

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SISTER SERAPHINE

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, one of Nevada's most beloved citizens is Sister M. Seraphine, O.P., of Reno, who this year marks her 50th year in the congregation of the Dominican Sisters of San Rafael, Calif. Thirty-eight of those years have been devoted to service to the people of northern Nevada, who accord her the highest possible measure of respect and admiration.

More than any other person, Sister Seraphine is identified with the growth of St. Mary's Hospital in Reno from a small 52-bed facility to one of the great medical centers of the West. Since her arrival as hospital administrator in 1931—just a year after the facility was opened—St. Mary's has added two wings and grown fivefold. Plans for additional expansion are underway.

Over the years, Sister Seraphine has become something of a legend to the thousands who received treatment at St. Mary's. During her long and successful tenure as administrator, she never permitted the burden of official responsibility to diminish the direct personal contact that is the pulse of a great hospital. Indeed, she candidly admits her role as administrator "included such things as bookkeeper, relief telephone operator, personnel officer, purchasing agent, maid, and lending a hand wherever needed."

"Lending a hand," according to those who were there, meant ministering to the sick through many long and sleepless nights. It meant assisting in the joyful ritual of birth as well as the sorrowful rite of death. It meant calming the fearful, soothing the child, and performing countless other little acts of tenderness and compassion.

Today, Sister Seraphine continues in an active role at St. Mary's. The present administrator, Sister Dominga, depends upon her to supervise the St. Mary's Hospital cancer, heart, and charity fund, which has received and disbursed \$57,000 since it was created in 1955. Moneys from the fund are used to assist long-term patients.

Equally important, Sister Seraphine maintains her visiting schedule with hospital patients, "trying to help them in little personal ways." It is a tradition that spans nearly four decades—a smiling lady in white, softly walking the corridors of a great hospital, bearing the gift of love. She has been a lifelong and dear friend of mine. I have often said that if there is an angel on earth she is that angel.

Recently, the women's editor of the Nevada State Journal, Mrs. Liz Wheeler, paid tribute to the many achievements of Sister Seraphine. I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Wheeler's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

SISTER SERAPHINE HONORED DURING GOLDEN JUBILEE YEAR

(By Liz Wheeler)

In observance of National Hospital Week, May 11-17, it is fitting that we pay tribute to a lovely lady who has worked very hard over the years for Reno and St. Mary's Hospital.

She is Sister M. Seraphine, O.P., who this year is celebrating her Golden Jubilee as a religious Sister in the congregation of the Dominican Sisters of San Rafael, Calif.

Thirty-eight of those 50 years have been spent serving the community of Reno.

As part of the many events planned in her honor, St. Mary's Hospital has issued a special edition of its house organ, the St. Mary's News Bulletin, which has combined observance of National Hospital Week with personal tributes to their beloved Sister Seraphine.

Born in Oakland, the third child in a family of nine girls and four boys, Sister Seraphine entered the Dominican Convent at San Rafael in 1917.

Sister Seraphine says that she succeeded Sister Xavier who built the first unit of the present St. Mary's Hospital building.

"Sister Xavier came here in 1925 as administrator," Sister Seraphine said, and "the hospital was across the street from the present one, in a red brick building, now St. Mary's Convent."

Construction of the main section of the present hospital was completed in 1930—having 52 beds. "I came to Reno as administrator in 1931," Sister Seraphine recalled, "and at that time, Sister Xavier became the director of nurses, and later surgical supervisor for approximately 25 years. Sister Gerard was here too," she said. Sister Gerard was supervisor of Maternity Department for many years.

"The three of us are often referred to now as 'the old guard' because we have followed along through 38 years."

In 1965, Sister Dominga was made administrator, after having been business office supervisor here for 10 years," she said. "We have seen many changes in hospital procedure during my years here," said Sister Seraphine as she reflected on her years in Reno.

"When I came here, some of the nurses boiled their hypodermic needles on a long spoon over an alcohol lamp; where today's procedure is to use only new, disposable hypodermic needles, used once and then destroyed."

One of the most interesting things to Sister Seraphine is the change in the mode of travel.

When she arrived here, she said, there was only a wooden building serving the Southern Pacific Railway Station—and today there is a modern railroad station as well as the huge Reno Municipal Airport.

"I arrived here in the summer of 1931," Sister Seraphine said, and "on Nov. 1, 1932, awoke to the fact that there was a bank moratorium declared on the banks in Nevada."

"Those were very trying days, when most of our Nevada people lost great sums in the bank that never opened," she said.

The depression years followed and Sister Seraphine recalled that "it was actually necessary to accept produce from many of our patients' ranches in lieu of cash."

"Somehow we survived, though, and our great Nevada people survived, too."

In 1936 it was necessary to add the East Wing of the main building, adding 25 more beds.

"In 1942 we were planning to add a few more rooms when World War II was declared, so it was 1949 before we were able to add more bed space in the East Wing and start planning for a new West Wing to the hospital," she related.

During the days of rationing, it was very difficult to obtain enough supplies, especially on goods that were needed for the Armed Services, she said.

"However, due to help from our faithful salesmen, they kept us safe on many items, such as linens, paper goods, etc."

"We always managed to pay our bills," Sister Seraphine remembered.

She said in 1950 they received help from the federal Hill-Burton funds and by 1951 they had completed the West Wing of the hospital—a basement and two stories with the third floor shelled in. By 1955, it was necessary to complete the third floor.

"This," Sister Seraphine said, "was made possible by an unexpected grant from the Ford and Fleischmann Foundations."

"The St. Mary's Hospital Guild that was formed in 1951 furnished the third floor with 14 pediatric beds and 12 adult beds, she said.

Sister Seraphine reflected that, "the Guild has remained a great source of help since then, in supplying furnishings and equipment for the hospital as well as wonderful help through its Volunteer Services."

She recalled how the hospital's needs called for additional wings and growth and how the East, North and West wings were completed with the help of federal funds, Fleischmann Foundation, donations and gifts. They also found it necessary to increase the size of the service units of the hospital.

She said the hospital has grown from the 52 beds, when she came, to today's size of 265 beds, and "as of today, we are again facing a real shortage of space and should complete the 4th and 5th stories."

"However, this seems impossible until we reduce our present debt," she said.

"Maybe some kind friends will come to our assistance. Who knows?"

Sister Seraphine remembers the days when she was administrator, that her job "included such things as bookkeeper, relief telephone operator, personnel officer, purchasing agent, maid, and lending a hand wherever needed."

"Now that I am relieved as administrator, I still find plenty of work to do," she said, "visiting the patients daily and trying to help them in little personal ways."

"In 1955, a kind friend gave us a donation to be used to help a cancer patient," she said.

"Since then, we have started an account, calling it St. Mary's Hospital Cancer, Heart and Charity Fund," Sister Seraphine related.

"This is one responsibility which I have been allowed to carry through the years and it has been a source of comfort to me—as well as those who need it. We are very grateful to our generous friends for this," she said.

She keeps the books for this fund and said "over the years, we have received many, many donations; all of which have been used to help long-term patients. This direct aid has grown, and to date we have received and distributed approximately \$57,000," she added.

Sister Seraphine wishes to pay tribute to the wonderful staff of physicians, nurses and employees for their loyal cooperation; and the St. Mary's Hospital Guild, Fleischmann Foundation, many friends and doctors who have contributed to help the hospital in furnishing of patients' rooms and other departments.

"Alone, we never could have done it, but with the guidance and help from Almighty God and our good friends, St. Mary's has grown to its present stature.

"They were strenuous years—hours long and tiring—but looking back, I would not want to change any one of them for an easier life," Sister Seraphine concluded.

WELFARE REFORM, A BEGINNING

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, time has long since passed for public assistance to become a national responsibility. Welfare is a national problem, having its origins in the continuing economic and technological transformation of this country and requiring effective national action.

Shortsighted and unjust public and private policies have drained the disadvantaged poor into cities, but the weight of social service costs is too great for our cities, or even our States, to carry. Their shrinking tax bases and obsolescent property taxes are inadequate to withstand the strain. As a consequence, the Nation's cities are staggering under the costs of responding to their citizens' needs.

Few persons would deny this, and fewer each day would avoid the conclusion that the remedy is a greater Federal role in public assistance. In many fields greater Federal participation is unwise, but the economics of the welfare problem make increased Federal contributions particularly appropriate.

Many proposals to radically alter the welfare system have been put forward. Many should be studied carefully, and some, after examination, should be tried. But pending adoption of major changes, we must urgently make critical improvements. What we propose today is the minimum that must be accomplished immediately. Drastic reforms are needed to begin to ease the despair of our disadvantaged, but we recommend intermediate steps to save our cities from bankruptcy and the citizens from hopelessness.

Our congressional districts include constituents of all levels of affluence. The obvious fact of recent years that public assistance has been of no help to the disadvantaged and a burden to those of middle incomes shows us that those with both low and middle incomes must work together to achieve a more equitable welfare system.

The bill that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) and I are introducing today would require the Federal Government to bear 90 percent of the costs of public assistance and 90 percent of the cost of Medicaid. It would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare power to set minimum welfare standards and uniform criteria for all States.

