currency—the same you are earning and spending—has no lawful value.

It came about this way: a bank foreclosed by advertisement on a borrower's note, bought the property (loan's collateral) at a Sheriff's sale, sued to acquire possession of the real estate in a case titled: First National Bank of Montgomery (Minn.) vs. Jerome Daly.

Martin V. Mahoney, Justice of the Peace, Credit River Township, Scott County (Minn.) presided at a jury trial on Dec. 7, 1968. The jury found the note and mortgage to be void for failure of a lawful consideration; also the jury refused to give any validity to the Sheriff's sale. The bank lost. Jerome Daly, the defendant, won and kept his land.

The president of the bank which is within the Federal Reserve System, admitted in testimony that the bank "created" the money/credit by a bookkeeping entry, the so-called consideration for the note and mortgage deed; also that no U.S. law or statute existed to give the bank the right to create

money in that manner. Handing down the judgment, Justice Mahoney said, "Only God can create something of value out of nothing."

The bank tried to appeal the case. The appeal fee of $2 was offered by the bank, using two Federal Reserve Notes ($1 bills); these were likewise declared unlawful and void. The bank agent failed to appear at a hearing on Jan. 22, 1969 and the appeal was dropped.

By comparison, a humble trading stamp is worth more than a $1 bill (Federal Reserve Note), or even a $1000 Federal Reserve Note. The two bills differ only in denomination and perhaps engraved design; each has paper-and-ink value of a fraction of a cent. On the other hand, basic trading stamps—the gold, the blue, the green—each has face value of one mill. Superior to paper money (FR notes), trading stamps have redemptive value in the merchandise offered in the stamp companies' catalogs. The Fed's currency cannot be converted into the gold or silver it purports to represent, and can be exchanged only for more of the same—paper or cheap clad-copper coins.

Fantastic? Remember the foregoing Daly case: a United States court prevented the bank's attempt to redeem its worthless note by seizing Daly's valuable land. The saga is explained with detailed clarity by Mr. Daly, a brilliant lawyer on monetary law, in "A Landmark Decision," price, $2, 28 E. Minnesota St., Savage, Minnesota 55378.

You say "But paper money has been working out okay."

The practice works if nobody objects. Jerome Daly objected. Do you object to working 23 hours (three days) to pay for a new suit? Or two weeks to buy an automatic washing machine? While Federal Reserve banker needs only to uncap his pen to create and to multiply fiat dollars thousandfold? "Fiat" means the money cannot be converted into metal coins—gold, silver, etc.

Worse, the Federal Reserve System is a private corporation, not a federal agency, despite its name and the 1913 Act that "blessed" it. The Fed's money-multiplication table appears on page 73 of The Federal Reserve System (1963), obtainable from the system, Wash., D.C., 20551.

Obviously, the wrong needs to be made right, Congress should outlaw the Fed's money-creating racket, should recall the clad-copper coins and replace the silver, should take steps to restore the gold that has been trucked off. Congress not The Fed, should regulate U.S. money.

Your U.S. Senators and Congressmen know, or should know about the critical mess.

---

## The Federal Reserve's "Instant Money" Operation Is Declared Null and Void by Court and Jury

(By E. F. W. Wildermuth)

The never explained conspiratorial like silence by the news media of this nation has kept most people in ignorance concerning a decision of major importance to all Americans, rendered by a court and jury in Minnesota on the 27th anniversary of the prelude to World War II via sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

To better understand the importance of this decision a brief review of the wisdom displayed by the framers of the U.S. Constitution is likely to prove helpful.

It was the purpose of the framers of the Constitution to provide for the creation of a firmly established common medium of exchange in payment for goods and services and in settlement of debts.

In an effort to achieve this end, it was mandated in the Constitution that the Congress of the United States shall have the sole and exclusive power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. To insure the uniformity of value of such money, the power to coin money was denied to the States.

Since the adoption of the Constitution it appears that Americans have become victims of sundry self-styled "do-gooders" claiming wisdom far superior to that demonstrated by the Founding Fathers. Under the guise of "protecting" Americans, laws have been enacted designed to "protect" Americans from almost every conceivable shortcoming of fallible man, many of which have proved to be deadly boomerangs.

### FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Among those man-made laws which have boomeranged is the Act of Congress approved by President Wilson on 23 December, 1913. This Act created the Federal Reserve System, composed of 12 Federal Banks, their branches and numerous National Banks, etc.

Americans have come to believe that the Federal Reserve Banks are owned and operated by the federal government. The Federal Reserve Banks are privately owned and pay no taxes. The Federal Reserve System is the most complex "instant money" Frankenstein ever created in the recorded history of mankind.

Presently, the money manipulators of the Federal Reserve Board are trying desperately to make their unconscionably high interest rate stick in what must be their futile effort to stem the wild inflation in this nation now about to get out of hand. It is the same Federal Reserve "experts," now striving so mightily, who have wholly failed to stabilize the dollar and curb inflation after having successfully advocated the outlawing of the Gold Standard in 1933.

In this dark hour of financial crisis it appears that the money manipulators of the world, operating through the Federal Reserve System, may have met over-powering adversity.

### MORTGAGE FORECLOSED

Jerome Daly, an attorney in Minnesota, executed a Note and Mortgage on May 8th, 1964 in the sum of $14,000.00 to the First National Bank of Montgomery. In the Spring of 1967 Mr. Daly came into arrears in payments in the sum of $476.00. The Note was secured by a Mortgage owned by Mr. Daly at Spring Lake Township in Scott County, Minn. The First National Bank of Montgomery foreclosed the Mortgage and bought the property at a Sheriff's Sale on June 26, 1967. Not having made payments after the sale or redeemed the property within the 12 months provided therefor by law, the Bank brought an action at common law to recover possession of the property . . . this is where the woes of the Bank began to sprout.

The suit by the Bank was instituted in the Justice of Peace Court at Savage, Minn. After two judges had been disqualified for prejudice and a third refused to preside at the trial, the case was transferred, pursuant to law, for trial before the Justice of Peace, Credit River Township, Scott County, Minn.

On December 7, 1968, the case was tried before Hon. Martin V. Mahoney and a jury of 12. The jury found against the First National Bank of Montgomery and in favor of Mr. Daly.

### A BOOKKEEPING ENTRY

It was admitted at the trial by the President of the First National Bank that in combination with the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, by virtue of their interlocking activity and practice they were one and the same bank and that they created the entire $14,000.00 which had been loaned to Mr. Daly, in money or credit upon their books by a bookkeeping entry. It was this "instant money" which the First National Bank of Montgomery used as "consideration" to support the Note and the Mortgage which it allegedly foreclosed. The jury found as a fact that the "instant money" created by the simple act of a bookkeeping entry by the loaning institution (The First National Bank) was not the lawful consideration required to support the Note it took from Mr. Daly and the Mortgage he gave the Bank as security for the Note. It having been determined that the Note and Mortgage were void for want of lawful consideration, there could be no validity to the so-called Sheriff's sale.

### "INSTANT MONEY"

There is no law or statute which permits or authorizes the creation of such "instant money" or any other money. Only Congress is vested with the power to create money and the Constitution does not authorize Congress to delegate its power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Yet, the Federal Reserve Banks have been lawlessly creating "instant money" with impunity for ever so many years . . . until the Court and jury in the Daly case found in essence, if not in fact, that the Federal Reserve Banks are not above the law. It is self-evident that the champions of "instant money" do consider themselves above the law, especially in view of the fact that such is not the full nature and extent of the lawlessness practiced by the Federal Reserve Banks.

Most Americans are not aware of the brutal fact that in addition to their lawless practice of creating money and credit by the act of a bookkeeping entry, the Federal Reserve and National Banks exercise the ultimate prerogative of expanding and reducing the supply of money and credit in this nation. Those fiscal "experts" also indulge in manipulation of interest rates without authority therefor by law . . . sometimes for their self-styled humanitarian purpose of presuming to control inflation, etc. If a continuance of such lawless acts is to be condoned, the creators of "instant money" can any day make paupers of practically every law abiding American, among others, by the simple expedient of controlling the supply of money, credit, etc. The same money magicians who can create money out of nothing can also create, at their whim and caprice, a financial crisis in this nation which will make the financial debacle which plagued Germany in the early 1920's look like a Sunday school picnic. The price of money and the value of money are not one and the same thing . . . A carload of "printing press money" is of little or no value to a person who has not the means of transporting such money to pay for a loaf of bread Federal Reserve Notes are printing press money.

### FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES "VOID"

Undaunted by the fact that a Court and jury had judicially determined that the First National Bank of Montgomery could not lawfully create money or credit by the act of bookkeeping entry, it offered two $1.00 Federal Reserve Notes in payment of the fee required by law to appeal from the judgment obtained against it by Mr. Daly. This "printing press money" was rejected by the Court upon the ground that it was void, among other reasons, because the sole consideration therefor was less than 1c, the cost of printing thereof: that the Notes lack a real or substantial fund for their redemption and because the portion of the U.S. Code which presumes to make such Notes legal tender was void as contravening Article 1, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution.

Thus, it appears that Government has been permitted to become the enemy of all decent and well disposed Americans largely because Congress has surrendered the sole and exclusive power "to coin money."

Who, among the public officials of this day, undertakes to prove worthy of their forefathers by pledging their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in pursuit of whatever means are lawful and just in restoring to Congress "the sole and exclusive power to coin money and regulate the value thereof?"

## JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM: AN INTRODUCTION TO FREE ENTERPRISE

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of young people today are honest, enthusiastic, and conscientious.

Unfortunately, the headlines in today's news go to those seeking to disrupt our society. It is my feeling—and I am sure that many of my colleagues in the House agree with me—that more emphasis should be given to the constructive activities of young people.

In that light, I would like to share with you and my colleagues the results of one junior achievement project in Rochester, N.Y. As many of you know, there are junior achievement programs in 600 to 800 communities across the country. These programs are designed to teach teenagers about private enterprise.

Business and community leaders organize programs in cooperation with local high schools. The young people then form, operate, and finally liquidate the individual business.

An example of such an operation could be the manufacture of a toy by the youthful businessmen. The project would include designing, manufacturing, and then actually selling the product. Young people would handle all the financial aspects of the business, carefully preparing the profit-and-loss sheet and other data.

The junior achievement program demonstrates existing opportunities for young people in the business world. It also serves as a guide for schools and helps them to adapt curriculums to present-day circumstances.

One of the junior achievement projects in my district is a monthly newspaper called the Young Opinion. This newspaper is sponsored by the Gannett newspapers in Rochester. Of the 19 teenagers who put out the newspaper, 18 have won awards for exceptional performance.

An interesting sidelight is the benefit to two particular students.

One came from a very unsettled family background, did poorly in school and had very poor work habits. The student is now in a stable home. Schoolwork has improved tremendously and the student has won two free trips to junior achievement conventions because of exceptional performance.

Adult supervisors at the newspaper tell me that another youngster had no respect for the free enterprise system and was also a poor student when he started. After joining the staff of the newspaper, the student sold $200 in advertising, applied for a college scholarship and is preparing to enter a cooperative educational program.

The Gannett newspapers have provided an outstanding public service in backing the junior achievement program. Mr. Al Mahar, Gannett director of sales, has worked closely with the Young Opinion staff and is also a member of the area junior achievement board of directors.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Warmbold, a husband and wife editor-reporter team for Gannett, are guiding the editorial direction of the Young Opinion. From the fresh, creative look of the newspaper, I would say they have done an extraordinary job with these young people.

Mr. J. Patrick O'Connor, chairman of the Gannett Co.'s junior achievement committee, has supervised the financial, production, and sales end of the operation.

The teenagers include Andrzej Gierczak, president; Vincent Giannantonio, vice president; Arlene Raybould, secretary; Roberta Torrance, treasurer; Patricia Pogroszewski, safety director; Nancy Berry, personnel director; Daniel Muldoon, advertising manager; and Johana Ambrose, Jeanne Barton, Carol Bojinoff, John Huber, Valerie Humnicky, Paul Miller, Robert Minges, Denis Pohl, Bill Ovellette, John Jones and James Wacht.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues here will join with me in wishing these young people success for their future and commending the efforts of all who helped them.

## DRAFT TREATY PROHIBITING NUCLEAR AND OTHER WEAPONS FROM THE OCEAN FLOOR

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the International Organizations and Movements Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as congressional adviser to the Standing Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, I applaud the action of the U.S. Government in proposing a draft treaty banning nuclear weapons and other implements of mass destruction from the ocean floor.

The draft treaty, unveiled today in Geneva, gives effect to proposals which the United States has been discussing during the past 2 years in different U.N. committees.

It constitutes a sensible and cautious first step—a very necessary step—toward the reservation of the oceans for peaceful purposes benefiting all mankind.

The United States has led the movement to make this principle operative in the domain of space; we now propose to extend it to the oceans.

I earnestly hope that the 18-Nation Disarmament Commission, meeting in Geneva, will give prompt and sympathetic consideration to the U.S. proposal.

In an age in which the threat of a nuclear holocaust has become a grim reality, we must exert every effort to extend the area of land, space, and the sea which will be denied to war-type activities.

The U.S. proposal does not jeopardize our national security; it respects the security requirements of all sovereign nations. At the same time, however, it attempts to provide a better, a more secure foundation for future peace.

Contents of the treaty follows:

DRAFT TREATY PROHIBITING THE EMPLACEMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ON THE SEABED AND OCEAN FLOOR

(Submitted by the United States at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva on May 22, 1969)

The States Parties to this Treaty,

Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of the seabed and ocean floor for peaceful purposes,

Considering that the prevention of a nuclear arms race on the seabed and ocean floor serves the interests of maintaining world peace, reduces international tensions, and strengthens friendly relations among States,

Convinced that this Treaty will further the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, in a manner consistent with the principles of international law and without infringing the freedoms of the high seas,

Have Agreed as Follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each State Party to this Treaty undertakes not to emplant or emplace fixed nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction or associated fixed launching platforms on, within or beneath the seabed and ocean floor beyond a narrow band, as defined in Article II of this Treaty, adjacent to the coast of any State.

2. Each State Party to the Treaty undertakes to refrain from causing, encouraging, facilitating or in any way participating in the activities prohibited by this Article.

ARTICLE II

1. For purposes of this Treaty, the outer limit of the narrow band referred to in Article I shall be measured from baselines drawn in the manner specified in paragraph 2, hereof. The width of the narrow band shall be three (3) miles.