The creation of a national standard is imperative in light of the recent Supreme Court decision on welfare and

rapid mobility toward the North and the West. According to estimates of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 100,000 to 200,000 additions will be on the welfare rolls as a result of the Court's striking down State residency requirements. The burden is compounded by the continuing influx of the poor into cities located in the traditionally richer and more industrial States, an influx helping to create the impression of a divergence between those of low and those of middle incomes.

The bill would also remove the limitations restricting the number of children who may be eligible for payments under the aid to dependent children program, the so-called AFDC "freeze."

In summary, the thrust of this bill is to begin the process of removing the worst injustices of the present law and establish a more equitable base of support for social service programs.

Cosponsors of the bill are JOSEPH P. ADDABO, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, DANIEL E. BUTTON, HUGH L. CAREY, JOHN CONYERS, CHARLES C. DIGGS, LEONARD FARRSTEIN, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, RICHARD FULTON, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, EDWARD KOCH, ABNER MIKVA, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, BERTRAM L. PODELL, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, and WILLIAM F. RYAN.

A summary of the bill's provisions follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL AMENDING THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TITLES UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

TITLE I

Title I of the bill provides for an increase in Federal matching grants to the States for the Federally-aided cash public assistance programs, including Old-Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Assistance to recipients under these programs will be matched by the Federal Government at 90 percent, up to a maximum payment level. The maximum established by the bill is \$125 per month per recipient under the adult programs, and \$70 for recipients under Aid to Families with Dependent Children. States could make payments above these levels, but they would not receive Federal matching funds for them.

Under present law, Federal matching is based upon complicated formulae which resulted in fiscal year 1968 in a Federal contribution varying from 82.4 percent in Mississippi to 42.4 percent in New York. Thus the Federal contribution for all States would be increased under the proposed bill.

The bill would also eliminate the present Federal payment limitations for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Instead of having specified dollar restrictions, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would receive the same matching as the various states. The dollar limitations would be retained for Guam.

The Federal contribution to the States for Title XIX—Medicaid—programs would also be increased under the bill. The Federal matching would be made 90 percent for all States, instead of the variable formula based on per capita income, which is in present law. Federal matching currently ranges from 50 to 83 percent.

TITLE II

The bill would also provide for uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for all cash public assistance programs. Under Title II, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is to establish the minimum amount of assistance which the States must pay to

recipients under the cash assistance programs. The Secretary is also to determine eligibility requirements for the various programs, such as permissible amounts of income and resources.

The minimum standards and eligibility requirements are to apply uniformly to all States. They are to be based on full need of recipients. Provision is made for variation among the programs to take into consideration different requirements of individuals under the various programs. Provision is also made for taking into account differences in costs in different geographic areas. Standards and requirements are to be updated annually.

The Federal Government would pay the cost of expenditures made by the States which were made necessary in order to comply with these new standards and requirements.

The bill provides for the standards and requirements to be effective beginning January 11, 1970.

Under present law States are free to establish their own standards of payment and of eligibility. The States vary widely in the amount which they pay to public assistance recipients. For example, the average monthly payment for a recipient of AFDC in January 1969 was a low of \$9.50 in the State of Mississippi, compared with a high of \$65.45 in Massachusetts. The conditions which are now established for eligibility also have wide variation. Areas of differences among the States include amount of income allowable, the value of real property which may be held, or of other resources, such as insurance. Another difference is the liability of relatives, for support, as well as many others.

TITLE III

Title III of the bill provides for the repeal of the AFDC freeze, which is now scheduled to become effective July 1, 1969. Under the freeze provision, the Federal Government would limit matching to the proportion of all children under age 18 who were receiving AFDC payments on the basis of a parent's absence from the home in each State as of January 1, 1968.

SKEPTICAL VIEW OF MILITARY BUDGET

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Viewing With Skepticism," published in the Philadelphia, Pa., Bulletin, of May 6, 1969.

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

VIEWING WITH SKEPTICISM

The Pentagon must feel, as the "most unkindest cut of all," criticism that has emanated from the usually friendly Senate Armed Services Committee about its handling of money.

There was Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., saying that the concern of the American people over the cost of government and the competence of those handling tax monies applied to the Department of Defense as well as to the Office of Economic Opportunity and other welfare programs. Imagine such a thing.

"I for one," he said, "expect to view with skepticism the entire military budget."

That kind of skepticism is growing with every indication of ballooned expenses. It is something to which the military is going to have to adjust. Time was when it would have been viewed as odd to question—although a President Eisenhower could effectively do so—the claims of the military on national resources.

There were reasons for this beyond the postwar fright of the country over the Communist menace. The scientific revolution in military technology clearly demanded large outlays, clearly required the facilities of a huge defense industrial complex. It still does.

Leaders and citizens who remembered the unpreparedness of the pre-World War II era, when American soldiers trained with mock tanks because they lacked the real thing, did not forget that lesson. Young agitators against the military today are no more acquainted with those circumstances than they are with the depression days.

Nonetheless, the military outlays have become so vast, and other national needs so pressing, that there would have to be increased legislative questioning as to the scale of military spending even if there were not considerable public unease over the wisdom of military policies.

When even the Senate Armed Forces Committee becomes a forum for the expression of disquiet, it should be notice to army generals to pull up their socks, for admirals to batten down the hatches, and for aerial commanders to avoid stunting.

ABOVE THE SENATE BABEL

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Richmond News-Leader recently carried an editorial which termed "incisive" and "inspiring" an address by the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, JR., to the annual awards banquet of the Richmond-First Club. This editorial points out, quite graphically, some of the observations of the senior Senator from Virginia which are worthy of note. The editorial follows:

ABOVE THE SENATE BABEL

In an incisive and, at times, inspiring address before the Richmond-First Club's annual award banquet Tuesday evening, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. cut through the confusing jungle of issues confronting the American people and discussed three specific crisis areas: crime, inflation and foreign affairs.

Senator Byrd brought out these facts, which seemed all the more startling when presented in his own low-key way:

Crime: 1. One in 50 Americans this year will be the victim of a serious crime.

2. Department of Justice statistics indicate that 97 out of every 100 retail businesses in the so-called ghetto areas of U.S. cities were robbed last year.

3. Not counting murders, assaults and rapes, there were 8,662 robberies in Washington, D.C. last year.

4. Crime is costing the American people \$31 billion annually or more than 40 per cent of the total outlay for national defense.

5. The Supreme Court of the United States has contributed to the crime crisis in America by over-zealous protection of criminals at the expense of society.

Inflation: During eight years of the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations, Federal spending doubled.

Foreign affairs: 1. America's world-wide commitments include mutual defense treaties with 44 nations.

2. Not counting naval forces on the move in the Pacific, Atlantic and Mediterranean, the United States has 550,000 troops in Vietnam, 225,000 in Europe and 56,000 in South Korea.

3. Russian-made MIGs operated by North Koreans shot down the American reconnaissance plane in the Sea of Japan. Without Russian aid, which is responsible for so many American deaths, North Vietnam could not long continue the war in Southeast Asia.

4. The Russians are responsible for the crises in the Middle East, in Czechoslovakia and in Asia. The United States, therefore, runs great risk in putting faith in Russian promises about peace.

5. Since President Lyndon Johnson ordered a drastic limitation in the bombing of North Vietnam a year ago, 12,867 Americans have been killed in Southeast Asia and 83,012 have been wounded. There have been more battle deaths during the past year of peace talks in Paris than during the two years of peace talks preceding the Korean armistice. The Paris peace talks have lulled the American people into a false sense of security.

In approaching the nation's problems, Senator Byrd is not beguiled by the fear and wishful thinking which seem to paralyze so many Americans today. His clear-headed approach to a given situation, now all too rare in Washington, is needed as never before. Because he stands for something and because he has something significant to say, Senator Byrd's voice is increasingly heard and heeded above the Senate babel. Once more in a critical time in our nation's history, Virginia is making an unusual contribution to national affairs through its able representation in Washington.

STUDENT DISORDERS

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, an article reprinted in the Washington Post of May 18, 1969, discusses some of the disturbing, long-range effects which may result from the contemporary disruptions of our college and university campuses. The author, Sociology Prof. Robert A. Nisbet, of the University of California, at Riverside, points out the historical affinity between boredom, nihilism, and brute violence, and the present inability of campus activists to distinguish between authority and power. Our failure to maintain the underlying authority of the basic values of our Western culture may indeed result in destruction of those fragile institutions so vital to our culture. Replacing the authority of the university's academic dean with the power of a police riot squad or the power of an undisciplined mob is abhorrent to that great tradition of liberal education and academic freedom nurtured in this country. We must not let the same forces which destroyed the intellectual freedom of the German and Austrian universities during the thirties succeed in the sixties and seventies in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Nisbet's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHEN AUTHORITY FALTERS, RAW POWER MOVES IN

(By Robert A. Nisbet)

(NOTE.—Nisbet is professor of sociology at the University of California, Riverside. His article is excerpted from the Montreal Star and the magazine Public Interest.)

The most striking fact in the present period of revolutionary change is the quickened erosion of the traditional institutional authorities that for nearly a millennium have been Western man's principal sources of order and liberty. I am referring to the manifest decline of influence of the legal system, the church, family, local community and, most recently and perhaps most ominously, of school and the university.