2. Blank (Baselines).

3. Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as prejudicing the position of any State Party with respect to rights or claims which such State Party may assert, or with respect to recognition or non-recognition of rights or claims asserted by any other state, relating to territorial or other contiguous seas or to the seabed and ocean floor.

ARTICLE III

1. In order to promote the objectives and ensure the observance of the provisions of this Treaty, the Parties to the Treaty shall remain free to observe activities of other States on the seabed and ocean floor, without interfering with such activities or otherwise infringing rights recognized under international law including the freedoms of the high seas. In the event that such observation does not in any particular case suffice to eliminate questions regarding fulfillment of the provisions of this treaty, parties undertake to consult and to cooperate in endeavoring to resolve the questions.

2. At the review conference provided for in Article V, consideration shall be given to whether any additional rights or procedures of verification should be established by amendment to this treaty.

ARTICLE IV

Any State Party to the Treaty may propose amendments to this Treaty. Amendments shall enter into force for each State Party to the Treaty accepting the amendments upon their acceptance by a majority of the States Parties to the Treaty and thereafter for each remaining State Party on the date of accepance by it.

ARTICLE V

Five years after the entry into force of this Treaty, a conference of Parties to the Treaty

shall be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in order to review the operation of this Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes of the Preamble and the provisions of the Treaty are being realized. Such review shall take into account any relevant technological developments. The review conference shall determine in accordance with the views of a majority of those Parties attending whether and when an additional review conference shall be convened.

ARTICLE VI

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from this Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treay, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its Country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty and to the United Nations Securly Council three months in advance. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events it regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

ARTICLE VII AND VIII

Blank (administrative provisions).

---

## GET YOUR OWN HOUSE IN ORDER

### HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 21, 1969*

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, during the incredibly ridiculous New York subway strike several years ago as well as in the case of numerous other strikes which plague New York City constantly, I do not recall any Member of the South Carolina congressional delegation calling upon the President to intervene. Somehow, these strikes seemed to be a matter for the State of New York to settle, or at least attempt to settle.

However, I suppose it is just asking too much to expect some of our colleagues from the State of New York to reciprocate for this common courtesy and decent way of doing things. Frustrated with their own lack of success at being able to resolve the complex problems of "Fun City," they now are turning to the sovereign State of South Carolina in an attempt to inject themselves into the internal affairs of my State.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to note that of the 26 Members of the House who asked the President to intervene in the Charleston, S.C., hospital workers strike, 13 of them were from New York City. In addition, they were joined by the two Senators from New York, who themselves were among 17 Senators also asking the President to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how far sheer hypocrisy can go. In the case of these House and Senate Members shoving themselves into a matter that in no way concerns them, hypocrisy has gone about as far as it can go. In every State represented by these gentlemen I can point to any number of critical State problems which, by comparison, make the Charleston situation seem like a Sunday school picnic. Nevertheless, I believe that these States can resolve their problems without any interference from me.

Now, instead of calling upon the President to step in and settle the strike, these gentlemen should have called upon national union leaders to abandon their attempts to violate the law and public policy of the State of South Carolina. Of course, this would be asking too much. After all, labor laws have been violated so much in other areas, especially New York City, until I am certain these gentlemen inadvertently forgot that they ever existed.

But, the very least these gentlemen could have done is publicly denounce strike leader Leon Julius Davis, the president of Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Employees Union. Surely, they must have known of the Communist activities of Mr. Davis. Perhaps I can refresh their memory. In 1938, Davis was the signer of a Communist Party petition to place a candidate on the Communist Party ballot. Later, while testifying before the House Committee on Education and Labor, he conveniently invoked the first and fifth amendments when asked if he was or had been a member of the Communist Party. The list of Communist and pro-Communist activities by Davis is virtually endless. However, for the benefit of my New York colleagues who may have a short memory, this is the same Leon Julius Davis who in 1960 was characterized by the Greater New York Hospital Association in a public statement as a "ruthless man using the sick and suffering as hostages in an attempt to set himself up as a dictator in our voluntary, nonprofit hospitals." The Hospital Association had ample reason to issue their statement. After all, Davis almost put them out of business because of illegal strikes, demonstrations, and outright violence.

Mr. Speaker, down my way a man—if he is a man—does not throw rocks at the neighbor's dog unless he has first locked up his own dog. Possibly the dog pounds in New York City are run very efficiently. If they are, it is the only thing there that comes to mind. So, if it is not asking too much of these gentlemen who have all the solutions for South Carolina, go home and get your own house in order, then come back and dictate to us. But, until you do, both the people of South Carolina and the people of your areas would be a lot better off if you would just hold your tongue.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I would like to include the following two editorials from the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., which point out some very interesting facts that should be considered by our colleagues who have been so quick to meddle in the affairs of my State:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, May 7, 1969]

CHARLESTON AND LABOR LAWS

Those 26 liberal Democratic Congressmen who asked President Nixon to intervene in the Charleston strike of hospital workers included a sizable number of lawyers. But you'd never know it from their crisp capsulization of labor law in their open letter introduced on the House floor.

Indeed, so faulty is their argument that one wonders whether their law degrees shouldn't be recalled by their institutions. Not only do they misstate the facts of the Charleston argument but they fallaciously interpret the Wagner Act and all subsequent history about relations between government as employer and public employees.

While the legal complications vary immensely from state to state, some facts of law are incontestable. The Wagner Act did not, as the Congressmen assert, make it clear that collective bargaining should extend into government as employer. Quite the contrary.

(Perhaps the fact that exactly half, or 13, of the Congressmen come from union-dominated, strike-crippled New York City conditioned their thought.)

The facts are these: no one can prevent public employees from forming a union. Governor McNair has made this essential element clear in his several statements.

A second fact is equally important: no court can at present order governmental units to bargain or make contracts with public employee unions, except in those states with express provisions therefor.

A Federal court in North Carolina recently sustained these two elements of law. Additionally, the Court upheld the state law which forbids local or state governmental units from doing business with public employee unions. "There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which entitles one to have a contract with another who does not want it."

Space does not permit extended review of government-organized labor problems, but it should be noted that differentiation can be made between three groups of civil employees: federal, state and local.

Also, it should be noted that a section of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 made the ban on strikes by federal workers explicit: "It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the U.S. or any agency thereof, including wholly owned government corporations, to participate in any strike. Any individual . . . who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for re-employment for three years." This provision was replaced on August 9, 1955, by a new and stronger substitute which made it a felony, punishable by a year's imprisonment and a fine of $1,000 for a federal employee to strike or assert the right to strike, or knowingly to maintain membership in an organization asserting that right.

Some states recognize public employee unions, but forbid them to strike. Other states do not recognize employee unions. Of those which do, at least 15 states have laws expressly forbidding strikes by these employees—but the laws have been ineffective.

In 1967 the New York legislature replaced its Condon-Wadlin law with the Taylor Law. But even the Taylor law was ignored, prompting New York State Supreme Court Justice Emilio Nunez to remark: "This (teachers') strike by a powerful union against the public was a rebellion against the government; if permitted to succeed, it would eventually destroy the government, with resultant anarchy and chaos." The judge simply echoed what Presidents Calvin Coolidge and Woodrow Wilson had said previously.

On March 7 of this year, the New York legislature revised the Taylor law, effective the first of last month. Courts may now impose unlimited fines on striking government unions, suspend indefinitely dues check-offs and impose mandatory penalties on individual strikers. Each public employee who strikes will lose two days' pay for every day on strike, will be placed on probation for one year and lose all seniority.

The Advisory Committee on State Employment Relations (of the Council of State Governments) is engaged in a comprehensive examination of changing relationships between the government as an employer and its employees. Its findings will certainly sustain the right of any state to recognize, or not to recognize, public employee unions in a bargaining process.

In the interim, it should be understood

that the Charleston confrontation is more a well-financed, sustained assault on the state of South Carolina's position vis-a-vis public employee unions and less a racial matter. Pacific settlement short of union recognition is realistic and attainable. The pity is that the Charleston workers naively chose to move in the very year that, at long last, a state employee classification system was scheduled to be enacted—meeting at least the salary upgrading desired by the hospital personnel. To strike to attain a union that—in the history of America labor relations—is technically and legally not allowed to strike is a basic absurdity.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, May 19, 1969]

PROJECTS FOR 17 SENATORS

Seventeen U.S. Senators, with profound expertise in the subtleties of the complex Charleston hospital strike that we did not know they possessed, have asked President Nixon to dispatch a mediator to South Carolina. They did so, they said, "because the importance of the dispute so clearly transcends the boundaries of Charleston, and even South Carolina." They added: "We believe the national interest demands efforts at the federal level to help resolve the impasse."

Interesting. Each of the 17, logically, subscribes to the doctrine that (a) internal affairs of a sovereign state, when they involve "the national interest," should be attended to by the federal Executive, and (b) "strategies of social change" should be non-violent.

All right. The assumptions being accepted, then let us suggest that Senators Thurmond and Hollings chat with their 17 colleagues about the dispatch of federal Executive representatives to each of the their states to help resolve problems that transcend the boundaries of their states and involve "the national interest."

The 17 are Senators Walter Mondale of Minnesota, Jacob Javits, and Charles Goodell of New York, Alan Cranston of California, Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Philip Hart of Michigan, Edward Kennedy and Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, George McGovern of South Dakota, Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, Harrison Williams of New Hampshire, Ralph Yarborough of Texas, Stephen Young of Ohio, and Clifford Case of New Jersey.

Let us consider what the President could do to intervene in affairs of these states that concern the "national interest," transcending their boundaries:

Michigan—Desperate poverty of the Upper Michigan peninsula has not been solved by Senator Hart or the state; black unionists of the United Automobile Workers are rejecting UAW leadership as "discriminatory"; and Michigan's hegemony over U.S. automaking clearly needs in-depth surveillance.

New York City—Permanent offices of almost all Federal agencies are required to control mass corruption in dispensation of federal funds; permanent mediators should be present to help resolve the city's "a-strike-a-day" problems; and HEW must investigate the continuous violence in the city's schools. Surely Javits and Goodell would appreciate President Nixon's help.

Texas—Both federal and foundation funds are being used to create hatred among Mexican-Americans; braceros from Mexico and farmers of Mexico are being starved to death along the border by concerted action of organized American labor.

Oklahoma—A full-scale investigation of oil depletion allowances, on the spot, is an ancient requirement.

South Dakota—Rights of Indian-Americans consistently have been ignored and deserve on-the-spot mediation and improvement.

Massachusetts—The "one-man, one-vote" philosophy of participatory democracy consistently has been ignored by the notoriously corrupt political structure of Massachusetts, an erosion of fundamental civil rights injurious to the "national interest"; and a full-scale inquiry of organized crime is obligatory.

Pennsylvania—Neither social welfare objectives of state or federal agencies are being met, with constant thwarting by Harrisburg; the City of Brotherly Love remains, in many aspects, a city of arrogant discrimination—particularly in building-trade unions.

New Jersey—Criminal influences upon the political system have been, and are, arrogant; open housing ordinances are ignored despite the best efforts of civil rights groups and ministerial organizations; and an inquiry into automobile insurance in the state should be welcome.

California—An objective inquiry into complaints of non-unionized grape-growers and workers, including violence against non-unionists, is mandatory; and several score of mediators should be placed on all state college campuses for an indefinite time.

Ohio—Mayor Carl Stokes complains that the Nixon administration isn't seriously interested in the nation's major cities and a team of government officials ought to probe deeply into what has been done and not done in Cleveland and elsewhere—and why.

Wisconsin—A very fundamental civil right of Americans to "freedom of worship" has been violently abused by individuals disrupting Sunday worship services in Milwaukee.

The list is far from complete and quite frankly comes "from the top of the head." Unquestionably, some even more important problems transcending the boundaries of these states and clearly involving the "national interest" have been overlooked. But we are certain that the 17 Senators, all being gentlemen of honor with abiding concern for their own constituents, will ask President Nixon to dispatch the necessary investigative and mediative crews to their states.

At least, we think we are certain. Senators Hollings and Thurmond might do a little checking.

## CASUAL REFERENCES TO BOYS' CLUBS HARM IMAGE OF "BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA"

### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Boys' Clubs of America is a congressionally chartered, nationwide, citizens-supported, volunteer organization of over 830 Boys' Clubs serving close to 900,000 boys 6 through 18 years of age. Mr. A. L. Cole of the Reader's Digest has recently succeeded President Nixon as chairman of the national board. President Nixon is now honorary chairman of the organization.

Boys' Clubs of America is the only national, nonsectarian, all-boy, very low dues, building centered, full-time professionally staffed organization with a varied and diversified program which provides continuous informal guidance to all of its members on a daily basis.

Boys' Clubs are open to all boys regardless of race, color, background, or social or economic status. The same applies to professional staffs and volunteer workers.

Historically and currently Boys' Clubs have a special interest in the disadvantaged boy usually not served by national youth organizations. Since a large percentage of Boys' Clubs are in the ghettos and since 34 percent of the boys are on the poverty level and another large number are near it, Boys' Clubs try very hard to reach the unreached, serve the unserved, motivate the unmotivated, and teach the untaught through programs of recreation, guidance, camping, health services, job counseling and placement, and family counseling to name a few.

Boys' Clubs are in their second century of service in building juvenile decency through programs aimed at promoting the health, social, educational, vocational, and character development of boys.

Unfortunately, there are many groups and organizations in this country which also call themselves Boys' Clubs but are in no way related to or affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America. In most instances these so-called "Boys' Clubs" are limited in scope and purpose. Thousands of athletic groups such as Little League and others call themselves "Boys' Clubs." Any group of boys banding together in their neighborhood can call themselves a "Boys' Club." Although many of these "Boys' Clubs" do provide some constructive activity, the program is seldom if ever as comprehensive in the total development of boys as that of Boys' Clubs of America.

More seriously, some organizations which have doubtful motives are operating under the guise of "Boys' Clubs."

One such example is that of the Boys' Club of Lexington, Ky., which has incorporated as a Boys' Club in the State of Kentucky but whose program and scope is questionable. They are currently under investigation by the House Banking and Currency Committee for tax gimmickry. This club does not have a building or a comprehensive program but as far as we know provides some scholarships to boys in Lexington. It also has a holding interest in a bank and possibly in a group of banks. Equally harmful is the confusion of identity resulting from newscasts about the "DuBois Club," a Communist Party group.