There are some who see in the accelerating erosion of these authorities the beginning of a new and higher freedom of the individual. The fetters of constraint, it is said, are being struck off, leaving creative imagination free to build a truly legitimate society. Far greater, however, is the number of those persons who see in this erosion the specters of social anarchy and moral chaos.

I would be happy if I could join either of these groups in their perceptions. But I cannot. Nothing in history suggests to me the likelihood of either creative liberty or destructive license for very long in a population witnessing the dissolution of the social and moral authorities it has been accustomed to.

I should say, rather, that what is inevitable in such circumstances is the rise of power; power that invades the vacuum left by receding social authority; power that tends to usurp even those areas of traditional authority that have been left inviolate; power that becomes indistinguishable in a short time from organized violent forces, whether of the police, the military or the paramilitary.

The human mind cannot support moral chaos for very long. As more and more of the traditional authorities seem to come crashing down, or to be sapped and subverted, it begins to seek the security of organized power. The ordinary dependence on order becomes transformed into a relentless demand for order. And it is power, however ugly its occasional manifestations, that then takes over.

To see the eruption of organized power as the consequence of a diminishing desire for liberty is easy. What requires more knowledge or wisdom is to see such power as the consequence of loss of authority in a social order. Authority and power: are these not the same, or but variations of the same thing?

They are not, and no greater mistake could be made than to suppose they are. Throughout human history, when the traditional authorities have been in dissolution, or have seemed to be, it is power—in the sense of naked coercion—that has sprung up.

A TISSUE OF AUTHORITIES

Authority, unlike power, is not rooted in force alone, whether latent or actual. It is built into the very fabric of human association. Civil society is a tissue of authorities. Authority has no reality save in the allegiances of the members of an organization, be this the family, a political association, the church or the university.

Authority, function, membership: these form a seamless web in traditional society. The authority of the family follows from its indispensable function. So does that of the church, the guild, the local community and the school. When the function has become displaced or weakened, when allegiances have been transferred to other entities, there

can be no other consequence but a decline of authority.

Culture, too, as Matthew Arnold wrote memorably a century ago, is inseparable from authority. There is the authority of learning and taste; of syntax and grammar in language; of scholarship, of science and of the arts. In traditional culture, there is an authority attaching to the names of Shakespeare, Montaigne, Newton and Pasteur in just as sure a sense of the word as though we were speaking of the law. There is the authority of logic, reason and genius.

Above all, there is the residual authority of the core of values around which Western culture has been formed. This core of values—justice, reason, equity, liberty, charity—was brought into being through the union of the Greek and Judaic traditions 2000 years ago. Until the present age, it has managed to withstand all assaults upon it. In the 18th and 19th centuries, conservatives, liberals and radicals, however passionately they may have fought each other, nevertheless recognized the authority of such values.

The most dangerous intellectual aspect of the contemporary scene is the widespread refusal of thinking men to distinguish between authority and power. They see the one as being as much a threat to liberty as the other. But this way lies madness—and the ultimate sovereignty of power.

There can be no possible freedom in society apart from authority. "Men are qualified for civil liberty," wrote Burke, "in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites." It is out of this disposition toward fruitful self-discipline that authority emerges and its legitimacy is recognized. Abolish the disposition and you equally abolish the capacity for liberty.

There are those, chiefly political romantics and sentimentalists, who think these "moral chains" are a part of man's own nature and that there is consequently no need to worry about their dissolution. But the horrors of our century should have taught us the precariousness of the virtue that romantics think to lie in man's germ plasm. In truth, man's virtue is inseparable from—is as precarious as—his culture.

THE DANGER IN BOREDOM

Boredom is one of the most dangerous accompaniments of the loss of authority in a social order. Between boredom and brute violence there is as close an affinity historically as there is between boredom and inanity, boredom and cruelty, boredom and nihilism. Yet boredom is one of the least understood, least appreciated forces in human history.

Nothing so engenders boredom as the sense of material fulfillment, of goals accomplished, of affluence possessed. It is such a boredom that goes furthest, I think, to explain the peculiar character of the New Left.

I do not deny that youth brings idealism in some degree to this movement; that disenchantment with the more corrupt manifestations of middle-class society plays its part. Youth is beyond question idealistic. But in our present society, youth is also bored. And it is from boredom that so much of the intellectual character of radical political action today is derived.

I should more accurately say nonintellectual character, for it is the consecration of the act, the cold contempt for philosophy and program and the increasingly ruthless behavior toward even the most intellectual parts of traditional culture that give to the New Left its most distinctive character.

It is boredom born of natural authority dissolved, of too long exposure to the void; boredom inherited from parents uneasy in their middle-class affluence and who mistake failure of parental nerve for liberality of rearing; boredom acquired from university teachers grown intellectually impotent and

contemptuous of calling that explains the mindless, purposeless depredations today by the young on that most precious and distinctive of Western institutions: the university.

We do well to take seriously the university and what happens to its authority in our culture. For among its prime functions traditionally has been that of serving as arbiter to that age group that has, at least temporarily, outgrown the authorities of family, church and neighborhood. Potentially, this age group is the most revolutionary of all groups in society, far more revolutionary than, say, the workers, the unemployed, the impoverished.

High in intelligence, emotionally buoyant, at full physical tide, this is the age group that is channeled by the university into the several areas of the professions, that provides the intellectual leaders of society. In the university is acquired lasting motivations toward learning, toward profession, toward high culture, toward membership in the social order. But, by the same token, it is this age group in the university that has largely furnished the West with its steady supply of revolutionaries.

Who is to say that our society does not require its occasional infusion of revolutionaries? But in the present age, the revolutionaries have turned on the university itself, and, and this is not only destructive but totally self-destructive.

The university is the institution that is, by its delicate balance of function, authority and liberty and its normal absence of power, the least able of all institutions to withstand the fury of revolutionary violence. Through some kind of perverted historical wisdom, the nihilism of the New Left has correctly understood the strategic position of the university in modern culture and also its constitutional fragility.

Normally, there are no walls, no locked gates and doors, no guards to repulse attacks on classroom, office and academic study. Who, before the present age, would have thought it necessary to protect precious manuscripts from the hands of revolutionary marauders?

The New Left is free to say all that it wishes, but it has nothing to say. Its program is the act of destruction; its philosophy is the obscene word or gesture; its objective, the academic rubble.

FEAR OF THE VOID

It would all be a transitory charade, a tale told by an idiot, were it not for one thing: the fears aroused in a middle-class society that has lost its anchoring in natural authority. Fear of the void is for human beings a terrible fear, one that will not long be contained. And in this state of mind, it is only power that can seem redemptive, however stained with blood it may be.

The entire country watched last summer's confrontation between New Left and police in Chicago. It was violent, ugly, and could only have aroused the chill of fear in those who had chanced to see the rise of Nazism in Germany, the burning of the Reichstag and the beginnings of a police system that was in time to encliothe German society like a straitjacket.

But I know of no national poll or study that has shown other than approval of police actions by a large majority. The size of this majority will grow. Human beings, I repeat, will tolerate almost anything but the threatened loss of authority in the social order: the authority of law, of custom, of convention. The void does not have to be great, or seem great, for the fears it arouses to become sweeping, for sanity in politics to disintegrate.

We are told by the polls that a large number of people watching their television screens that night in Chicago found even the berserk actions of police and pseudo-police gratifying, reassuring, healing to the

sense of security. Let us not forget that there is a strong upswell of boredom in affluent middle-class society, too. And power, as history tells us, is as often the antidote to boredom in society as to anxiety.

We need, as Max Lerner recently wrote in a thoughtful column, a new social contract in our society, one that will do for our violence-torn social order what the doctrine of the social contract in the 17th century sought to do in that age, fresh as it was from the horrors of the religious wars. But the task will be far more difficult.

The institutions of Western society are less solid and encompassing than they were then. Two centuries of convulsive social change and of remorseless increase in centralized political and economic power have seen to that. We are plagued even by our achievements, for material progress has inevitably taken toll of traditional culture.

Above all, at this moment, we need a liberalism that is able to distinguish between legitimate authority—the authority resident in university, church, local community, family, language and culture—and mere power. Failure to make this distinction between authority and power can only result in the ever-wider replacement of the former by the latter.

If our liberalism can see no profound difference between the authority of an academic dean, however fallible this may sometimes be, and the power of the police riot squad, we shall find ourselves getting ever greater dosages of the latter. The impulse to liberty can survive everything but the destruction of its contexts; and these are contexts of authority—a legitimate authority that is inseparable from institutions.

OUR INCREDIBLE SUPREME COURT

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it never falls. Just when it seems that the Warren court has achieved the ultimate in imprudent jurisprudence, that august body tops itself again. Fortunately, change is well on the way, and we can soon hope for better performance.

However, the present tendency was highlighted again on April 1 when the Court ruled that it was right and proper for a union to fine any member who tries to work harder than the union says he should. Apparently such believers in free enterprise and personal endeavor are discriminating against their union bosses by trying to do a conscientious job.

I suppose the next logical step would be to set a speed limit on track meets so that slow participants will not feel slighted and no one will finish first or last. This seems to be the Court's idea of democracy in action—perhaps inaction would be a better word.

The April 2 issue of the Chattanooga Times included an article on this decision. In its latest effort to "color everyone gray," the Court has attacked the basic premise of American initiative. I can think of no more compelling argument for a change in this body whose senility seems to be compounded by a general lack of experience in and knowledge of the greatest economic and political system devised by man.

The article referred to follows:

COURT HOLDS UNION RIGHT IN FINING RAPID WORKERS—IT RECOGNIZES "LEGITIMATE RIGHT" IN HOLDING PRODUCTION DOWN—TO CONSIDER NEGROES' RIGHT TO USE PRIVATE POOLS

WASHINGTON.—The Supreme Court Tuesday endorsed the power of labor unions to ease "competitive pressure" among pieceworkers by fining them for going over production quotas.

The 7-1 decision dismissed the argument that the discipline system in a Milwaukee motors plant is illegal coercion and recognized, instead, that unions have "legitimate interest" in trying to hold production down.

If they did not do so, Justice Byron R. White said for the court, the competitive pressure generated by an unlimited pay system could endanger workers' health, foment jealousies and reduce the work force.

However, the court cautioned, the fines must be reasonable and not the "mere fiat" of a union leader and membership in the union must be voluntary.

The decision, which provoked a dissent from Justice Hugo L. Black, shared attention with another case, the court's willingness to consider the claim that Negroes cannot be barred from private all-white community parks and swimming pools.

A Negro family in Fairfax County, Va., is suing to gain rights to recreational facilities available to white neighbors in the subdivision. The family rented its house from a white government worker.

Last spring the court gave Negroes protection against discrimination in the sale or rental of private houses. The new case, to be heard next fall, could make suburban living more appealing to Negroes by opening to them some of its side advantages.

The labor decision overrode complaints by four machine operators at the Wisconsin Motor Corp. in Milwaukee—which makes internal combustion engines—that they were being kept from working at the top of their capacity and ability.

The piecework rate, said White, is established in collective bargaining, is geared to the average competent worker and is designed to assure adequate rest periods. He suggested industrious workers who object are free to try to persuade the union—the United Auto Workers—to change the rate in future negotiations with the company.

"If the company wants to require more work of its employes, let it strike a better bargain," White said. "The labor laws as presently drawn will not do for it."

The quota system allows pieceworkers to produce as much as they can each day but sets a ceiling on how much pay they may draw. Wages for over-production are "banked" by the company and paid to the worker for days when he doesn't reach the production ceiling.

If a worker insists, the company will pay him immediately for his over-production, but he may be fined up to \$100 by the union and expelled for nonpayment.

In other actions the court:

Turned down an appeal by Louis E. Wolfson, a multimillionaire industrialist, sentenced to a year in prison for selling a large block of unregistered stock owned by Wolfson interests.

Rejected an attack by sanitation workers in New York City on a state law barring strikes by public employes.

Threw out, by 5-4 vote, the robbery conviction of a California man, Walter B. Foster, on grounds police arranged two lineups so that his identification was "virtually inevitable."

That last ruling appeared to point toward an eventual conflict with Congress. Last year's Crime Control Act, in reaction to court rulings, directed that testimony of an eyewitness shall be admissible in evidence in federal criminal trials.

CARDINAL WRIGHT OF PITTSBURGH, PA., A MAN OF HUMBLE SPIRIT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the good article by Thomas O'Neil of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, dated Saturday, March 29, 1969, regarding my very good friend, John Cardinal Wright of Pittsburgh, Pa.

CARDINAL WRIGHT OF PITTSBURGH, PA., A MAN OF HUMBLE SPIRIT
(By Thomas O'Neil)

Until yesterday, it was Bishop John J. Wright, prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, humanitarian, beloved leader of his flock, equally comfortable among the world's intellectuals as he is among the steelworkers to whom he ministers, and possessor of a finely honed Irish drollness delivered with an unmistakable Boston accent.

Yesterday Bishop Wright became John Cardinal Wright, a Prince of the Roman Catholic Church. And despite his elevation as one of the top men of Catholicism, the humble spirit of John Wright, pastor to his flock, will not change. This was evident as he received members of the secular press in his Victorian Morewood Heights mansion.

Intermixing humor and seriousness in a manner in which only he can do, the new cardinal told the assemblage that he had been informed of the honor in a telephone call about 6 a.m. from Apostolic Delegate Luigi Raimondi from Washington, D.C.

"I have nothing in writing, so this may well be just a rumor," he remarked. "If so, a lot of you have been terribly inconvenienced."

With his elevation, Cardinal Wright became the first American ever to be elevated directly from bishop to cardinal. All of the other newly-named cardinals were archbishops, and elevation from other than archbishop has happened only rarely in the centuries-old tradition of the Roman Catholic Church.

Asked his first reaction on hearing the news, Cardinal Wright said he was "amazed and astonished," and had no hint that the appointment was impending, even though he had been in Rome as recently as Ash Wednesday (Feb. 19).

As the interview began, the new cardinal was interrupted by a telephone call from John Cardinal Dearden, Bishop Wright's immediate predecessor in Pittsburgh and now Archbishop of Detroit who was named a cardinal at the same time by Pope Paul VI.

The cardinal shortly returned to his audience, and noted, again with his humor showing, that "Pittsburgh has given two cardinals in the past 15 years but the Pirates haven't done so well."

Becoming serious, he noted that his new position would enable him to carry on the duties closest to his heart—ecumenism, peace, and human rights.

His humor surfaced again as he noted with a chuckle that he now becomes "a source close to the Vatican," and he went into an aside telling how the American reporters in Rome would congregate at a certain tavern directly across from the Pope's residence.

"Every day at five o'clock," he said, "the bartender would translate the Roman newspapers, and every story the reporters wrote would quote the bartender as 'a source close to the Vatican.'"

Commenting on the Pope's selection of new cardinals, he noted that the list is in line with the tradition of the past 20 years of

"internationalizing" the College of Cardinals. The list announced yesterday includes four Americans, eight Italians, three Frenchmen, two Brazilians, two Spaniards and one each from China, the Philippines, Scotland, New Zealand, Mexico, Korea, Germany, Holland, India, Madagascar, Canada, Guatemala, the Congo and Ecuador.

The college now includes ten American cardinals, the largest number in history.

Bishop Wright became a cardinal immediately upon notification, although he will not be formally invested until April 28 when a ceremony will be conducted in Rome by Pope Paul.

The cardinal was born in Boston July 18, 1909, the oldest of six children. His mother was of Irish descent, his father Scotch.

In his younger days, he worked as a copyboy and later as police reporter for the now-defunct Boston Post.

He was graduated from Boston Latin School and received a bachelor of arts degree from Boston College and studied for the priesthood at American College in Rome, where he was ordained in 1935. He earned a doctorate in theology three years later with highest honors from Gregorian University in Rome. It was there he continued his lifelong custom of seeking out unfortunate individuals to help. He was at the bedside of a notorious American hoodlum, who had been deported to Rome, when he died.

Cardinal Wright, who is 59 years old, returned to Boston where he taught philosophy at St. John's Seminary, then was named secretary to William Cardinal O'Connell and Archbishop (later Cardinal) Richard J. Cushing. He was appointed in 1947 auxiliary bishop of Boston and in 1950 was named the first bishop of Worcester, Mass., a position he held until being named head of the Pittsburgh Diocese in January, 1959.

Considered one of the church's leading intellectuals, Cardinal Wright is also one of its leading authorities on Joan of Arc. His private library is crammed with some 4,100 books and artifacts on the martyred French saint.

Press service reports from Rome indicate that Cardinal Wright is in line for a position on the Vatican Curia, central administrative agency of the Vatican. If appointed, he would be the only American on the Curia.

However, because of the absence of official word from Rome on such an appointment, Cardinal Wright declined comment. It appears likely, however, that the cardinal will be forced to leave the diocese he has served for the past ten years.

(The last American to hold a post on the Curia was Francis Cardinal Brennan of Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, who died July 2, 1957.)

The Cardinal emphasized that until such changes are forced upon him by reason of his new office, he will continue to function as shepherd of the diocese with as little interruption as possible in his daily routine.

Perhaps the unique personality of this newest of the church's princes is best summed up in the following anecdote spoken by the cardinal yesterday.

"Last weekend I spoke at an ecumenical service at Harvard University. Tonight I will speak to a group of women in McKeesport. To be sure, I am more at home in McKeesport than I am with them."

WRIGHT'S SERVICE PRAISED

Members of the district's Protestant and Jewish community were among the many who offered congratulations and good wishes to John Cardinal Wright on his elevation.

The Rev. W. Lee Hicks, executive director of the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh Area telegraphed: "Your tireless efforts on behalf of all men towards peace, justice and love have been a constant source of encouragement to us... We your Christian brethren are greatly honored to share with

you in the work of the kingdom in Pittsburgh. Our prayers go with you in your new office."

The Rev. Dr. William F. Ruschhaupt Jr., Pittsburgh Presbytery executive, said that the new status for the cardinal is "in keeping with the outstanding leadership he has demonstrated in Pittsburgh religious and secular affairs."

He added, "I am fearful that his elevation to the rank of cardinal presages his leaving the Pittsburgh Diocese. While this would open up avenues for greater service, it would be a severe loss to the Pittsburgh religious community."