Derogatory publicity by these and other so-called "Boys' Club" organizations does not help the cause of Boys' Clubs of America. Boys' Clubs of America is vulnerable since it cannot control the use of the words "Boys' Clubs." It is difficult to convince the public that some of the less desirable types of Boys' Clubs are not the same kind of organizations as those affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America.

It is important that every opportunity be utilized to interpret the difference between a bona fide Boys' Club affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America and other "Boys' Clubs" in a community. Regular affiliated Boys' Clubs are normally members of a local Chest or United Fund and have a representative, high caliber board of directors responsible for the policy and operation of the Boys' Club. They have buildings, facilities, and camps and are operated by professionally trained workers. They provide a daily program of activities and services which are diversified and wide enough in scope to meet the in-

clination, interest and need of every boy in the community. Boys' Clubs of America affiliates are allowed to use the official Boys' Club keystone insignia on their buildings and stationery.

---

FATHER ROMAGNO AT 75—CALM WILL COME AND THE FACTS WILL TALK

---

## HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 24, 1969, the Reverend Marcellino Romagno, O.Ss. T., pastor of Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church in Asbury Park, N.J., will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his ordination. He will be honored at a dinner in the Berkeley-Carteret Hotel, Asbury Park.

Father Romagno has made an outstanding contribution to his church and to Monmouth County and he has served as an inspiration to thousands of persons. Father Romagno married my wife, Marlene, and me so we have both had the pleasure of knowing him for some time.

Mr. Speaker, the Asbury Park Press recently published an article on Father Romagno which I found most inspiring. I know that my many colleagues in the House of Representatives will be interested in reading this article about a fine man and at this time I place that story in the RECORD:

[From the Asbury Park Sunday Press, Mar. 30, 1969]

FATHER ROMAGNO AT 75—CALM WILL COME AND THE FACTS WILL TALK

(By Ed Reiter)

ASBURY PARK.—There have been many milestones along the priestly path of the Rev. Marcellino Romagno, O.Ss.T.

And as the path grows longer, the milestones seems to grow larger.

Last year Father Romagno marked his 30th anniversary as pastor of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Roman Catholic Church.

Earlier this month, he celebrated his 75th birthday.

And now he is preparing for an observance that looms as the largest milestone yet: The 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

It was on July 13, 1919, that John Michael Romagno, third of 10 children in a "simple, struggling" Italian family, took his final religious vows and assumed the name "Father Marcellino" as a member of the Order of the Most Holy Trinity.

As he approaches his golden jubilee, Father Romagno—a short, portly man with an air of quiet dignity—has only happy memories of the last half century.

"I have pleasant remembrances," he says, speaking with a soft Italian accent, "and I do not regret that I chose this kind of life. If someone would ask me if I would start all over again, I would say, 'Yes, I would.'"

The life that he chose actually was that of a missionary priest. The Trinitarian Order sent him to the United States from Italy in 1921 to work in its American missions.

He served at St. Ann's Church in Bristol, Pa., for 17 years—eight of them as pastor—before coming here.

Even today Mt. Carmel technically is a missionary church, designed to serve Americans of Italian extraction.

"Today, we have all different nationalities in our parish, on account of intermarriages," Father Romagno notes.

"But we still have the privilege of a national parish. That is, those of Italian extraction can still belong here, even if this is not the closest church."

There are some 900 families in the parish now—twice as many as there were in 1938 when he became the pastor. And many of them live in other towns, notably Neptune and Ocean Township.

The parish has acquired more than just new members during the last 31 years. It has gained a whole complex of new buildings, including its present church, at Asbury avenue and Pine street (completed in 1951); its rectory (built in 1955), and its 12-classroom school and convent (dedicated in 1963).

Nor is Father Romagno through with his building program.

He's had plans drawn up for a youth center and gymnasium, and he hopes to have it built this summer.

"The people are surprised that at my age I undertook another heavy task," he relates. "But I felt I was able to do it, and knowing the kindness and generosity of the congregation I started with full confidence.

"The youth should be kept busy all the time," he adds. "They should get tired, so that when they go home they go to sleep. We are building this youth center so they can enjoy themselves and keep away from doing wrong things in the streets."

Amid all the growth of the parish, the pastor has made it his business to know his people personally.

"I know the children, parents, and grandparents," he says. "In 31 years so many have died, been born, and been married.

"In all this time I have always been interested in keeping the families together, giving them some kind of attraction toward the church."

The winds of change within the Catholic church have made the job of the priest more difficult in recent years, Father Romagno admits. He views them, however, without alarm.

"There are many changes that now seem to disturb our minds," he remarks, "but eventually they will do us a lot of good.

"Years ago the people had simple faith, but now we must work in the minds of the people and put the doctrine in different ways. Eventually all the doubts will be cleared up.

"You wait: In 10 or 15 more years the calm will come and the facts will talk. The church will not be destroyed, just purified."

He regards the use of English in the Mass as one example of a change for the better.

"The people did not understand anything in Latin," he says. "Now they attend Holy Mass more effectually and more diligently.

"It was very hard for me in the beginning because of my age, but I willingly accept the changes which the church has made."

Despite his age, he takes an understanding attitude toward younger priests who have forsaken the priesthood because their consciences came into conflict with church regulations.

"We must admire the younger priest today," he declares. "It's very hard to be a priest today. People's minds are all confused with this new ecumenical teaching, and they want to follow their own way, their own conscience.

"Many priests give up the priesthood because they think they can do better in the world. This turmoil happened before, at the time of the Reformation. But the calm came then, later on, and so it will come now, too."

Father Romagno is one of two priests in his own immediate family. His younger brother, the Rev. Michael Romagno, is pastor of a church in Senandoah, Pa.

His own aspiration is "to stay here as long as possible, as long as my mind is clear and I have my health.

"I feel better now than I did 30 years ago," he says. "But a person my age can't foresee so well 10, 15 or 20 years. I must live day by day, year by year.

"When the good Lord will say, 'That's enough, that's all,' I must go and someone else will continue the work of God.

"I'm not indispensable. One pope dies, another one comes. And so it is in the parish: Father Marcellino dies, another pastor comes. The church will go on."

In the meantime, he'll stay on the job.

"I enjoy my work," he remarks.

And does he hope to mark his diamond jubilee 25 years hence?

"That," he says, "is up to the Boss."

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

---

## HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of California at Los Angeles this week celebrates its golden anniversary. I warmly congratulate the university, its administration, and its student body on this momentous occasion. Not only as an alumnus of the university, but as one who has profited all his life from the high quality of education received at UCLA, do I participate in the well-deserved tributes that are being heaped upon this great institution during this week.

UCLA has a proud record to look back on since it opened its doors in 1919 as the southern branch of the University of California. In 1919, 1,250 students were enrolled. Today, almost 28,000 students are on campus daily; another 80,000 or so are registered in evening extension courses. UCLA is known as one of the very finest universities in the world. It has excelled in scholarship and in athletics. Its alumni have received fame and recognition in many fields of endeavor. Let me cite a few of the men and women UCLA has graduated: Dr. Ralph Bunche, Nobel Peace Prize winner; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and Nobel Laureate in Chemistry; Agnes DeMille, famous choreographer; Jerome Hines, Metropolitan star; Jackie Robinson, the first Negro to play professional baseball; Louis Banks, managing editor of Fortune magazine; Rafer Johnson, Olympic decathlon winner; Dr. Walto Lyon, scientist who charted the first voyage of the U.S.S. *Nautilus* under the North Pole.

Indeed, UCLA is one of the finest in academia. The energy, integrity, the learning concepts, the hopes and aspirations of its faculty and student body have made it so. In a great measure, its achievements have been possible because of the unusual and prized system of free university education that the State of California has established for its citizens. The State's willingness to invest in the future of its citizens has contributed greatly to the exceptional institution that today is UCLA.

I am not unmindful that the problems which exist at many universities also exist on some of California's campuses, and that these unresolved problems must be solved if academic growth is to continue. Education at all levels is still the most meaningful opportunity this country can offer to its young people. This is especially true of higher education, because from that point, young people become this Nation's leaders—its doctors, scientists, businessmen; its educator, its artists, its writers, its politicians, and its statesmen—or whatever field of endeavor a young person wishes to pursue.

UCLA has extraordinary gifts to offer to these young people to prepare them for their place in society. UCLA's students will—and must—continue to be enriched in mind and in spirit, with freedom to learn and to create on the highest intellectual plane, without which this Nation will become a wasteland.

The university needs only to remember its past 50 years of accomplishments—through wars, depressions, and other times of great social change, to be able to look confidently toward an even greater future.

UCLA will continue to grow. Its influence will continue to be felt, and it will continue to be one of the best in academia.

## MARITIME DAY

### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on this observance of Maritime Day, it would be well if we were to dedicate ourselves to actions in this Congress to bring a new sense of hope to those who operate and man our merchant marine—to the development of a program that will lead to a new era of construction of American vessels and an enlargement of the amount of cargo carried aboard these American vessels.

As we survey the disarray of our merchant marine fortunes on Maritime Day 1969 it must be obvious to all of us, Mr. Speaker, that we need a realistic program to properly carry out the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so that the maritime industry may prosper instead of continuing to suffer. What is urgently needed is a sweeping program that will lead our ailing fleet to reconstruction and recovery.

A strong merchant marine is vital to U.S. prestige and potency as a seapower and should be commensurate with the U.S. status as a leading world power.

A strong merchant marine provides direct economic benefits for shipowners, shipbuilders and shipworkers, and indirectly benefits every other segment of our economy by serving the commercial needs of the Nation and the world.

A strong merchant marine provides an important means for redressing the deficit in our balance of payments, because to the extent that our imports and exports move in foreign vessels we add to the deficit, and to the extent that they move in American vessels we contribute toward an eventual surplus.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons for having a strong merchant marine. Yet we have ignored these facts and allowed our fleet to practically diminish—and this is regrettable. I would hope, therefore, that we can move forward from this Maritime Day toward a new era of maritime strength.

## NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week many of us have had an opportunity to share with our admired Norwegian American friends in their celebration of Norwegian Independence Day.

These observances are a poignant reminder that 155 years ago the people of Norway were jubilant over the adoption of their new Constitution and its farsighted assurances of rights and privileges for them and for the subsequent generations to come.

It is no wonder that American citizens of Norwegian birth or extraction place the celebration of Norwegian Independence second only to our own American Independence Day. It is no wonder that these patriotic citizens who have consistently demonstrated their loyalty to this country, its flag, its laws, and its people pay such fervid tribute to their erstwhile homeland and the Constitution which their forebears adopted over a century and a half ago.

This noble and historic document came into being only after the most astute statesmen and proficient legal minds took from our Declaration of Independence and from the provisions for assuring personal freedom emanating from the French Revolution the best statements and principles which they wove into their own historically sound legal structure—a structure so sound and so far seeing that only a relatively few amendments have been required since its adoption on May 17, 1814.

With this magnificent background of independence both in theory and in practice, the people who left Norway to come to the United States brought an attitude of mind and a dedication of purpose wholly consonant with that of the pioneering people of this country.

No element among the races and nationalities who have migrated to our shores in the almost 200 years of its independent existence have made a more significant or lasting contribution to this Nation than those who came here from Norway. It is with both pride and appreciation that we acknowledge their signal influence on our westward expansion. It is with similar pride and gratitude that we acknowledge their great contribution to bringing to this country so many who pioneered and helped to expand this country's important maritime role.

Mr. Speaker, all America can be grateful for what these God-fearing, law-abiding, and hard-working people have done to help build America into its present greatness. No group of new Americans has so quickly been blended and absorbed into the so-called American way than have these descendants of the Vikings. However, no group has been more capable of preserving the joyful customs and wholesome reminders of their forebears. Every American of Norwegian birth or extraction can be proud of his lineage and can be proud of what his people have done to make this country great.

Every American of whatever lineage can be proud of his fellow citizens who celebrate Norwegian independence, and every American can be grateful for what these fine people have done for him personally.

I congratulate once more these friends and neighbors who honor Norway's great constitution and who pay tribute to a country whose love for freedom and justice to all mankind has never wavered.

## THE TACTICS OF TERROR IN VIETNAM

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the war in South Vietnam which has been either overlooked or ignored in some quarters is the extent to which civilians of South Vietnam have suffered at the hands of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Communists. It is ironic, when one considers the propaganda war being waged by those who are against the U.S. effort in that beleagured country, that full disclosure of the terror employed against these people is not given wider and regular publicity. When the U.S. presence in Vietnam is in defense of the South Vietnamese people in their fight to preserve their liberty against Ho Chi Minh, what better justification for our policy can we have than the brutal and widespread killings to which these free people are subjected? It is again ironic that attention is given to the fair packaging issue in order to insure that the housewife gets the proper quantity in a box of raisins, but the same housewife can lose a husband or a son in Vietnam and the cause for which he died is allowed to be buried in a welter of left-wing propaganda. The most simple yet eloquently compelling argument for our being in Vietnam—the protection of the lives of innocent people—goes virtually ignored in many circles. Just let five towns in any given State in our Nation suffer the loss by murder of a mayor, or a policeman, or a civil servant, or a teacher, or any other local leader at the hands of a group whose official policy is terror, and the people would be up in arms—and rightfully and fortunately so. But let literally thousands of village and hamlet chiefs, civil servants, policemen, schoolteachers and other village leaders

be dispatched to their graves over a period of 10 years or more in South Vietnam, by the same inhuman methods and motivated by the same godless philosophy which has snuffed out literally millions of lives throughout the world in the last 50 years, and this slaughter is matter-of-factly noted and forgotten.

One publication which has consistently put proper emphasis on Communist inhumanity to man in South Vietnam is the National Observer. One of its correspondents, Peter T. Chew, writing from Saigon, reports on the upsurge in terror in South Vietnam since the beginning of this year. It is indeed tragic that similar extensive articles on this issue do not appear day in and day out, month after month, to drive home to the American people the deliberately inflicted and policy-directed sufferings perpetrated by the enemy in that yet free land.

Accompanying Mr. Chew's article is a picture of a burial scene in South Vietnam which has been repeated thousands of times over the years. This particular picture is similar to others which were published in the weekly magazine, National Review, some months ago and which had been obtained from the Defense Department. The title of the National Review photo story was: "Vietnam—The Photographs We're Never Asked for."

The lead paragraph explained:

When National Review approached the Pentagon to secure photos of Vietcong atrocities, an official said, "You're the first people who ever asked for these." The photos on these four pages are clear—and, we know, sickening—evidence of atrocities outlawed by all laws of war, which have left Vietnam covered with butchered and desecrated corpses.

Under unanimous consent, I shall submit the article, "The Tactics of Terror in Vietnam—Viet Cong Strikes by Scalpel," by Peter T. Chew, and appearing in the May 19, 1969, issue of the National Observer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

VIETCONG STRIKES BY SCALPEL—THE TACTICS OF TERROR IN VIETNAM

(By Peter T. Chew)

SAIGON.—With both sides pressing peace initiatives, why has the National Liberation Front (NFL) intensified its campaign of terror against South Vietnamese civilians?

Since the first of the year, some 3,000 noncombatants have been assassinated, or have otherwise lost their lives as the result of mounting terrorist activity. In recent weeks—in apparent celebration of Ho Chi Minh's 79th birthday on May 19—terrorist incidents have assumed an especially ghastly quality. Furthermore, the trend is expected to continue in the weeks ahead, President Nixon's peace overture notwithstanding.

There is no single, clear-cut answer. But psychological-warfare specialists say that important clues can be found by careful study of the daily "Roundup of Communist Terrorist Activities" issued by the Vietnamese national police here every evening. Written in chillingly understated prose—"A VC team entered Xom Lang Hamlet, Go Cong Province, took a woman named Phan Thi Tri, aged 33, from her home to a rice field 50 meters away and killed her by cutting her neck with a machete"—the roundup puts one in mind of a stock market of death which is analyzed for information concerning the enemy's strengths, weaknesses, and intentions.

WATCHING THE COMPUTERS

"When the computers show, for example, a sharp increase in Viet Cong abductions of villagers in a sector of a province," says a U.S. Government authority, "it is an almost certain bet that we can soon look for a Viet Cong attack in that neighborhood because the villagers have been impressed into service as porters."

Most authorities agree that terrorism is a weapon of the weak, and that this rule of thumb can be applied to the Viet Cong at the present time, decimated as their ranks have been in combat. This is especially true in the Mekong Delta, where North Vietnamese Army (NVA) troops were reported on the move last week for the first time in the traditional Viet Cong stronghold.

As a result of this attrition, the burden of fighting shifted almost completely last year from the Viet Cong to the NVA. The VC were, in a sense, shunted aside. Consequently, they lost face with their allies and with the South Vietnamese people whom they seek to subjugate. They began to lose the momentum that a revolution must maintain in order to succeed.

"The hard fact is that the National Liberation Front is trying to fuzz over its impotence," says Douglas Pike, author of the recently published *War, Peace, and the Viet-Cong*, who is considered one of the foremost authorities on the NLF; he served here for nine years with U.S. Government agencies studying the enemy's political and military structure.

DRAWING ATTENTION TO THEMSELVES

"The Viet Cong can't raise the troops to do the job, so this terrorism, this rocketing of market places and the like, is a way of drawing attention to themselves on the cheap. They almost seem to be saying: 'Yes, there is talk of peace, but *we* still count; *we* are still potent.' It's as though they were afraid that the North Vietnamese will forget to invite them to the final peace settlement."

Other reasons for the terrorism are put forward. With the incessant talk of U.S. troop withdrawals, and Washington's fervent desire for peace, the Viet Cong are passing the word, as they have done before, that the United States plans to "sell out" the government of Vietnam (GVN). By demonstrating that Viet Cong assassination squads, grenade tossers, and mortar crews can strike almost at will, the enemy is saying to the South Vietnamese: "You had better come over to our side before it is too late."

In Saigon during last year's Tet offensive, the Viet Cong started a similar rumor with considerable success, according to a Rand Corp. survey taken after the fighting had ended.

"As variously spun out," says the report, "the rumor was often based on suspicions or fears that the U.S. Government had recently decided that it should pull out of Vietnam. This was considered plausible because of the past record of official U.S. pressure on the government of Vietnam to accept the National Liberation Front as negotiating partner, the existence of factions within the American political scene which favored a Viet Cong [Saigon] coalition government in South Vietnam, the enormous cost of the war to the United States in terms of men, material, and domestic morale. . . ."

RUMOR OF A SECRET MEETING

Thus the story spread through Saigon that the United States had met secretly with the Viet Cong and had agreed to allow them to attack the city, so weakening the government of Vietnam that "the United States would have an excuse to begin negotiations, to form a coalition government in Saigon, and to withdraw American troops in short order."

Ironically, the peace negotiations are credited, indirectly, with the increase in Viet Cong terrorist activity. Anxious to control as much of the population as possible when peace does come, the government of Vietnam, with U.S. assistance and encouragement, began an "accelerated" pacification program late last year, a program that has met with considerable success. To counter this drive, the Viet Cong accelerated their time-tested terror tactics, which, by conservative estimate, have resulted in the deaths of more than 20,000 civilians and the wounding of twice that number since 1957. Their targets were the same as always: the village and hamlet chiefs, civil servants, policemen, schoolteachers, natural leaders of all kinds, self-defense forces, people in the employ of the Americans.

"They are particularly anxious to keep the schools closed," says a U.S. military man. "Not long ago they stopped a school bus and told the children not to go to school. When the childrens' parents allowed them to continue school, they stopped the bus again the next week, took a little girl off the bus, and cut her fingers off. The school has been closed ever since."

Last week, U.S. officials, who were busy setting the stage in Washington, Paris, and Saigon for President Nixon's Vietnam speech, found the Viet Cong terrorism difficult to ignore. By way of welcoming Secretary of State William P. Rogers to Saigon, the Viet Cong rocketed the runaway of Tan Son Nhut Airport the day before his arrival for conferences with President Thieu.

"The indiscriminate and senseless killing and wounding of civilians in their homes and in the streets only raises questions about the intentions of the other side," said Mr. Rogers. "Symbolic acts of terrorism like those that took place in a number of cities in South Vietnam as recently as yesterday do not reinforce the hope of a settlement."

At first glimpse, much of the killing that has been taking place in recent weeks has appeared to be indiscriminate and senseless. Upon closer examination, however, most of the killing had a specific purpose, was not always indiscriminate, and, to the Viet Cong at least, was anything but senseless.

READING THE MESSAGE

Because it is so difficult to terrorize people in the mass—as, for example, Stalin was able to do with his purges—terrorism is more often employed as a scalpel. Hence there is invariably a carefully conceived reason for each attack. Sometimes the reason is quite obvious; sometimes it is incomprehensive to all but the person or persons to whom the "message" is directed.

Take some recent incidents. The other day, a terrorist threw a hand grenade into the yard of Adm. Eimo R. Zumwalt, commander of U.S. Naval Forces, Vietnam. One of the principal uses of terrorism is to gain publicity, and to boost the morale of one's followers. Names make news, and even though no one was harmed in the attack, the attempt was a major news item.

"It might not even have been as complicated as that," says one analyst of the daily terrorism roundup. "The attack was carried out in such an amateurish fashion that it could have been a disgruntled Vietnamese civilian employe of the Navy."

Early one morning, a terrorist tossed a hand grenade into the government's central post office and telegraph office opposite Saigon Cathedral, just a few blocks from the Caravelle and Continental Palace hotels, in the very heart of downtown Saigon. Why? Again, an attack on such an installation is newsworthy and conveys, momentarily at least, the impression that the Viet Cong is ubiquitous. Moreover, the Viet Cong constantly urge the citizenry to stay away from such government installations. The grenade was a reminder.

DEATH ON A CHOLON BUS

Two women terrorists boarded a bus in Cholon, the working-class and Chinese section of the city, shot the driver, and set fire

to the vehicle, the driver and a passenger perishing in the flames. Senseless? Probably not, in the Viet Cong view.

"The bus was probably owned by a Chinese businessman," says the analyst. "Now every commercial vehicle moving on the roads in Vietnam pays 'taxes' to the VC or to crooks who claim they are VC. The Chinese are pretty foxy; the businessman probably tried to get out of paying off."

Adding to the terror mix are straight forward attacks upon targets such as police stations and military installations in which innocent bystanders are inevitably killed and wounded. Terrorists casually wheeled a cart up to a police station in Cholon at midday last week and fled when suspicious policemen approached. Seconds later, a 40-pound explosive in the cart ripped through the police station, killing one woman and wounding 26 bystanders.

Another nervy terror squad was surprised in the process of setting up a 60mm. mortar in a school house within range of the heavily guarded Presidential Palace. National police killed one of the mortar-men and arrested two others.

SENSELESS ACTS

Regardless of the rationale, Westerners find many acts of terrorism "senseless" in view of the extremely heavy toll of innocent persons. Terrorists one recent morning concealed a powerful bomb in a container and placed it on a street corner in front of a coffee shop in the most congested section of the market in Ben Tre, a city south of here. The bomb killed 6 persons and wounded 42; among the dead were two 60-year-old women and two girls, aged 3 and 12.

Equally horrible, in Western eyes, are the indiscriminate rocketings of market places, hospitals, and shacks of the poor in cities such as Saigon and Da Nang. Such actions are seen as attempts at mass terrorization. They fail because the enemy is not strong enough to send rockets and mortars over in sufficient quantity to induce this effect. As a result, the rocketings have had a tendency to backfire, infuriating many people who had often as not been indifferent to either the Viet Cong or the government. The rocketings have even converted some opponents of the Thieu government.

"Some militant Buddhists came to me in shocked surprise and righteous indignation," says one U.S. official. "They said, as though they had just discovered a great new truth: 'Why, they are killing innocent people with these rockets here in Saigon!' It was all I could do to keep from replying: 'Yes, you're at least getting a dose of what the people in the villages have been living with for nearly 15 years. Maybe now you'll wake up.'"

By far the most grisly, and significant, chapter in th history of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese terrorism in South Vietnam is still unfolding in the city of Hue where, since the end of the Tet offensive last year, more than 2,000 bodies of persons methodically assassinated by the enemy have been dug up from shallow mass graves. Volunteer gravediggers, many of them teen-agers, are still finding bodies, and officials believe that another 1,000 and possibly 2,000 will be uncovered.

"It was the beginning of the 'night of the long knives' that is standard operating procedure after a Communist takeover," says a U.S. State Department man who has made a study of the Hue massacre. "The North Vietnamese held Hue for nearly a month, and they had planned to hold it permanently as an enclave. The assassination squads worked from prepared lists, just as the Nazis and the Stalinists did. What happened in Hue is just a smattering of what you can expect if the Communists succeed in taking over South Vietnam."

There is reason to believe that President Nixon had Hue in mind when he said in his Vietnam speech last week: "When we assumed the burden of helping defend South Vietnam, millions of South Vietnamese men, women, and children placed their trust in us. To abandon them now would risk a massacre that would shock and dismay everyone in the world who values human life."

When the enemy was finally dislodged last year from the thick-walled Citadel of Hue where they made their last stand, 19 mass graves were found containing the bodies of 1,200 men, women, and children. Many of the dead were the usual victims: city and province officials, national policemen, military personnel, others with a reputation for anti-communism, and Catholic refugees from North Vietnam.

REDS TURN ON THEIR ALLIES

But what came as a shock to many was the fact that the Communists also assassinated militant Buddhists who had been involved in earlier attempts to overthrow the Saigon regime, men who had worked with the Communists toward this end. They eliminated, as well, members of numerous antigovernment political parties, foreign missionaries, and medical personnel.

Among the foreigners killed were Father M. Cressonier, 59, and Father Pierre Poncet, 36, of France, who belonged to the Societe des Missions Etrangeres de Paris, Father Cressonier having lived in Hue for 25 years. Two other French priests, members of the Benedictine Order, were also assassinated.

Students and faculty of Hue University were appalled at the murder of three German professors of medicine and the wife of one of them.

"They were discovered April 2, 1968," says a U.S. Government report. "They had been dumped into a single shallow grave in a freshly plowed potato field behind a rural pagoda not more than 1½ kilometers south of the walled city. All had been shot in the back of the head, their hands trussed behind them with wire. The victims were: Dr. Horst Krainick, 59, professor of pediatrics, and his wife Elizabeth (whose body had been mutilated); Dr. Raimund Discher, 44, professor of internal medicine; and Dr. Alois Altekoester, 36, professor of general medicine.

"These people had never done anything warlike or hurtful to the VC," said Dr. Nguyen The Anh, professor of history and rector of Hue University. "And Frau Krainick was a gracious lady. We simply don't understand it."

BURIED ALIVE

American and South Vietnamese investigating teams report that "almost half of the victims were found in conditions indicating that they had been buried alive. Many were found together in groups of 10 to 15, eyes open, with dirt or cloth in their mouths. Evidence also was discovered of victims having been clubbed unconscious prior to being buried alive."

In one official report of the massacre there appears this item: "Tang Quang Tu Pagoda. Coordinates: YD 764–240. Number of graves: 13. Number of bodies: 67. Date discovered: From 3/1/68. Comment: Victims shot. Buddhist monk in Pagoda heard nightly executions by pistol and rifle shots in plowed field behind pagoda during first two weeks in February, with victims pleading for mercy. Leader of Vietnam Nationalist Party Nguyen Ngoc Ky, was among victims found here."

In March of this year, a new search for bodies was begun at the instigation of a diminutive 40-year-old widow, Madame Ton That Lang of a neighboring district. Her husband, a school teacher, had been taken from their home by six Viet Cong soldiers six days after the city's occupation.

Madame Lang prevailed upon her district chief to ask for volunteers and trucks to begin a search for bodies in the sandy marshlands not far from Hue. The search was successful. Other committees were formed, other searches were begun, more bodies were found.

"One set of graves was discovered when someone noticed that the grass in that particular field was greener than it was in the next field," says an American official.

Identification, most of the time, has been impossible, for the enemy destroyed the victims' identification cards. One woman obviously had a premonition of her fate: She wrote her name, ID card number, and address in ink on the inside of her underwear.

The first batch of 1,200 bodies found last year was buried in a paddy. But the new finds, totaling 800 bodies so far, are so numerous that it was decided not to waste any more valuable rice-growing land with a cemetery; hence a new burial ground has been established in sandy scrubland.

The bodies are placed in plywood coffins, which are painted red and given numbers. Then mass funerals are held. Among the mourners at a recent funeral was Madame Lang. She hasn't found her husband's body yet. But she hasn't given up the search.