"It is an honor richly deserved," commented Dr. Solomon B. Freehoff, retired spiritual leader of Rodef Shalom Temple. "From the moment he came among us, the general community knew it had a religious leader of friendliness and genuine humility."

Bishop Roy C. Nichols, resident head of the Western Pennsylvania Area of the United Methodist Church, praised Cardinal Wright as "a very good friend," adding that he was pleased with the new honor. "We shall be praying for God's blessing and guidance in his new work," Bishop Nichols said.

Mayor Joseph M. Barr remarked that "those of us in public life who have been privileged to be closely associated with this distinguished church leader are well aware of the exceptional qualities which obviously prompted this pronouncement from the Vatican . . . Bishop Wright shared with the people of Pittsburgh his rare combination of wisdom and wit. Above all, he demonstrated a sincere interest in the affairs and problems of this community and its people."

FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of H.R. 11550. The relationship of poverty and family size is indisputable. One of every five American children lives in poverty. Forty-three percent of all families with six or more children live in poverty compared to only 21 percent of families with four children. The Social Security Administration determines poor and near-poor status according to the amount of money a family has to spend per person per day for food. This is a reasonable determination and points out vividly the ever worsening plight of a poor family that continues to increase in size each year while its income remains stable. It also demonstrates how a family living on the edge of poverty can be pushed over the brink by unwanted births.

I think we all realize that the choice of number and spacing of children must be one that is made by each family according to the dictates of conscience. When a middle-class family makes such a decision the way is easy. They go to private physicians. For the poor and the near poor there may be no real choice. Every study has shown that the poor express a desire for the same family as the middle class. In fact, though, the poor have more children than they want. The difference seems to be access to family planning services and if you cannot afford to see a private physician the chances are you will not receive family

planning help. There are today an estimated 5 million American women who want but cannot afford family planning services.

In Los Angeles County there are approximately 159,000 low-income women who are in need of family planning help. Only 32,500—less than 26 percent—are receiving aid. According to one study over one-third of the women in California who are in need of family planning services live in Los Angeles County. In its report to the Governor, the State of California Population Study Commission stressed the critical need to gain and maintain a compatible balance between the population growth rate, and the development of economic and natural resources of the State of California. This report indicates that there is a fundamental need for a massive injection of additional funds for family planning services from both local and Federal Government if this balance is to be achieved. As a result of the investigation and recommendations of this commission, the California Interagency Council on Family Planning was formed and consists of members representative of all relevant disciplines from the various parts of the State. Among the council's activities have been the assessment of needs and interest by local agencies—private and public—in expanding local family planning programs. Of the metropolitan areas in the State of California, Los Angeles County was identified as the area requiring priority attention—State of California Population Study Commission: report to the Governor, August 11, 1966.

In order to make Federal aid more readily available, I joined in 1967 in sponsoring an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act that provides for grants to establish family planning projects in poverty areas. One of these projects was recently initiated in Los Angeles County. It combines the efforts of the health department, two county hospitals, two planned parenthood affiliates, and five community action agencies to increase services and conduct an outreach program. The project is expected to reach an additional 15,000 women in its first year of operation. The need, however, is still not met. Over 100,000 women remain outside the scope of all programs.

Some of them, no doubt, could be reached through the special family planning project grants authorized by title V of the Social Security Amendments of 1967. This legislation set aside a minimum of 6 percent of all funds authorized under title V for family planning project grants. Congress in the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act stipulated that 9 percent of fiscal year 1969 funds go for this purpose. Title V was passed in 1967 and has been in effect for almost 1 year. No grants were made until March. Only a fraction of available funds have been obligated. Not one woman has received family planning services under the program. Los Angeles made application several months ago but it and many other cities are still waiting. The children's bureau has not been receptive to the program. It has no full-time staff either in Washington or in regional offices to process applications or

to advise interested communities. Confused and conflicting policy statements regarding the program have been issued. Guidelines were not made public until January 1969 and were given only limited circulation. There are several other programs administered by HEW under which family planning services could be rendered. None of them function effectively, primarily because responsibility in this area is so diffused.

I believe the problem of providing family planning services to low-income women is far too important to be dropped between the bureaucratic cracks. The legislation we are introducing today will establish a Center for Population and Family Planning under the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs to administer all family planning project grants and all population research to coordinate and evaluate all other family planning programs within HEW, to support training of manpower for this field and to provide liaison with other Federal agencies that have programs relating to population and family planning.

I believe this is an important first step toward making family planning services available to all.

PROSPEROUS RIVERSIDE READY TO REAP EVEN MORE BENEFITS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, here in Congress we hear so many requests for Federal aid that it is refreshing to a community doing something without help from the Government. Such a town is Riverside, Ala., which is located in my district. A recent article in the Birmingham News outlined the progress Riverside is making under the direction of Mayor W. A. Coleman.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the RECORD.

PROSPEROUS RIVERSIDE READY TO REAP EVEN MORE BENEFITS

(By Thomas F. Hill, News Staff Writer)

Mayor W. A. Coleman probably wears more hats than anyone else.

He wears one as a railroad engineer, one as mayor, one as a sportsman, one as a businessman and one as a farmer.

In addition to this, he probably could wear still another as being a person who does things differently.

For instance, Mayor Coleman is planning to build a new city hall without federal assistance!

And more important, he plans to pay for the new municipal building without negotiating a loan, floating bonds or seeking a grant.

Mayor Coleman plans to pay cash for the new city hall!

This is but another chapter in the political life of Coleman, who is serving his third term as mayor of Riverside—a political career that has seen him break rules, win poker games with large utility firms, and parlay a \$1,200 plot of land into a million-dollar complex.

When Coleman took term as mayor of Riverside which had been incorporated since

1883, he found about \$326 deposited in the bank to the municipal government account. Today, the balance is over \$20,000.

Once a big sawmill town with over 30 cars of lumber a day being loaded up for transportation to other areas, Riverside's economy had dwindled to almost nothing. The 1960 census showed about 126 persons living there.

The city limits of Riverside extended a radius of one mile from the mayor's home, which was built in 1946.

The city limits have now been extended six miles, taking in the tourist development of Logan Martin Lake, and stretching into the perimeter of the rich potential of the Talladega Speedway.

Through some rather heavy "eye-ball-to-eye-ball" negotiating, the mayor succeeded in swapping a plot of land he owned with a 10-acre tract owned by Alabama Power Co. on an even trade.

The Power Company had the tract for a possible steam plant construction site, but later decided to build at Wilsonville. The company needed the land the mayor owned for some gas valves.

The even exchange of land valued at less than \$2,000 then has inflated tremendously in Mayor Coleman's favor. Today, his 10-acre tract contains the Riverside Marina, where hundreds of expensive boats tie up, a Holiday Inn, two filling stations and a candy specialty shop.

The mayor isn't selling, but his less-than \$2,000 land now is worth more than \$1 million!

When not acting as mayor, or running his milling or poultry industry, or overseeing the Marina, which he leases, Mayor Coleman dons a railroad cap.

As second oldest seniority employe of Southern Railroad, Mayor Coleman is engineer on the Southerner's run from Birmingham to Atlanta. He owns Riverside Milling Co., has over 200,000 laying hens, operates Riverside Milling Commissary, Riverside Investment Co., and is vice president of Anliston Production Credit Corp.

Although he leases Riverside Marina to someone else, he still maintains an active interest in it.

He feels when the speedway fans throng to the Talladega International Speedway, Riverside will reap the profits.

"We are operating in the black, too," said the mayor. "We have police protection, street lights, natural gas service, fire protection, and free garbage pick-up."

Drawings have been OK'd for the new city hall, which will have 3,200 square feet and house all the functions of municipal government.

The mayor is working to prepare Riverside for speedway and water recreation prosperity.

As a negotiator, financier, engineer, executive and fisherman, he is sure to land the catch he is seeking.

And he insists he is going to do it in his own way—no loans, no grants, only old-fashioned cash-on-the-barrelhead.

**THE NEW DEAL AND THE STATES—
FEDERALISM IN TRANSITION**

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, the good work of Prof. James T. Patterson. His book, "Congressional Conservatism and the New Deal," published in 1967 is an excellent study of a tumultuous period which

left such a large and lasting imprint on this Congress, particularly upon the House of Representatives. This year, Mr. Patterson, associate professor of history at the University of Indiana, has had published a book, "The New Deal and the States—Federalism in Transition." Once again, Professor Patterson has give us an informative and useful study. This book informs us about Federal-State relationships prior to the New Deal administrations of Franklin Roosevelt and how these were radically altered, particularly by social security and work relief programs. The account of varying reactions by the States during the first 100 days of the first Roosevelt administration is fascinating.

**TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GOVERNOR
OF TENNESSEE, PRENTICE COOPER—
A GREAT AMERICAN**

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this means of honoring the memory of the late Prentice Cooper, a distinguished Tennessean and a great American who served his beloved State and Nation with dedication and devotion.

Prentice Cooper, my friend and constituent, passed away recently following an outstanding career of public service that included three terms as Governor of Tennessee and service as Ambassador to Peru.