---

## MICHIGAN'S BATTERED BABIES

### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News recently carried a series of articles written by Ruth Carlton and Kathleen O'Brien on Michigan's battered babies. The tragedy of child abuse with its unbelievable horrors points to an area where there is great need for new approaches by the courts, welfare agencies, and the entire community toward solving this problem. In Michigan last year the reported number of child abuse cases totaled 766, and for the Nation as a whole it is reported that one or two children are killed by their parents every day.

Indeed, too little attention has been given to the innocent victims involved, many of whom are too young to talk and are forced to bear lifelong emotional and physical scars of this brutality. One of the reasons this problem has been overlooked is that it relates to the family and the personal relationship of its members. But this whole problem affects society and it demands solution.

At this point, I place the series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone to read:

MICHIGAN'S BATTERED BABIES: ARE THEY THE VICTIMS OF THEIR PARENTS' RAGE? OF SOCIAL WORKERS SNARLED IN REDTAPE? OR OF A SOCIETY THAT DOESN'T CARE?

(By Ruth Carlton and Kathleen O'Brien)

Two-and-a-half-year old twin girls died last year in Wayne County as a result of burns they suffered when their stepmother poured boiling water on them as they were taking their bath.

A six-month-old baby boy was found weak and close to death in a Detroit home where three other children seemed happy and well-fed.

A two-month-old baby was badly bruised when he was brought into a Detroit hospital emergency room. The mother said he had fallen out of his crib. Later, under questioning, she admitted throwing the baby across the room when he would not stop crying.

These are three of the 766 cases of child abuse reported in Michigan last year; 334 came from Wayne County. Four of the Wayne County children died—all under 27 months of age.

Most of the victims are under three . . . too young to tell what happened to them . . . too small to run away.

Doctors are required by a 1964 state law to report all suspected cases of child abuse to the Michigan Department of Social Services (MDSS). This law also protects the doctor's anonymity.

Still all authorities agree only a fraction of the abuse cases are reported.

Furthermore there is no agreement among authorities about what steps should be taken when a case of abuse is reported.

Should the abused child be removed permanently from the parents?

Should the parents be punished by having their child taken from them?

Or should an effort be made to rehabilitate the parents through social work counseling?

Should the child remain in the home while his parents go through this emotional re-education? Or should he be temporarily placed with foster parents until his own parents have learned to handle their anger and frustration a different way?

"There's a struggle in philosophy of how to handle beaten babies," says Judge James H. Lincoln of Wayne County Juvenile Court.

"The Department of Social Services seems to feel social work should be carried on without court intervention. I object; you wind up with dead kids.

"I want the Department of Social Services to offer social services; but I want them to bring each case immediately to court.

"I want an official petition filed to move the child out of the home on every abuse case."

He says parents will often agree to let children go into boarding homes without the case going to court.

"But two months later when they want the child back nothing can stop them.

"I'm in favor of social work to help the parents. But use the authority of the court to protect the child.

"Even if the court leaves the child in the home there is more control if the case has been reviewed by the court. Then the parents have to let the social worker in. It's different than social work visiting on a voluntary basis," Judge Lincoln says.

"I have a baby in the hospital now so savagely beaten he may not live," says Dr. Marilyn Heins, director of pediatrics for Detroit General Hospital.

He is an 18-month-old boy who weighed only 14 pounds when he was brought in. His tiny back is scarred from beating; his belly bloated from near starvation.

Half a dozen burn spots on his cheeks are the size of a cigarette coal.

His mother had been arrested two years ago when another of her children was brought in brutally abused.

"We (the doctor who examined him, the nurse and social worker who visited the home) all said this is a terrible situation; the children should be removed at once. But nothing happened.

"How many children from that home must suffer before someone takes action to protect the children?" the doctor asks.

A Detroit police woman says: "It is out of our hands. All we can do is report to the Michigan Department of Social Services." (Before the 1964 law, child abuse was reported to the police.)

The implication is: they report to the MDSS and nothing happens.

A social worker says, "One abused child, returned home for lack of proof that his parents were responsible, was dead two months later as a result of 'an accident'."

Another social worker who formerly worked for the Wayne County DSS says: "There is so much paper work involved with taking a child from his home and placing him in a foster home that the social worker can't possibly offer real service to the parents or the child."

Many cases of child abuse still go unreported, says Dr. Margaret Zolliker, director of maternal, child and school health for the City-County Health Departments.

"Most doctors in private practice are gunshy; they won't turn in a case of abuse for fear of being sued." (Even though the law protects their anonymity, a family that takes a child to their family doctor can figure out where the report came from.)

Often the doctor simply cannot believe a patient he knows is capable of beating a child, she says.

"These parents fall into two groups," Judge Lincoln says. "Those who know they are doing wrong to break a child's bones and those who think they are following the Bible on spare the rod and spoil the child."

The greatest need in Wayne County is for adequate marriage counseling, family social work, which could shore up these families, Judge Lincoln says.

"With help for the parents many of the 3,000 kids now wards of my court might be in their own homes. We would not need the constant search for boarding homes and adoptive homes if we prevented the breakdown of the family—the child's own family."

"Child abuse is just one facet of the larger problem—unwanted children," says Dr. Marilyn Heins.

"We should attack it by all methods to prevent unwanted children . . . birth control, legal abortion and subsidized adoption. Anything rather than unwanted kids."

In the meantime Dr. Heins feels the emphasis should be on protecting the child . . . especially the very young child who has no defense.

Dr. Heins says 17 percent of the children coming into Detroit General are there because of neglect or abuse.

In a study of 47 families brought before Wayne County Juvenile Court for child abuse, these facts stand out:

Twenty-six of the 47 abusive parents were under 25 years of age.

Twenty-one of the parents had married before the age of 20.

Half of the parents had failed to graduate from high school.

Many of them were mentally retarded.

Thirty-three of the 47 children abused were under three years old.

In 23 of the families the abuse was confined to one child.

The majority of the families were from the inner city.

But Dr. Zolliker stresses that the problem is not confined to the inner city.

"Although pressures are greater on poverty families who live in the inner city, abuse cuts across all boundaries. It is not limited to any economic group, nationality, race or neighborhood," she says.

Police records show many forms and types of abuse. Children have been beaten with bare fists and baseball bats. They have been burned with open flames, lighted cigarettes, electric irons and boiling water.

They have been strangled or suffocated by pillows or plastic bags. And they have been stabbed, bitten, shot, subjected to electric shock and had pepper forced down their throats.

How does abuse start?

A psychiatrist at Wayne County Juvenile Court says abuse frequently begins when a child cries and the parent cannot quiet him, or when the parent begins to toilet train the child and finds it more difficult than he had expected.

In both cases patience runs out and the parent loses control, according to the doctor.

Children who were unwanted pregnancies or children who have health problems are especially likely to be abused, he says.

"After you have seen some of these children you expect to find a huge brute of a parent who inflicted the abuse. This is not the case. The parents are usually pathetic people who you think could hardly lift a beer bottle.

"Usually only one parent is the abuser, and it's as often the mother as the father," this doctor says.

Does the parent restrict his abuse to one child?

"We used to think so. But I find when the court moves the abused child to a foster home, the parents single out another child as their victim," says the psychiatrist.

"In checking into the family's history we often find another child in the family died mysteriously."

Doctors are not sure how abused children will grow up. Whether they can ever function as citizens after the terror they have experienced. They do know that quite often the abusive parent was himself an abused child.

Will the baby lying in the hospital with the angry whip marks on his back grow up to abuse his children?

Punishing the parent is not the answer. But what is?

Dr. Heins believes one step might be the formation of an agency that would be able to handle the entire problem of abuse in one facility.

"It is quite difficult to get treatment for parents who abuse their children," says Dr. Heins. "These parents need treatment before the child is returned to the home or we are going to wind up with more dead children."

Ideally such an agency would handle only the problem of child abuse instead of the multitude of problems the Department of Social Services handles.

"No child protective work is really being done when everything is closed Saturdays and Sundays," says Rosemary Klug, chief of women's division, Detroit Police Department.

"On weekends we (the police) are the only protection agency," she says.

"Before the law was changed in 1964, child abuse was reported to the police department and investigated by policewomen. Now investigation is left to the agency (Department of Social Services) and reporting is required of doctors. They are not reporting.

"We get very few abuse cases now," Miss Klug said. "On one case last week we arrested a mother and placed the child in custody. We felt the child's life was in danger. But we will probably be criticized by Department of Social Services."

Some of the tiny cries for help from the children are being heard by the authorities.

The important job now is answering these cries before they are silenced forever.

---

ABUSED CHILDREN TAKE A BEATING: CHILDREN GET HURT WHILE SOCIAL WORKERS FIGHT LEGAL FORMS, REDTAPE

Detroit is failing its abused children. They get lost in a mountain of paper work which buries all efforts of the social workers hired to help them.

The social workers really care about what happens to kids or they wouldn't be there, but they can't cut through the red tape.

While I was supervisor of the Wayne County Department of Social Services abuse department, I took on an abuse case myself just to see what was involved. I thought maybe my staff was not coping efficiently. They were—as efficiently as possible under the circumstances.

On my one case I had to fill out some 30 forms—all of them long. I found myself doing hours and hours of paper work, but not doing a good job where the child and his parents were concerned.

And this was ONE case. My four social workers had an average case load of 35 families with some 130 children.

The paper road-block started 15 or 20 years ago with some simple documents. When a hole was discovered in one, a new document

was written to plug the hole. But no form was ever discarded. Health, Education and Welfare came along and wanted certain information which added more forms—all of them long.

If you care what happens to children and their families, it haunts you. I finally quit. Before leaving I had asked for a revision, cutting paper work, hiring of clerical help to do essential paper work to free social workers to give service.

I still believe it can be accomplished if the public knows the conditions.

The philosophy behind the Department of Social Services approach is sound. Basically it's to try to save the family—to help the parents change so the child can remain with them.

These are the only parents the child has.

There is in most of these parents a love-hate relationship toward this child. They do love him. The parents have a great need for maturity, to solve some of their own problems.

We know when we take a child out of his home he does miss his parents even though he's been abused.

But the safety of the child is the first consideration. If he seems to be in danger, he is moved promptly to a carefully selected foster home.

Hopefully this foster home will nourish him for the year or more until he can return to his own home. The social worker will work regularly with the parents to help them mature enough to find different ways to reacting to this child. (Abusing parents are usually immature and reacting childishly to their child.)

The philosophy assumes it will take at least a year for the parents to change. And the social worker would need to see them at least once a week to bring about such a change.

In the meantime the social worker is also helping the child adjust to his foster home, arranging for visits with his own parents and after the visit help the child understand his conflicting emotions.

At the end of this ideal year the child is reconciled with his parents and moved back home.

That's the philosophy.

Would you like to hear how it works?

In reality if the social worker visits the parents briefly once in three months she's doing well.

As for that carefully selected foster home—if there is a bed empty in any licensed foster home, the child is put in that bed.

Because the child is thrown into the first foster home available, he may be thrown out of it in a couple of weeks.

These children are usually damaged emotionally by the time they are two years old. They are difficult children to handle. They may be bed wetters, fighters, sulky, withdrawn, unreasonable in their demands for attention.

So they are moved from foster home to foster home to foster home, deteriorating on the way.

And if a child is returned to his own home at the end of the year, the family probably is no different than at the time the child was removed. Nor is the child.

Before quitting my job as a social worker for abuse cases, I also pleaded that some one set up priorities.

You have the hospital demanding that an abandoned baby be removed immediately.

You have Healey Home (a temporary shelter for Juvenile Court) demanding that a child be moved into a foster home, immediately.

You have to calm down a foster mother whose payments haven't arrived for six weeks.

You have another foster mother demanding you remove a five-year-old who wets the bed and beats the other kids.

What do you do first? Some priorities must be established.

Every night I went home haunted by the things not done. Praying that the next day's papers wouldn't have a tragedy headline. For when you are dealing with abused children the thing you don't have time to do may mean a child will die . . . a parent commit suicide.

So eventually you give up the battle.

---

BATTERED BABY RESCUED BY SOCIAL WORKER: A 53-HOUR DRAMA

(By Ruth Carlton)

Here are the steps one social worker had to take to remove one obviously abused child from the parent's home. We will call her Miss Smith. She works for Wayne County Department of Social Services (DSS).

MONDAY

2:10 p.m. Doctor calls Wayne County Department of Social Services. He has just placed a 10-month-old boy in a private hospital whom he believes to be victim of parental abuse.

2:15 p.m. Miss Smith calls him back for his report. Baby has broken arm, black eye, burns on buttocks and possible internal injuries.

3 p.m. Miss Smith goes to hospital to see child; by coincidence meets parents there. Nurse finds private cubicle for them to talk. The parents deny everything. Miss Smith takes their address, tells them she will call on them later this afternoon.

4:20 p.m. To doctor's office, sees correspondence with California doctor who had treated this child before family moved to Michigan. California doctor had suspected parental abuse.

5 p.m. Social worker drives to child's parents' home. They had not told her it was an apartment building. No list of tenants is posted, the caretaker not at home. Miss Smith calls it a day.

TUESDAY

9 a.m. Phones caretaker and gets apartment number and telephone number for the parents.

9:30 a.m. Phones parents, explains why she had not kept her appointment the day before, outlines next steps: File a petition with the court (Wayne County Juvenile Court), judge to decide whether child returns to them. Preliminary hearing at Juvenile Court likely within three days. Angry father says he is going to hospital and get his child.

9:45 a.m. Miss Smith calls hospital, asks them to discourage parents about moving child. She assures hospital she is requesting an order of detention from court which she will deliver to hospital later today. Hospital promises nothing. Doesn't want to get involved.

10:15 a.m. She calls court to ask if detaining order can be given by phone. The answer is no. Nothing can be done without first having her written petition for the court to review the case.

10:30 a.m. Social worker types a two-page, single-spaced petition (in quadruplicate).

1 p.m. Delivers petition to court, waits for court order of detention to be typed and signed by judge.

2:45 p.m. Takes detention order to hospital. The father had left an hour earlier with the little boy.

4 p.m. Miss Smith calls the prosecutor. He advises her to request writ of apprehension the next morning.

5 p.m. Calls her supervisor and court to report.

WEDNESDAY

9 a.m. Applies for writ at Juvenile Court.

1 p.m. Phones California doctor who agrees to airmail his record of his case and x-rays. These will be vital for the court hearing.

4 p.m. Notified writ is ready. (Here comes a musical comedy situation of who is to serve writ on the parents. Wayne County Juvenile Court, seething under repeated refusals by the state legislature for adequate financial help, refuses to send an officer of the court to get the child. That, in the court's opinion, is the state's responsibility.

Miss Smith who weighs 105 pounds seems an unlikely person to take a child away from two belligerent parents. Eventually able-bodied man from another office is asked to accompany her.)

4:30 p.m. Calls police in family's precinct requesting an escort.

5 p.m. Picks up writ of apprehension at Juvenile Court, drives by police station to pick up escort.

6 p.m. Arrives at parents' home. As writ is handed to the father, mother picks up the baby and walks into the bedroom. The father follows, closing the door.

6:20 p.m. Father reenters room and announces, "You can take me to jail but you can't take my baby out of here." He returns to bedroom. This scene is repeated several times until the father is persuaded to call his attorney. Attorney advises him to obey court order.

7:15 p.m. The father agrees to allow the child to be taken into care but says he and his wife will go too.

7:40 p.m. They start out . . . the social worker, the man who served the writ, the mother and her two other children in the social worker's car. The baby in the mother's arms. The baby's father drives alone followed by police car.

8 p.m. The child is placed in Detroit General Hospital—53 hours and 50 minutes after the abuse was first reported.

THURSDAY

9 a.m. Miss Smith dictates a series of reports on this case to go to the Michigan Department of Social Services in Lansing with carbons to prosecuting attorney and Juvenile Court. Various forms required for this one case fill her day.

11 a.m. She calls home-finder of Department of Social Services to ask for a foster home for the child. Fills out series of papers that set up payment to foster mother. Makes out clothing order. (When parents refuse to bring clothes to the child, new clothes must be bought.)

2 p.m. Calls hospital to arrange to pick up child and take him to foster home. But the doctor wants more tests so the baby is to be kept in hospital a few more days.

Monday the social worker will have to appear at the preliminary hearing at Juvenile Court. She is the petitioner asking the court to look into the case.

When the baby is placed in foster home, it will be Miss Smith's job to take him back to the hospital for medical followup.

She will also offer social work counseling to the parents. The first appointment will be in her office. If she thinks it safe, she will go to their home for subsequent appointments.

(This social worker is responsible for 32 child abuse cases at this time.)

MDSS goal is to close each case in 30 days referring the family to some other agency (Lafayette Clinic, Family Service, Child Study Clinic).

If the court decides not to return the child to his parents immediately, the child is made a temporary ward of the court and assigned to one of Detroit's child care agencies which will supervise him in a boarding home. All of this is accomplished with due amount of paper work.

With the total tonnage of paper involved in one case of child abuse, it is not hard to understand how the children "get lost" says one experienced social worker.

---

ABUSED CHILDREN: THEIR PARENTS WERE ABUSED KIDS

(By Ruth Carlton)

"Those people! I could kill them myself.

"When I think of anyone beating a small child until they break his bones . . ."

This explosion, from a gracious, poised,

normally compassionate woman is reflected by most of us.

The subject of battered babies strikes raw nerves and we react in anger.

"But these parents need sympathy as well as the child," plead the social workers.

"We must see abusive parents as troubled people, as greatly in need of help as is the child they have abused," says Robert Daniels, social work supervisor for Catholic Social Services of Wayne County.

"These parents are like children themselves, hostile because their own needs have been unmet and resentful because of the demands made on them as parents."

They themselves grew up in troubled families. "In fact if one point stands out, it is that problem-families beget problem-families," he says. "Somewhere we must break the cycle."

He and John A. Brown, district supervisor for Catholic Social Services of Wayne County, have followed three sets of parents since 1965 when they were referred to the agency for child abuse. Incidentally, none of these families was on public assistance.

In each case the small victim was moved immediately. With the child safe in a temporary foster home, intensive social work counseling was done with the parents.

Neither of these social workers talks in terms of success. But they are convinced these parents profited by social work.

"Now they are better able to fulfill their roles as mothers and fathers, as wage earners, than they were," says Mr. Daniels.

"We have no illusion of having solved all their problems. But because of social work they are able to function much more effectively," Mr. Brown says.

The social worker has to set modest goals in dealing with abuse cases, they say. Only one of these three battered babies has been returned to his parents. The other two have been placed in adoptive homes.

Here are the three cases:

CASE NO. 1

Danny Stevens, 14 months old, was removed from his home because of repeated abuse by his mother.

Mrs. Stevens was retarded and emotionally disturbed. She had had a troubled childhood centered around an alcoholic father and a disturbed, rejecting mother.

Her relationship to her mother had been hostile but dependent and the mother had exerted constant control over her life.

Danny had been born just a week after Mrs. Stevens' mother died. These two events were so closely associated in Mrs. Stevens' mind that she rejected her son from birth, could not bear to hold him. She reacted with rage if the baby cried to be fed or diapered.

After the court took Danny out of this home, Mrs. Stevens talked every week with the social worker. She made enough progress that Danny was returned home after 14 months. There has been no further abuse; Mr. Stevens continues to see the social worker once a month now.

CASE NO. 2

Mr. Carson was brought to court for abusing his infant son. He told the judge he had been angry when his wife left him babysitting. The baby cried, and because he could not stop the crying, he picked up the child and flung him across the room.

Mr. Carson was a depressed dependent person. He was still mourning for his father who had died four years before. His mother had recently married a man of whom Mr. Carson disapproved.

Some way Mr. Carson associated the helplessness of his son with his own helplessness which was compounded now by feeling deserted—deserted by his father's death, deserted by his mother's remarriage, deserted by his wife's leaving their baby with him.

The baby was moved to a foster home. Social work counseling began for Mr. Carson.

Both parents are what the social workers call "limited" . . . more popularly called retarded. The man was willing to give up the child, his wife was not. So the court took permanent court custody of the little boy.

Today Mr. Carson is in the process of getting a divorce.

Mrs. Carson and her daughter have gone to live with her mother.

An adoptive home is lined up for the son who is now four years old. The little boy has some brain damage from the abuse. But the adoptive parents want him even though the doctors do not know how severe the brain damage is.

CASE NO. 3

The Jones family came to the attention of the Juvenile Court when Mrs. Jones demanded they take her three-year-old son George. She threatened to kill him if they didn't.

Mrs. Jones also had three little girls. She was an inadequate mother, but this did not include abusing them. She could not tolerate her son George. She beat him severely and put him outside in near zero weather to punish him.

She resented the attention paid George by his father and other adults.

Mrs. Jones was retarded, came from a home where she was neglected, and had been placed in a state training school for delinquents in her early teens.

Mrs. Jones gave up her boy to be adopted. He is now thriving in an adopted home and the Jones family is still intact—mother, father and three daughters.

"These three parents who abused their children all came from problem families," says Mr. Daniels.

"In trying to help them we focused on the parents themselves and not on the act of abuse. We tried to convey to them our concern over their situation and to provide a climate of goodwill in which we could work with them."

Occasionally the social worker made suggestions about child care and the rearrangement of routines.

A housekeeper to be with a mother who had abused her child during the day while the father was at work.

Day care for a two-year-old so the mother could get some relief.

Mr. Daniels sees abuse as a result of a variety of forces operating on the parents: Their psychological needs, limited intellect, social pressures and economic adversities.

"Where there is a problem of child abuse, there are invariably other problems in the family," he says.

Mr. Daniels sees abuse "not as an intentional act of violence on a child or as merely the result of parental rage, but rather as a response to the parent's overwhelming anxieties and to the hostility engendered by them, which somehow the child seems to intensify."

He feels that social work might be more effective if the neighbors and relatives of abusive parents could stop looking upon them as criminals and see them as deeply troubled human beings.

Perhaps then the cycle could be broken . . . that destructive cycle of abused children become abusing parents.

---

BATTERED BABIES: LOTS OF ORGANIZATIONS BUT TRAGICALLY LITTLE SERVICE

(By Ruth Carlton)

Michigan's failure to protect battered babies and rehabilitate their parents is part of the reason State Department of Social Services is now under fire.

A bill has been introduced to remove child neglect (which includes abuse) from the State Department of Social Services (SDSS).

Senate Bill No. 198, introduced Feb. 26 by Senator Lorraine Beebe, of Dearborn, would set up a new state department—Department of Youth Services—taking both child neglect and delinquency away from the State Department of Social Services.

Judge James H. Lincoln, of Wayne County Juvenile Court, who is one of the supporters of the bill, says: "I do not want to attack personalities. I'm really not interested in who is to blame. But some children's services have to be shifted from SDSS.

"There is no question that the Romney Commission (the Governor's Commission on Youth Problems) report is a hell of an indictment of lack of leadership." (The bill resulted from this report.)

Judge Lincoln referred to his recent request addressed to Bernard Houston, SDSS director, dated April 24:

"I wish to again reiterate the urgent need for five or more additional workers in Wayne County, to be assigned specifically to child abuse cases.

"The Department's (SDSS) policy of dropping cases after 30 days is just simply nonsense. The Department of Social Services is handling the entire neglect load of a number of counties. In Wayne County, their services are either paper thin or nonexistent.

"If the Department of Social Services were to give the same services to Wayne County that now are being furnished to some other counties, it would take no less than 50 workers," the letter said.

Houston's reply to the judge stated he was referring the request to the appropriations committee. "Which means he isn't going to do anything," the judge commented.

"Houston is in an extremely difficult position," the judge continued. "His requests for money from the state legislature are ignored unless some outside group comes up screaming.

"But to get money for a project you have to plan, document, present a five-year plan, and promote it. This SDSS has not done.

"If anything there has been a decrease in services in Wayne County since the merger (the 1966 merger of state, county and city welfare services under SDSS)."

From court to hospital to social workers there is agreement that the battered baby problem can be solved only with adequate casework for the parents. Helping unstable, frustrated, immature parents is also the best prevention known for battered babies.

Increasingly it is suggested the State of Michigan should set up these services rather than depending on the efforts of Catholic Social Services and Children's Aid Society, both private Torch Drive supported agencies.

"The battered baby is only one part of a broader problem of grossly inadequate care and protection of children in many kinds of situations," says Eben W. Martin, family and child welfare consultant of United Community Services and president of the Detroit chapter of National Association of Social Workers.

"A comprehensive, early, child protective and family strengthening service is greatly needed in Michigan. This kind of program is provided in many states by a public agency," Mr. Martin said.

What are protective services?

"Catching a family in trouble before tragedy overtakes them . . . working with them before they harm or kill a child," is one social worker's definition.

Actually Detroit has several fragmented, isolated attempts along this line. Five workers here, six workers there, against unknown thousands of families needing such services.

Here is what Detroit offers these families:

Wayne County Department of Social Services: Five abuse workers who, by plan, would work with the parents for 30 days. (The court calls the 30-day limit "simply nonsense." The social workers say they have no time left for social work if they complete the paper work.)

Wayne County Juvenile Court's Child Study Clinic: No long term service offered. Parents are interviewed before the court

hearing decides whether or not to return their child.

Children's Aid Society: The Torch Drive agency responsible for protective services to Protestant families. The department has decreased from nine workers to five in the last five years.

Catholic Social Services: Provides casework service "that contributes toward a stable and healthy family life" to Catholic families.

Protective Service Unit: Five workers. Set up two and a half years ago with services provided by Catholic Social Services, money by SDSS. Available to any family regardless of religion.

Families are referred by police or schools when children are so blatantly neglected that there is danger to the child.

"We go to their home saying, 'We hear you are having difficulty and we will try to help,'" says Virginia LaFalce, director of the unit.

She plans to introduce a new approach later this month: Group counseling for six to eight mothers.

The First Unitarian Church, 4605 Cass, has agreed to house the project, rent free. Miss LaFalce is looking for volunteer drivers who will pick up the mothers and their children.

She also needs volunteers experienced in nursery school techniques so the session will be a growing experience for children as well as mothers.

SDSS specifies that services be limited to 90 days.

Can parents be changed in 90 days?

"We try to find the family's most immediate problem related to the child and concentrate on that. In 90 days we know how it's going—whether the family is catching a gleam of hope or whether to refer the case to Juvenile Court," Miss LaFalce says.

"Sometimes in 90 days a parent decides he can't handle it. A man whose wife has died leaving him with young children may ask that they be placed in a foster home temporarily.

"Often we refer the family after our 90 days to other UCS agencies," she says.

Obviously the total combined services offered by these small projects can touch only an infinitesimal fraction of parents of neglected and abused children.

There's no way of knowing their total number but at least three thousand of their children are now wards of the Wayne County Juvenile Court.

The conviction that it is preferable to strengthen the existing family and hopefully return the abused child to it is based on:

The damage to the child when he is uprooted.

The difficulty in finding enough foster homes.

The danger that when a shortage of foster homes exists a child may be put into a home no better than the one he's leaving.

In fact Dr. Paul V. Woolley Jr., pediatrician-in-chief of Children's Hospital of Michigan, reports three cases of battered babies abused by foster parents.

Dr. Woolley was one of the pioneers in recognizing the battered baby syndrome. When he first published in medical journals a dozen years ago, many doctors were explaining the multiple fractures in infants as some mysterious ailment of bone fragility.

Dr. Woolley has just completed a chapter on battered babies for a new medical text in which he gives data on 55 constructive cases of physical abuse admitted to Children's Hospital.

| Age: | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Under 3 months | 12 |
| 3 to 6 months | 13 |
| 6 to 12 months | 14 |
| 12 to 24 months | 7 |
| 24 to 36 months | 5 |
| Over 36 months | 4 |

Six of the babies died. Four are known to have permanent damage.

In writing of possible solutions, Dr. Woolley says:

"Sometimes material assistance and moral support for those (parents) where frustration and immaturity are evident suffices.

"In others a close and constant tie to a person skilled in interhuman relations has helped. Some benefit from psychiatric approaches. . . ."

As a last resort he lists "long-term removal of the victim through court action."

"Even this is not a cure-all," he writes, adding that three of his 55 cases were battered in foster homes after having been removed from their parents because of abuse or neglect.

"It is self-evident that no amount of legislation can help unless supported by an enlightened concern on the part of the community, the courts and the medical profession," he says.

---

BATTERED BABIES: VICTIMS OF THEIR PARENTS OR OF SOCIETY?

(By Ruth Carlton)

In this series on battered babies charges have been made against the State Department of Social Services (SDSS) headed by Bernard Houston.

A former head of the abuse department for one county Department of Social Services says she resigned because a ridiculous amount of required paper work prevented her from giving social work services.