This distinguished public servant will be missed but his name will be recorded in the annals of Tennessee history among those who stood foursquare for high principle and sound government.

I want to extend to Mrs. Cooper, their three fine sons and other members of the family a further expression of my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy in their loss and bereavement. Mrs. Evins joins me in these sentiments.

In this connection, I place in the Record herewith an editorial from the Nashville Banner concerning the life and service of Prentice Cooper:

PRENTICE COOPER

Although nearly a quarter of a century has elapsed since Prentice Cooper's tenure as Chief Executive of Tennessee—and another generation has come of age—the memories of a beneficial service linger, along with policies of fiscal strength he helped instill. The constructive endeavors marking his three terms at that helm vastly outweigh the personal and political vendetta waged by his antagonists.

He is remembered with respect by the state he served; a man possessed of the courage of his convictions—and who never retreated from a principle espoused, or from a challenge. Times has vindicated many of the policies that were his, in controversy then. It has brought into clearer focus the value of objectives once subjected—out of spite work—to sharp dispute. In the total picture, the administration of Prentice Cooper is seen as one of able, progressive stewardship.

He did not believe in fiscal legerdemain—and sought, successfully, to establish the state's financial affairs on a sound base of

balanced budgets, forgoing excessive public debt, and enforcing insofar as possible adherence of cost level to the taxpayers' ability to pay. That was not shortsightedness respecting necessities of progress, but a due concern for the state's welfare. And it occurred, notably, at a time when fiscal recklessness at the national level was in its early innings. Subsequent developments have justified Governor Cooper's judgment in that vital particular, and subsequent administrations have found in it a salutary, helpful standard.

He was a stickler for law and order as the premise of responsible government at any level. By instinct a conservative, he opposed excessive departures—step by step—from the constitutional pattern.

By those convictions his concept of duty was shaped, and no man of his time was subjected to wilder abuse by his critics—the target of lampooning, vicious political assault and innuendo.

The Banner did not always agree with Governor Cooper, but respected the sincerity of his position—and his profound regard for faithful discharge of the trust three times committed to him. Quite obviously, the constituency of Tennessee shared that faith.

He honored the assignment, proud of his state and of the national heritage of which it was—and is—to every Tennessee citizen, a proud component. Latterly by President Harry S. Truman's appointment, he served as U.S. Ambassador to Peru.

A patriot, he served his country in uniform—a soldier in World War I. Active in American Legion work, he was elected as state commander in 1931.

His passing shocks and saddens the state that knew him as distinguished son and public servant.

BOOBYTRAPPED HIGHWAYS

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I introduced legislation designed to eliminate fixed hazards along our Federal-aid highways. Such hazards as wall-like bridge abutments, spearlike guardrails, concrete footings, and rigid signposts kill and maim thousands of Americans each year.

As a result of hearings before the Public Works Committee, State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads have acted in such a forthright manner to correct this situation without the enactment of this legislation.

I would like to commend to the attention of other Members the following press release from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety which announces the publication of "Booby Trapped Highways," a booklet released by the Federation of Insurance Counsel which accurately points out the seriousness of this problem:

BOOBYTRAPPED HIGHWAYS

"Booby Trapped Highways" owes its origins to Congressional investigations and hearings held in 1967. They disclosed the enormity of a public health problem that threatens the life of every highway traveller—the problem of the fixed hazards indiscriminately placed alongside our nation's roads.

These hazards—wall-like bridge abutments, rigid signposts, concrete footings, spearlike guardrails and many others—kill

and maim thousands of Americans each year. In the currency of human and property waste their costs are astronomical and senseless—and avoidable.

"Booby Trapped Highways," a publication of the Federation of Insurance Counsel, explains this pressing public health problem and some ways in which the highway environment can be changed to correct it.

Your copy of "Booby Trapped Highways" has been made available by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. The Institute believes that roadside hazards which aggravate crashes, and the deaths, injuries and property losses resulting from crashes, can be:

Designed out of newly planned and built highways across the nation.

Removed from existing highways by intensive, systematic programs to correct spending, maintenance and replacement policies at the Federal, State and local levels that have contributed to the roadside hazard problem or that fail to guarantee its immediate correction.

Next time you drive on a familiar highway after reading this publication, look for the booby traps. When you see a thick steel I-beam signpost planted next to the road, ask yourself what would be the consequences of crashing into it. Then, ask why it hasn't yet been replaced by a breakaway signpost designed to yield safely in crashes instead of destroying a car and its occupants.

Or when you see a guardrail's sharp spear-like end pointed at your oncoming car, ask yourself whether the "guardrail" wasn't misnamed—and then ask why its threatening pointed tip hasn't been angled back from the roadway and safely buried underground.

Keep looking. Keep asking why you and your family must be threatened with the death penalty if, for any reason, your car should veer or be forced off the roadway for even a moment. Ask how *this* environmental problem was allowed to happen.

A motoring public aware of our highway system's booby traps will, we believe, be unwilling to tolerate the kind of highway spending, planning, construction and maintenance that produced these hazards and that fails to eliminate them throughout the country. We hope this publication will contribute to public awareness and demand for changes that will save many, many lives now being needlessly wasted along America's highway.

HOUSING NEEDS OF POOR PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1968, the President's Committee on Urban Housing transmitted its findings and recommendations to then President Lyndon Johnson. As directed in June 1967, the committee spent 16 months studying all aspects of this Nation's housing problem and then concluded:

We believe that the primary purpose of housing programs should be to meet the housing needs of today's urban poor.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am primarily concerned with that objective and I am seriously disturbed by the failure of past and present efforts to effect that purpose.

Major Federal housing efforts have taken place since World War II and they were stimulated by the postwar demand for housing—rather than by any other

need. However, housing laws of all sorts and shapes and sizes have come forth from this legislative body since 1934—but still it is a battle to put the emphasis on the housing needs of poor people.

It was in 1937 that Congress set up its first long-range program of public housing for low-income families. Like today, it was based on Federal loans and annual subsidy payments assisting local housing authorities. But it was not until 1949 that Federal responsibility to the housing needs of poor people was firmly stated to be an objective or a responsibility of the Federal Government. The National Housing Act of 1949 called for "the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

After nearly 20 years, the statement had demonstrated only a rhetorical value and it was former President Johnson who took it upon himself to reaffirm that commitment so long overdue. Sufficient concern was stimulated within the 90th Congress to bring about a statement of Federal intent to make good the pledge of 1949.

Today, I look at those words and I am skeptical that the "decent home for every American family" carries any meaning for this Government. It is one more in a long list of commitments to poor people which, I fear, will go unhonored. As I survey past pledges and relate them to current housing conditions of the urban poor—it seems these verbal commitments are designed only to placate the press and to calm public concern from the affluent. These pledges have not formed the foundation for action. There is lots of "glorified intent" but there is no followthrough. There is lots of time spent bill writing and little time spent putting the law to work. And I am tired—like all the poor people who have been waiting—tired of having persons tell me there is a law which provides the assistance we seek.

I am no expert on housing matters but I can tell you from firsthand knowledge what the housing problem is for the urban poor. Because I can do that and because I am a Member of this Congress where the needs of people are supposed to be recognized—I must speak out against the further toleration of the present housing tragedy which exists in our cities. I can only conclude that my witness to the housing problems in St. Louis, Mo., must be fairly representative of all metropolitan problems. And I need no housing expertise to make the judgment that Federal efforts have failed miserably to meet the needs of poor people.

It is astonishing that so little has been done to make good past pledges for housing. If the Members of this body have not digested the report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, let me call to your attention several of its noteworthy findings:

First. More than 12 percent of American families cannot afford decent housing.

Second. In numbers, that means 7.8 million American families or one in every eight, cannot now afford to pay market

price for standard housing which would cost no more than 20 percent of their total incomes.

Third. At least 10 percent of the Nation's existing shelters are in substandard condition.

Fourth. The average ratio of housing costs to gross income total population is 15 percent.

Fifth. One half of the 7.8 million families in need of housing are surviving on less than \$3,000 a year.

Is this body unaware or does it merely choose to ignore the following truth. In 1949, the men who occupied these seats in the Congress pledged to build 810,000 public housing units over the ensuing 6-year period. Twenty years have elapsed since then and still we have not met that goal. May I further note that until 1967—we had met only a few more than one-half the number of units pledged in 1949. It was not until the activity of the past 2 years that this Government brought the number of public housing units to 800,000—still 10,000 short of the 6-year goal set in 1949. The Committee report on urban housing summarizes it this way:

In other words, after more than one-third of a century, Federal efforts have met only one-tenth of the Nation's subsidized housing need.

What meaning then, does the law have for poor people? This is the question being asked with increasing regularity whenever poor people start marching. "Work within the law, respect the law and obey the law," they are told, "for this is a nation of laws and not of men." But what of the law to implement the decent home pledged in 1949. Why was that law not respected and what men are they who have kept that law from honoring its commitment? The convenient cliché relied upon to taunt the poor people has no meaning when applied to laws for poor people. Men then assert themselves over law and no one seems to notice.

Last year, the legislative body of this Government took a firm stand in committing itself to meet the Nation's most urgent housing needs. The Housing Act of 1968 helped to remind the forgetters that we are still determined to provide that "decent home." President Johnson called it the "Magna Carta to liberate our cities."