Both court and police implied criticism of the handling of abuse cases by the Department of Social Services.

The social worker said she filled out as many as 30 forms on one case.

"Nowhere can we find where as many as 30 forms could possibly have been required," Mr. Houston says in a written statement. "We do have a forms problem but it is not within the battered child program itself.

"Only five forms are actually required for the department workers to carry out the responsibility vested in us through Act 98, which is to

(1) Determine if intentional injury occurred.

(2) Refer to proper law enforcement.

(3) Maintain information registry."

However, Mr. Houston then goes on to list circumstances in which "other forms will be necessary" if additional services are required through another agency "whether these are court forms or the forms of another program in this department."

Also two forms orginate with the county board of auditors. And extra forms are necessary for Medicaid, he notes.

The News learned from another social worker that 30 forms is a conservative estimate in abuse cases. One must be filled out on every child in the family, not just on the one abused child.

Four children in the family means the same form must be filled out four times.

And this series of four must be repeated each time the abused child moves—say from hospital to foster home, on to a second foster home.

Mr. Houston says some forms had been discontinued before The Detroit News article, and three others have been combined since.

He says the required forms have not blocked the efficiency of his staff in Wayne County citing that out of 306 referrals in 1968, 177 were confirmed as abuse.

Sixteen children were removed permanently from their parents and 66 temporarily.

Answering the criticism of local police and court, as reported in Sunday's News, Mr. Houston wrote:

"To our knowledge there simply is no conflict of philosophy between SDSS and the juvenile court. Neither responsibility nor authority is removed from the hands of police and the court."

To indicate cooperation with the court, Mr. Houston points out 21 of the first 34 abuse cases in April were filed with Wayne County Juvenile Court.

State Department of Social Services has established protective services in 10 counties. Wayne County is not one of them.

Mr. Houston claims, "Extremely high priority has been given the battered child program in Wayne County. In January instructions went to staff to cut caseloads which had been 90 down to 30."

The abused child program was separated from neglect to form a separate unit, and the most qualified staff assigned to it, he says. Also one staff member was assigned as liaison to each large hospital.

Mr. Houston says, "A series of statewide workshops on battered children are being set up with Probate Judges Association, the Supreme Court, the Prosecutors' Association and the Attorney General's office."

He points out that while a 1965 law gave SDSS broad responsibility to investigate battered baby charges and provide services, sufficient money has never been allotted to carry out this responsibility.

Critics of SDSS agree the state legislature has never come through with the necessary money. But some believe this is as much due to lack of leadership and promoting on the part of SDSS as to any niggardly attitude of the legislators.

What does this all add up to?

Obviously Michigan babies are still being battered around.

Obviously not enough counseling is available to their parents.

Obviously a preventive approach is needed to keep more babies from being abused.

What is the answer?

Transfer of responsibility to a separate State Department of Youth as proposed in Senate Bill 198?

Preventing unwanted children by more emphasis on planned parenthood and abortion as suggested by Dr. Marilyn Heins, director of pediatrics at Detroit General Hospital?

More funds from the state legislature so State Department of Social Services can do a better job?

Aroused citizens who will demand attention for those too little to run their own protest movement?

As one social worker put it, "It boils down to too little money, too few workers, too few facilities. Only by getting citizens aroused can you ever change the establishment."

---

## INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

---

### HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must act this year on substantial social security legislation. Benefits are seriously deficient at the present time, and because of inflation continued delay means that every retired person's social security check, in effect, gets smaller and smaller with each passing month.

I consider it a duty today to cosponsor Representative VANIK's bill which provides for a 15-percent across the board increase in social security benefits; the bill would also raise the minimum monthly payment from $55 to $80, and very importantly, it provides for automatic adjustments in benefits when the cost of living rises. According to an estimate of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in

autumn 1968, for a retired couple to live moderately it cost $4,100. Yet, the average monthly social security payment to a retired couple in December of that year was about $165. Unquestionably, benefits must be increased to meet basic needs.

Let us keep before our minds that to our shame almost 6 million Americans over 65 years of age are living in poverty. Even by raising social security benefits by 15 percent only about one-fourth of these poor people will be brought above the poverty line.

President Nixon has asked the Congress for a 7-percent increase in social security benefits, and that increase is supposed to become effective in February of 1970. At current rates of inflation, half of that increase, or more, will have been wiped out between now and February 1970. A substantially higher figure is obviously called for.

When it was reported that the House Committee on Ways and Means would not consider social security legislation this year, I wrote to Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the committee, urging him to somehow make room for a social security bill. We all recognize the importance of the tax reform legislation presently before the committee, and want effective legislation in that area. But a social security bill also deserves high priority. This is not something which affects just a few people; we are talking about the daily existence of a sizable segment of our population—about 25 million people. I strongly urge that the House Committee on Ways and Means find a way to consider a social security bill as soon as their tax deliberations come to an end.

The very delay we are threatened with here shows the necessity of an automatic adjustment provision linked to increases in the cost of living. Inflation moves more quickly than Congress acts. Why do we continue to allow retired persons to go through the painful inbetween periods which exist once the cost of living rises significantly, and before the Congress enacts corrective measures to increase benefits?

The social security system must be updated so that older Americans can live their retirement in dignity and a certain deserved leisure without living in poverty today, or worrying that with their fixed income they will be living in poverty tomorrow.

## BENEFITS FOR OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, Congress must take note right now of our wasteful spending in foreign aid and of similar waste in the ineffectually waged war in South Vietnam.

The American people have to have the truth and the many upstanding senior citizens of our country, who have survived several hardships over the past 50 to 100 years, are deserving of some tranquility and ease of living.

We are in the middle of Senior Citizens' Month, May 1969. And, where do we find ourselves? Without enough money to continue some necessary domestic programs, which I deem first in priorities to be considered by Congress and the administration. This includes programs for the elderly. There are just too many instances I am aware of where our elderly friends receive very little, if anything.

Nevada senior citizens will note that the Nevada Legislature found it could not allocate State money to the tune of $45,000 to keep six Nevada programs for the elderly in operation. Those programs have ended.

The picture looks just as bleak at the Federal level with a considerable amount of budget cutting underway. Witness the loss, at the moment anyway, of our fiscal year 1970 money for the vitally needed southern Nevada water project. I am still waging my own effective battle to reinstate these funds. Other cuts by the administration Budget Bureau eliminated the Lake Mead Base, a defense installation near Las Vegas. Also, the Clear Creek Job Corps Camp near Carson City, which is being phased out and then there is the closure at the end of June of the Elko Weather Bureau. I have fought to maintain these domestic operations in Nevada.

These cuts and others like them are coming from the Federal level and I say it is all due to the giveaway programs in so-called American foreign aid. I have steadfastly been opposed to our U.S. policy in aiding foreign countries when I know, along with other Members of Congress, that more often than not our financial help and our aid in the form of various goods ends up in the wrong hands—the hands of crooked politicians and the racketeers of the black markets. From these corrupt hands, I have learned, this American aid is turning up as aid to enemy Communist countries. I call our so-called foreign aid program treasonous aid to the enemy.

And then there is the waste of money, and life, in Vietnam. If we are going to do battle in Vietnam with honor—let us do battle and fight to win. Otherwise let us get out now with an orderly withdrawal.

When you correct these two major problems facing this country, we are well on the way to amending our domestic troubles, which have first priority in my opinion and for which I will consistently battle for and to win.

But until the wasteful spending, especially in foreign aid, is stopped, I see no easement on some of our immediate domestic problems and as a result, we must work together hard to achieve needed programs to help make the golden years of so many of our fine citizens' lives more fruitful. I will watch closely for methods where Congress may improve the situation to benefit our elderly citizens and, when the time comes, will take a stand with whom I hope will be the majority in favor of such benefits. In addition, I will vote for increased social security benefits.

## A MESSAGE FOR NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I rise to pay tribute to the American merchant marine on this National Maritime Day. The President has seen fit to issue a proclamation calling on all America to honor our merchant marine industry on this day.

This is entirely fitting, since this year we are observing the 150th anniversary of the voyage of the SS *Savannah*. This voyage was unique in that for the first time an ocean-going vessel had employed steam for propulsion for part of the journey. We can still be proud that that pioneering voyage was accomplished by an American vessel.

In proclaiming this day, the President said:

> A strong and profitable merchant fleet is vital to America's economic welfare and defense capability. The American flag on merchant vessels on the high seas and in foreign ports is a symbol of our Nation's dedication to peaceful trade throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, this statement contains the basic points which emphasize and underline our need for a merchant marine industry. These points are: Our economic welfare, our defense capability, and our international trade. There is a fourth point which can be added to these three which is entirely pertinent. This is the contribution that U.S.-flag international carriers can and do make to our balance of payments, or our imbalance, as the case seems to be at present.

Together, these four points would seem to be sufficiently urgent and compelling to trigger a substantial response, especially in view of the gradual decline in our maritime industry. And make no mistake about it, the industry is on the decline. It is not too strong a term to call the situation alarming.

I think that the projected level of our privately owned U.S.-flag dry-cargo fleet of vessels very adequately demonstrates what is happening to our entire merchant marine industry. And this is why so many of us who are aware of the situation are concerned.

On January 1, 1968, there were 663 dry-cargo vessels in the U.S.-flag fleet, which were 25 years of age or less. In just 1 year, this total had dropped by 50 vessels to 613, on January 1, 1969. At the rate we are going, the 1968 total of 663 vessels will have fallen to 244 by January 1972.

This is the direction our merchant marine is going. It is not in the best interests of the United States to stand by and permit this decline to continue.

I am pleased to point out that your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries did face up to its responsibilities and acted to arrest the decline in our maritime industry. The committee earlier this month reported out a meaningful authorization for the maritime program. For the item of ship construc-

tion assistance, the committee raised the amount requested, which had been only about $16 million, to what it felt was a more appropriate level of $145 million.

The level of $145 million was selected, not as the maximum possible for a vessel revitalization program which we could or should be providing for, but as a floor below which we dare not go.

Subsequently, the House gave its full assent to the action taken by the committee by passing the authorization measure without amendment or even serious debate.

This country has almost endless shorelines, and exposure to oceans, gulf, and deepwater lakes. It creates an enormous demand for goods of all kinds, leading to vast levels of international trade. This was true of the past as well as at present. With these attributes, it is only natural that this country has a tradition of a strong and vigorous merchant marine.

But we could lose this important industry if we continue to permit it to decline. And there is not a great deal of time left in which to decide whether we intend to retain an active merchant marine, or to see it wither on the vine and disappear.

Let us hope the time never comes when National Maritime Day merely calls to memory something that once flourished in our midst and then passed out of existence.

---

## A LEGISLATIVE REPORT FOR VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

---

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have taken a great interest in the problems facing volunteer fire departments and ambulance services. The dedicated men and women who give freely of their time and efforts are performing a most vital service, particularly in the less populated areas.

Mr. Harold Semling has written a very comprehensive article for the May issue of Fire Chief magazine on the legislation pending before the Congress which affects the volunteer firemen. I would like to share with my colleagues his rundown on this legislation:

A REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: BILLS AFFECTING THE FIRE SERVICE

Fire chiefs have a considerable stake in legislation now pending in the 91st Congress.

Among the thousands of bills already introduced in the House and Senate are many, which, if passed, could be of substantial value to fire departments. (Over 9,000 bills had been introduced in the House and 1,600 in the Senate by the end of March.)

Since most of these bills will never become law or even be given serious consideration, it is up to the fire chief to work now for his legislative objectives. Simply, this is best done by personal contacts and writing to his Senators and Congressman.

Here is a brief rundown of some major legislation pending in Congress of concern to the fire chief.

Federal benefits would be extended to all firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty, whether or not a specific federal law was involved under a proposal pending in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Congress last year passed a bill to provide compensation in case of injury or death to law enforcement officers in cases involving violation of national law. Under proposals advanced by Sen. Birch Bayh (D. Ind.) and Rep. Andrew Jacobs (D. Ind.) and 20 other Congressmen this coverage would be extended to non-federal cases and firemen (S. 1277 and H.R. 7989).

"This expanded coverage would be justified," according to Senator Bayh, "because the job of . . . fire protection has in many cases become a national responsibility."

"It is truly difficult today to draw hard and fast lines which separate jurisdictional responsibility for public employees who are devoted to protecting the lives and property of all persons without regard to their domicile, place of origin, or final destination," according to Sen. Bayh.

Federal contributions would be supplementary and would be adjusted according to other compensation to which the local fireman was entitled. Under the bill, a widow who is the sole survivor would be eligible for 45% of the monthly wage rate of her deceased husband, Bayh explains. If there are dependent children the rate could go up to 75% of the deceased's wages.

Legislation to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or to interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot is pending before the House Judiciary Committee (H.R. 7594, introduced by Rep. Thomas S. Kleppe [R. N. Dak.]).

Compensation would be provided for firemen not employed by the United States government who are killed or injured in the performance of duty during a civil disorder under a number of bills introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. Many of these bills would also provide for damage or loss of firefighting equipment not covered by insurance. Some of these bills are: H.R. 890 by Rep. Philip E. Ruppe (R. Mich.), H.R. 3105 by Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan (R. Md.), H.R. 4166 by Rep. Henry Helstoski (D. N.J.); H.R. 5218 by Rep. Robert H. Michel (R. Ill.), and H.R. 9128 by Rep. Joseph E. Karth (D. Minn.).

The Federal Property and Administrative Act would be amended so as to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations under legislation proposed in the House of Representatives. Among the legislation's sponsors are Rep. John O. Marsh (D. Va.) (H.R. 1210), Rep. Samuel S. Stratton (D. N.Y.) (H.R. 2132), Rep. Cornelius Gallagher (D. N.J.) (H.R. 1117), and Rep. Henry Helstoski (D. N.J.) (H.R. 2361). Stratton would include municipalities. Rep. Marsh would include volunteer rescue squads. Rep. Helstoski would include Indian groups under federal supervision and rescue organizations at 50 per centum of the estimated market value, as would Rep. Gallagher.

Legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives to prohibit certain acts involving the use of incendiary devices (H.R. 7468 by James G. Fulton [R. Pa.] and H.R. 8159 by Hamilton Fish [R. N.Y.]). The bills were sent to the House Judiciary Committee.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control would receive $665,000 to carry out its functions under the Fire Research and Safety Act under legislation (H.R. 7208) intorduced by Rep. H. B. Gonzalez (D. Tex.) and referred to the Appropriations Committee.

A dozen Senators are sponsoring a bill (S. 413) by Sen. Joseph M. Montoya (D. N.M.) to provide for cooperative rural fire protection. The legislation would provide for technical assistance, training, and equipping fire control forces to suppress both structural and wildfires in rural areas which are now under no organized protection or have only limited protection. The bill would be administered by the Agriculture Department. It would, according to Sen. Montoya, be a local effort supported by federal-state cost sharing at a 75-25 percent level. The bill was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

The President would be authorized to proclaim the Second Saturday in May of each year as a "day of recognition" for firefighters under a bill (H.R. 3698) introduced by Congressman Jerome R. Waldie (D. Calif.) and referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

Congressman Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (D. Mich.), has suggested that Congress pass a resolution (H. Con. Res. 171) supporting one uniform, nationwide, fire-reporting telephone number. The proposal was referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There are other similar proposals.

Representative Henry J. Helstoski (D. N.J.) has proposed legislation under which the government would provide temporary assistance where public school buildings are destroyed by fire disaster or natural causes. The bill (H.R. 2360) was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

There have been a number of bills to provide federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances. These bills have been referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Statutory subsistence allowances, up to $5 per day, received by firemen would be exempt from gross income for taxing purposes under a bill (H.R. 7911) introduced by Congressman Albert L. Watson (R. S.C.) and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman C. E. Gallagher (D. N.J.) has introduced a bill (H.R. 1121) which would change the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the hospital insurance benefits program for retired firemen and policemen who reach 65 years and who have at least ten years of service. The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee.

Ambulance drivers and attendants would be exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act under a bill (H.R. 5490) introduced by Representative W. E. Brock (R. Tenn.) and referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Fund raising activities of volunteer fire and ambulance companies would be exempt from federal excise taxation under a legislative proposal (H.R. 6987) of Rep. Frank J. Horton (R. N.Y.). The bill, sent to the House Ways and Means Committee, which is presently considering an overall revision of federal taxes, is aimed at providing more money for the volunteer fire departments.

Money is the biggest problem for the volunteer fire departments which now comprise 92 percent of all U.S. fire departments, Horton told the House when he introduced the bill. "Unfortunately, few local fire services have the resources to do the job properly," he said. Adding, "firefighting is no longer a question of jumping off the back step and running down the street to a brush fire. The job is bigger and more dangerous than ever before. Special equipment and special training are needed to fight today's fires. By 1975, we will need 20,000 more fire stations to adequately protect our smaller population centers."

"Local fire and ambulance departments need every penny of the money that they raise to meet the increasing demand for more facilities, equipment, and training centers," according to Horton.

Congressman Joseph P. Vigorito (D. Pa.) has proposed (H.R. 3696) that volunteer firemen's organizations be exempt from all

federal income taxes and reports. The bill was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman Ogden R. Reid (R. N.Y.) would have the Internal Revenue Code amended to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen. The bill (H.R. 2714), referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, would let volunteer fireman deduct expenses for uniforms, automobile accessories, maintenance and depreciation, gasoline and other items used in connection with his firefighting activities.

Volunteer fire companies would be allowed the same special postage rates on second-and third-class mail that is now available to certain nonprofit organizations under legislation introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, (R. Del.) with 29 cosponsors has re-introduced the legislation (S. 20) in the Senate which was referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Rep. William V. Roth (R. Del.) has introduced the bill (H.R. 1343) in the House and it was referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Bills similar to Roth's have been introduced by others.

"Other groups already authorized by statute to use such preferential rates include religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, fraternal, associations of rural electric cooperatives, and one highway or development publication of each State of the Union," Sen. Boggs explains.

The Delaware Senator believes that "this is a group to which volunteer fire companies should belong. There is no more dedicated or unselfish group of men and women in the country than those belonging to volunteer fire companies and their auxiliaries."

"A prime fund raising program with most fire companies is a fund solicitation by mail. Enactment of this bill," according to Sen. Boggs, "would be of immediate specific assistance in this effort." The Internal Revenue exempts volunteer fire companies from taxes and allows as a personnel deduction any contributions to volunteer fire companies. Postal authories have said from time-to-time they use the Internal Revenue Service's definition of a nonprofit organization as a guide for permitting nonprofit mailings by organizations.

The Senate on three separate occasions, despite objections from the Post Office, has passed such legislation and sent it to the House. In 1966, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service favorably reported the bill and sent it to the House floor for action. The legislation was never taken up in the closing days of that Congress.

Sen. Boggs expresses the hope that "Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee would take early action on it and that hopefully the Congress would enact it and it could become law."

Legislation proposed by Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski (D. N.Y.), Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would improve conditions of firemen employed by the federal government. Other members of the House have introduced similiar bills, all of which are pending before the Post Office Committee.

One bill (H.R. 7364) would improve the basic work week for firefighters employed by the government.

A second bill would liberalize the requirements as to age for the appointment of firefighters in the federal service.

Senator Ernest F. Hollings (D. S.C.) has proposed that federal firefighters be considered as being employed in hazardous occupations. His bill (S. 578) is before the Senate Post Office Committee.

Fire Chiefs have a considerable number of friends in Congress, but positive results will depend on hard work and concentrated action.

---

## DISTORTION THREATENS FREE PRESS

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, apparently people the world over are coming to know the Washington Post.

The Russians have expelled their Moscow reporter for distorting the facts as antirevolutionary action—which apparently means that their news line for American consumption somehow got to the Kremlin. The Malaysians banned their Newsweek magazine on the grounds it contained "distortions of facts," and the Thais even refused admittance of one of their reporters to their country, because they feared distortion of the facts in reporting.

Yes, the Washington Post reputation would now seem worldwide—distorters of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news clipping from the Evening Star in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 21, 1969]

THAILAND CONVINCED "LEFTISTS" WEAKEN U.S. WILL IN ASIA

BANGKOK.—Thai officials are convinced that what they consider to be leftist criticism in the American press and intellectual community are causing a softening of America's will to fight Communist aggression in Asia.

This conviction was reflected in the decision of the Thai government to refuse to admit a critical American correspondent into the country. But Thai Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman has spoken freely on the subject for the past two or three years.

In press conferences, on speaking tours, in letters to influential American friends and other contacts, the eloquent foreign minister has accused Western "subversives" of preventing the United States from winning the war in Vietnam and endangering America's relations with Thailand.

He has privately named correspondents whom he regards as pro-Communist or "liberal," a word he uses with considerable disdain.

ADMITTANCE DENIED

Thant's abhorrence of Western criticism was epitomized in his government's decision to deny admittance to Stanley Karnow of the Washington Post, who arrived here Sunday night to cover the conference of the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization. Karnow was put on the next flight out of the country.

Officials were annoyed with articles in which Karnow had questioned the value of large-scale American aid to Thailand and had pointed out the Thai government's historic inclination to switch diplomatic allegiances depending on the needs of the moment.

Thai sensitivity to foreign criticism has grown in proportion to the country's increasing commitment to American interests in recent years.

The government did not admit American warplanes were flying from Thailand to bomb parts of North Vietnam until more than two years after the air war had begun.

BASE VISITS CURBED

Thai officials still do not let reporters visit the bases except on rare occasions. And they are equally reluctant to let the press cover Thailand's own long-smouldering conflict against guerrillas in the northern and northeastern provinces.

The aura of secrecy surrounding military activities in Thailand reflects to some degree the feeling among certain officials that the government may have slipped into much too close relationship with the U.S. Thai leaders, although they welcome American aid and have indicated they would like to decrease their country's over-all dependence on the U.S.

---

## A FORMER NEWSMAN COUNSELS JOURNALISTS

## HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive young Oklahomans I know is James R. Jones, formerly appointments secretary to President Johnson, and now a practicing attorney in Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. Jones has an extensive background in journalism acquired before he turned to law and public service. Against this background, he has written an article, "It's Time To Interview the Journalists," in the current issue of Pace magazine.

The article reflects Mr. Jones' understanding of journalism and the problems of the journalist. It also reflects his opportunity, while serving President Johnson, to become acquainted intimately with the machinery and workings of politics and Government. The article contains criticism of the press, but it is responsible and understanding criticism. It also makes a series of constructive suggestions to the profession of journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this article will be of great interest to the Members of the House, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

IT'S TIME TO INTERVIEW THE JOURNALISTS

(By James R. Jones)

Journalism and public service are, to me personally, the two greatest callings in life. In both areas you have difficult challenges and unlimited opportunity to serve your fellow man. In both areas your efforts can leave behind a heritage of accomplishment for society which no amount of wealth can purchase. And in both areas the cry for new thought and unprejudiced judgment was never greater.

The main safeguards of our democratic institutions are our First Amendment freedoms of speech and press. These are what basically distinguish this nation from every other people in the world.

With these freedoms the press has gained enormous power—which is as it should be because the press is our most effective deterrent to tyrannical government. But with all this power comes an equally enormous responsibility. The responsibility of courage. The responsibility to tell both sides of the story. The responsibility of accuracy. The responsibility of carefully distinguishing news from editorial opinion.

There are laws and regulations to protect society when a thief enters your home, a doctor carelessly performs surgery, the loan

shark extorts exorbitant interest, or the grocer sells spoiled meat.

But how much more damaging it is when a reporter misquotes or misidentifies an innocent citizen, an editor vilifies a man with an unpopular cause, the publisher preaches hate of minorities, the television commentator degrades an honest public official by reporting with a certain smirk on his face. For these instances of malpractice, society has virtually no remedy.

Despite all these shortcomings, of course, there is another 99 percent of the journalistic profession which is honest, accurate and unbiased.

But there are danger signals. The power of the press rests on its credibility and when this is tarnished, even by a few reporters, not only journalism but our whole society suffers. When the average citizen can't believe what he reads, a free press is in jeopardy.

Last fall 1,200 college journalists gathered in New York City for a conference. A New York Times reporter interviewed some of these young people. This is the lead on that Times article: "Most newspapers are biased. Television is superficial. Most magazines are immature."

This is not the judgment of some congressman who claims he was treated unfairly by a reporter. These are criticisms of young men and women who aspire to join the honored ranks of great reporters and editors.

Earlier this year a national weekly news magazine wrote in an "inside story" that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had strongly opposed any bombing halt. The magazine said it took the Secretary of Defense and a White House Assistant to convince President Johnson that Rusk should be overruled.

The first problem is the article was wrong in its facts. I know that Mr. Rusk did not oppose the bombing halt as indicated in the article. The appalling fact, however, is that this magazine never bothered to call Mr. Rusk to ask his side of the story. That's not professional reporting.

These are the kinds of examples that prompted one of the fine reporters of our time, Howard K. Smith, last year to terminate his nationally syndicated column for an indefinite period. In his final column Mr. Smith explained why. He said he felt that the American press, by creating phony heroes or phony villains, might be contributing to the confusion and frustration now damaging the nation's spirit. He said that some journalists have turned reporting into image making.

Stokely Carmichael is a good case in point. A few years ago, he was unknown. Today he is a household word. Of course, this ordinarily might do no harm, but in this case Mr. Carmichael is a flagrant example of extremism. Therefore he is automatically good copy—or made to be good copy—and this has had a damaging effect on Negro leaders who are not extremists. It would seem that the only Negro some of the media wish to pay attention to is one holding a torch or honing a knife. There are many responsible Negro leaders—in fact, the overwhelming majority. Mr. Smith reported one responsible Negro leader as saying: "If I say no to Stokely, you fellows won't print it in one sentence on the back page. My people think I am doing nothing. But if I go see him, it's on the front page and my people think I am in there pitching."

I do not object to the free publicity given the Carmichaels and the H. Rap Browns. But I do object when it's not balanced reporting. For then it makes it harder for a President and Congress to do what needs to be done and get the funds for programs to meet the problems. It makes life difficult for responsible Negro leaders who aren't getting publicity and acclaim. And worst of all, it frightens a large segment of our society and decimates the ranks of those working for racial progress.

Mr. Smith's last column might remind us all that the Fourth Estate forms one of the most potent forces in this nation. He wrote that with this power, there must come responsibility, some restraint, some understanding, that the press quite literally can create movements and people and leaders and problems—and can make those stories come true.

My only quarrel with Howard Smith is that he didn't stay within the profession to try to correct the wrongs that exist. How do we right these wrongs?

This question bothered a group of high-level government officials last year. Here are some of their suggestions:

a) Journalism is one of the professions. Yet, it is the only profession that has no entrance examinations or requirements. The press might choose an examining board of distinguished journalists and require entrants to pass examinations showing that they understand the times and their circumstances.

b) This board of journalists should set high standards of professionalism and jealously keep watch to insure that reporters and editors live up to these standards. This should not be a board of censors. However, when injustices occur through inaccurate, unbalanced or false reporting, the board should be quick to correct the errors publicly.

c) Finally, it may be time to change the basic attitude of journalism. Perhaps more attention should be paid to the common, everyday problems that plague society, and to the efforts that succeed and therefore contain lessons we need to learn.

Many men are disturbed by the shortcomings of the few in journalism. But correction and change can only be meaningful when they come from within.

Just as no public official should rest with pride so long as one public servant is dishonest, just as no lawyer can take pride in his bar so long as one fellow barrister inadequately represents a client, so no responsible journalist should rest so long as any irresponsibility exists in his profession.

---

# SENATE—*Friday, May 23, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, we lift our hearts to Thee in thanksgiving for life and health, for love and friendship, for work to do and strength to do it, for this good land and all its people. Come near to those who have special need of Thee—the poor, the infirmed, the unloved. Send out Thy light and truth through all who teach and heal and pray that the weak may be made strong and the strong kept pure and just.

Grant us in our daily duties here the higher wisdom which Thou dost bestow upon those who seek to serve Thee in spirit and in truth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 20, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1969 in the amount of $160,000,000, for payment of the first installment of the U.S. share of the 1969–71 increase in the resources of the International Development Association, which, with accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 20, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 21 and 22, 1969, received messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on May 21, and 22, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, May 23, 1969.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 20, 1969, the following favorable executive reports of nominations were submitted:

On May 21, 1969:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

William T. Pecora, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Geological Survey.

On May 22, 1969:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Francis J. Galbraith, of South Dakota, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia;

Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Oliver L. Troxel, Jr., of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia;

John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Argentina;

Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Dahomey;

Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Dominican Republic;

Spencer M. King, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Guyana;

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois to be Ambassador to Japan;