Indeed, the law gives this Government the authority to solve our problems, but the law cannot enforce itself. Let us not kid ourselves that the law of 1968 will carry us near the necessary objectives—for, at the rate we are going, it will have to be rewritten and reaffirmed in another 10 to 20 years, just like the law of 1949 was rewritten and reaffirmed last year.

The reason is simple. Men are taking precedence over law—a law which cannot be implemented without funds. Money, for the crucial programs made law by the act of 1968, simply is not there and, as such, the law is nullified and void. There are no funds to enforce the open-housing provisions of the law—and only token funds for the grandeur efforts planned through rent supplement, model cities, and urban renewal. The program cannot bring the change they

were intended to bring—and when they fail to make good the promises publicized, the law becomes more and more meaningless for poor people.

Our priorities are sadly amiss. According to the committee report, the Federal Government spent \$303.7 million in fiscal 1968 to subsidize the existing 800,000 housing units for low- to moderate-income families. A miscalculation in the Pentagon in the amount of a measly \$300 million probably would not even be considered a serious mistake.

How can we overlook the meaning of our spending habits from fiscal 1962 through fiscal 1967?

In the period, the following amounts were spent: \$356.3 billion for national defense, \$33.2 billion for stabilizing farm prices and income, \$24.2 billion for space exploration, \$22.2 billion for Federal highway construction, \$8.1 billion for all housing and urban renewal programs, and \$1.25 billion for Federal housing subsidies.

Again we ask: "How long must the poor people wait for these programs endorsed by, but not supported by, this Government?" The newspaper byline reads "Congress Passes Landmark Housing Law"—the people read, the people wait, and nothing happens because funds were never budgeted nor sought.

I register my vigorous opposition to the forces—and they are human forces—who stand in the way of this law to provide decent housing.

Today, I come not only to protest those efforts which are made only in the books—but to protest one particular aspect of the feeble subsidy effort which is being made.

Let me cite the case in point which, I believe, is typical of cases existing in all metropolitan areas of the Nation. The city of St. Louis reaped the rewards of the brief spurt of public housing activity generated by the Federal Government in the 1950's. In other words, we have in St. Louis one of the high-density, minimum-comfort projects now cited as a landmark and tribute to the lack of foresight in public housing. It has been inspected by persons from all over the country who come to show others how public housing should not be built. Pruitt-Igoe was erected to replace a slum—but it is a monster which should have been torn down the day it was built.

The slum replaced by Pruitt-Igoe housed 5,000—whereas Pruitt-Igoe put 12,000 people in the same area—7,000 to 9,000 of whom were children—in 33 high-rise structures which now—14 years later—stand 30-percent vacant because of the combination of blunders which created it.

Pruitt-Igoe is the subject of a rent strike at this time which I support because rents in Pruitt-Igoe are not reasonable for the kind of structural deficiency and present rehabilitation and repair needs which plague the project. Tenants in Pruitt-Igoe are asked to pay a disproportionate share of their incomes for housing below reasonable standards.

Aside from the structural problems which cannot be altered but which might be dealt with, Pruitt-Igoe suffers from a serious lack of operating funds and the

inability of tenants to finance with their rent the operation and maintenance of these buildings.

Under present law, Federal annual contributions are made to the local housing authority to cover the full costs of retiring the bonds. The Federal Government is now authorized to pay an additional \$120 per year for first, elderly; second, persons displaced by urban renewal; third, the extremely poor; and, fourth, extremely large families. The cost of project development is financed by tax-exempt local bonds and payment in lieu of tax, not more than but usually at 10 percent of shelter rent—is financed by tenant rent.

Tenant rent is pegged to cover all operating, maintenance, and payment in lieu of tax costs. Tenants of projects like Pruitt-Igoe, built in 1954 and suffering from the structural as well as from inflationary problems, cannot afford that rent.

The obvious need is for a greater subsidy in order to lower the rents and to provide for the necessary maintenance and repair which will make these buildings as livable as possible. The obvious source for these funds is the Federal Government and based on the commitments written into law, the Federal responsibility for assistance is clear. Only four States have adopted State-aid programs of any size and the State of Missouri, while it is currently debating such a housing assistance program in its legislature, is not prepared to provide the funds needed by Pruitt-Igoe.

There must be an additional subsidy from the Federal Government. To date, the policy has been to categorize a target group in need of special assistance and allow them an additional payment of \$120 per year to the local housing authority. Today, I present legislation calling for an additional subsidy in the amount necessary to hold rents in public housing projects at and preferably below an amount which is 25 percent of tenant income.

Additional Federal funds must be provided if projects like Pruitt-Igoe are to be used. Unless more realistic finances are provided many public housing projects will go vacant and provide other scars on the inner city. That is precisely what will happen if these projects are not given the benefit of the additional funds necessary to take the pressure off rents. Rents cannot now meet the skyrocketing maintenance and operating costs of these 1950 structures.

It is my understanding that only two or three men in the country have any working knowledge of the annual contributions formula as such—and I have been advised to seek additional funds through an amendment to that formula. My bill calls for a new subsidy based on an additional formula which will be applicable to those public housing projects starting to suffer from age in addition to their innate defects. A project would be required to hold rents at a level which would not exceed 25 percent of the average income of all persons eligible for residence in that particular project. Recently constructed projects would not be effected as their rent requirements

would not be in excess of that 25 percent of income factor. If the average income for persons eligible for residence in a particular unit were \$5,000, rents could not be pegged at levels which would exceed an average \$1,250 per year rental. If, however, as in the case of Pruitt-Igoe, operating, maintenance, and payment in lieu of tax requirements exceed that average yearly rental, additional Federal contributions would be made to the local housing authority in an amount to cover that additional cost beyond the 25 percent of income average.

To restate my purpose, it is to keep the rents for these tenants down to a reasonable level. Twenty-five percent is the absolute limit of reasonableness, particularly when we consider that the national average of percent of income paid for housing is only 15 percent.

I do not hold my bill up as the perfect solution to the problem—but I will not yield on the necessity for providing some solution to this specific problem as soon as possible.

I submit this bill to my colleagues and to the Committee on Banking and Currency not as a prototype for action but as an urgent statement of the need for their expertise and experience to be directed to this specific problem area. It is clear to me that there must be an additional subsidy for those projects like the St. Louis Pruitt-Igoe. These tenants are entitled to the same rent and housing benefits as tenants occupying units through other kinds of housing and rental programs, financed with Federal funds. Whatever the best means, I hope we shall pursue it.

Most in need of amendment is the entire record of Federal efforts in behalf of the poor—whether it be housing or hunger or jobs. This legislation is an attempt to correct only one injustice in only one aspect of the housing needs and problems of this Nation.

The report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing must not go the way of the Kerner report. It is not enough to build new units for the poor—but to seek fair utilization of existing public housing units which is what I seek in the bill I present to this body.

GERMAN SOCIAL SECURITY
HAILED

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, the statement by the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, made a few weeks ago, indicating there would be no increase in social security benefits this year, came as a distinct shock to many of us. The need for an increase this year is apparent to everyone. The meager checks many of our elderly are existing on today is a blot on our Nation's history. At the beginning of this year, I filed H.R. 55, a bill calling for

a 50-percent increase to all social security recipients. This bill provides that the formula for the collection of social security taxes be changed from the present system which requires a 50-percent tax on the employer and 50 percent on the employee to a new formula providing that a third of the tax be paid by the employer, a third by the employee, and a third by the Federal Government. This would result in hundreds of thousands of the elderly who are now forced to apply for old-age assistance through their welfare departments back home to supplement their meager checks in order to survive, to receive their pension allotments in a dignified manner. The bill would also provide for realistic social security payments more in line with the needs of the elderly.

I take leave to include in the RECORD a news column that appeared in today's Boston Globe, written by Joseph B. Levin, entitled "German Social Security Hailed." The article points up why the social security payments in Germany are higher. I trust the Members of Congress will read this article and join with me in the passing of legislation that would go part of the way in bringing relief to an intolerable situation that exists today and with no outlook for the relief in the future.

The article follows:

GERMAN SOCIAL SECURITY HAILED

(By Joseph B. Levin)

United States and West German Social Security systems are compared in the following extraordinary letter from a Massachusetts woman who receives old age pensions from both. She has asked that her name and address be withheld. She writes:

"This letter is a comment on your open letter to Mr. Nixon May 15. I am a widow of 72, somewhat better off than many of my age, but no thanks are due SS or the private pension system.

"My late husband died in 1958 and at the time had been for 10 years a full professor at Brandeis. From this \$111 per month from Social Security and \$20.45 per month from the Teachers Insurance.

"He was previously for seven years professor at the Berlin Music Academy. After his death, I received from the German government a monthly pension of \$156; and in 1966, this was raised to \$213; and in 1969, to \$287 to compensate for the increased living costs. In addition, I received in 1967 a lump sum of \$1700 to compensate for the rise during the years until 1966.

"During this period my SS income increased 10 percent and the Teachers Insurance pension went from \$15.08 to \$20.45. Certainly I could not live on my American income and I hope that these comparative figures may emphasize what can be done for the elderly by the governments and certainly could be done more easily in this rich country."

SENIOR SET

A: This writer is deeply indebted to this lady for passing along the information. The German pensions are higher because the German government makes a substantial contribution from its general revenues to Social Security whereas the U.S. government contributes nothing except for a pittance to certain special categories, like those who have become 72 but have no Social Security. Otherwise, SS is paid for entirely by the employer and employee, and the self-employed.

Social Security has worked out a system using electric data processing to speed action

on initial and subsequent claims. According to John Rynne, district manager of the Boston office, the system can cut days off the processing time. For an initial claim to fall into the speed-up category, the applicant must present certain important documents, like his Federal W-2 form, SS tax data, wedding and/or death data. Consult your SS office.

ALBERT RAINS SPEECH CONTEST

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years, former Congressman Albert Rains has sponsored the Albert Rains Speech Contest at Snead State Junior College in Boaz, Ala. This event has been most beneficial to the young people of Alabama in the development of forensic talent. At a time in our history when so much depends on the sheer ability to communicate, giving young people the opportunity to translate their thoughts and feelings into a cohesive, easily understood discourse is an invaluable experience.

At this time, I place in the RECORD copies of the three winning speeches from this year's contest, and congratulate first place winner, Larry R. Buchanan, 1600 O'Brig Avenue, Guntersville, Ala.; second place winner, Maylon Andrew Blythe, Route 2, Springville, Ala.; third place winner, William Henry Barnett, Route 3, box 137, Blountsville, for their outstanding efforts in this year's contest:

FIRST PLACE: CAMPUS DISORDERS

(By Larry Buchanan)

I have risen rung by rung on the ladder out of poverty. I have had a taste of freedom. I have seen visions of prosperity. Most of all, I see the goal for which I have striven so long and so hard now within the grasp of my hand.

When I was a child of about six years old, my father had an average income of about thirty five dollars a week. Despite the poverty of my family, I had the chance to set my goals. I, despite my poverty, had the chance to live in America and enjoy seeing myself progress toward my life's dream. That dream is now in sight.

Clouds of gloom are now rising around my dream. These clouds are those students who are seen locking college administrative boards in the administration building. These clouds are the students who have an all-night so-called sit-in in the gym on their campus. These clouds are the professors standing before their classes saying that he believes the United States deserves to be defeated in the Vietnamese conflict.

Clouds that are darker than these are those that are represented in the wall of the state trooper's siren and the sight of the convoy of our national guard rolling out as they are called to fight the "nutty" students who are challenging the very basis on which the United States is founded.

They are in truth waging an internal war on the United States. This is a war against me. It is a war against my dreams. It is a war being waged against my heritage and my future. It is war being carried out in full scale against my life and the hard work through which I have had the chance to come to college and take my place in the world.

Yes, it's a war against me, but what do I do? Do I acquaint myself with the problem well enough to suggest some possible solution? No, I do just as most other Americans do. I say, "I am not a college official; therefore, it is not my job to try to think of a solution. So I am not going to." Since when have I written my congressman a letter about the situation? I have done just as most complacent Americans have done, I have not written him.

I do just as other Americans do. By my complacency, I am doing just as other complacent Americans are doing, I am inviting those "nuts" to come right in and ruin the country.

Just as other Americans, by my complacency, I invite those freaks who are rioting on our campuses to run off the best educators we have. And just as other Americans, I haven't walked up and socked one of those "nuts" just because he cheered Ho Chi Minh and his Viet Cong. And as most Americans I have become alarmed at the rampant rise of Communism on our campuses, but what I have done is simply to sit around and be complacent waiting for others to take the lead.

I, as other Americans, have hidden behind this excuse, "I just don't want to get involved." But I and other Americans are involved. Our future is at stake. Our present life is in question. Complacency is causing the defeat of our past because we are not even defending it.

If we would get involved could not we defeat those rioters on our campuses?

If we don't get involved, one of these days, it will be too late. These scatterbrain idiots who are burning our colleges will have completely burned our society, and then it will be too late to get off our course of complacency.

SECOND PLACE: CURRENT CAMPUS AGITATION

(By Malan Andrew Blythe)

Instead of displaying a state of intellectuality and respect for the officials, students on many of the college campuses of today's America shed an air of unethical bitterness and physical brutality toward their superiors. The interpretation of the word "authority" has greatly contributed to riots and demonstrations in college campuses throughout the nation. Currently, the educational systems of America are in a state of turmoil, and the nation itself is in a state of instability.

If one has observed the steady progression of campus agitation in American colleges, he has undoubtedly found a group which calls itself "Students for a Democratic Society", commonly referred to as SDS. Michael Klonsky, national secretary of the SDS, openly stated that "our primary task is to build a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement." F.B.I. Director, J. Edgar Hoover, told a Congressional committee, "If anything definite can be said about the 'Students for a Democratic Society,' it is that it can be called anarchist." SDS has been involved in over two hundred campus disputes during the present school year.

The SDS is influential on the American college student in many ways.

The Society encourages the burning of draft cards; it encourages the protest against ROTC, and it is active in instigating the organization of demonstrations and sit-ins. In effect, this society works on the emotions of the student in order to obtain its selfish goals.

Psychologically defined, the student of American colleges is starving for a mental state of balance or homeostasis. These young people are increasingly upset; and, truthfully (although contrary to popular opinion), they have every right to be upset. For there is a great behind-the-scene reason for disturbances such as campus agitation in the

fields of ROTC training, draft control, and school facilities. The cause of this agitation is none other than the forced stress—both physical and mental—brought on by the "Students for a Democratic Society." Zbigniew Brzezinski, professor of government at Columbia University stated, "no doubt what is involved here is not so much a crystallized political revolution as a psychological expression of frustration, alienation, an unwillingness to confront systematic tests."

The SDS has used strong psychological tactics in order to create aggressive behavior in the typical American college student. While racial disturbances existed in full force which were probably kicked off by its own agents, the "Students for a Democratic Society" used this trouble in order to gain its purpose—that of encouraging anarchy. The misuse of draft cards, and the complaints against ROTC programs were also started by the SDS in an attempt to build in America the needed contempt necessary for a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary revolt.

Most of the militants and student revolvers are of high-class or high-middle-class social status. Why, then, do these students revolt? Why do they despise authority? Perhaps the answers to these questions date back to the childhood of many of the students' parents. The parents of these students grew up in a time when life itself was a struggle. The fathers of this present generation helped build up the society that is now being torn down. Why do these students yield to the forces of SDS? Not because this generation is a low-class, rebellious generation, but rather because this is a generation which is starving for responsibility. The fathers of these students had the responsibility of pulling this nation together and making it a highly educated, and highly cultured country. Until the present time, the teen-age society knows little of the meaning of real responsibility. Yet, they seek responsibility. Since SDS realizes this important fact, it will, as it has in the past, provide a pseudo-responsibility for these students who are having life easy because "daddy had to struggle to get by." This pseudo-responsibility in simple explanation is anarchy.

Who then is to blame for the unfavorable atmosphere of the college campuses of today? Just where should the blame be placed? There is no person, there is no organization, which we can totally blame for this unorthodox behavior. The blame falls upon an abstract concept in the minds of the people. The reformation of this inner feeling alone can save American college campuses from total destruction. The inner feeling most prevalent is that of emotional instability (because of lack of wholesome responsibility) which constantly haunts the minds of today's college students. The lack of sufficient student-teacher and parent-child communications has resulted in a mental war between the two generations. The facial problems offered the student a way to exercise responsibility—though false it was—and thus prove to his superiors that he could and would fight for position in society. Using the conflict of the generation gap, SDS has terrorized over two hundred colleges throughout the nation. The crises of the generation gap have offered fulfillment to Klonsky's hope of building a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement.

As a solution to instability in the student, mental homeostasis may be established as follows: (1) The general public must become aware of the sly tactics of the Students for a Democratic Society. (2) The parents and teachers must realize that today's college student is literally starving for responsibility. If parents and teachers do not provide this needed "wholesome" responsibility, the SDS will supply the student with pseudo-responsibility in abundance. (3) The general public

must realize that the college student, like everyone else, is seeking a place in society, and if the students are not accepted in this society, they can find acceptance in the SDS Communist society.

THIRD PLACE: STUDENT RIOTING AND DISTURBANCES ON THE CAMPUS

(By William Barnett)

President McCain, members of the faculty, my fellow students, and guests:

What has happened when many centers of learning have become the welcome gathering place for revolutionaries, that the campus has become a perpetual battleground? How did we get it so confused?

President Nixon recently stated that college administrations must "have the backbone to stand up" against student violence "if free education is to survive in the United States. College officials must recognize that there can be no compromise with lawlessness and no surrender to force." But our leadership seems to have contradicted itself, for the president of the Association of High Education declared that, "Colleges are not churches, clinics, or even parents. Whether or not a student burns a draft card, participates in a civil rights march, engages in sexual activities, becomes pregnant, attends church, sleeps all day or drinks all night, is not really the concern of an educational institution."

The trend toward disorder and lawlessness on American college campuses has aroused great controversy and confusion. The problem exists almost everywhere in the university world today. The central problem seems to be concerned with what we can do about this world's wrongs, and in what manner we can heal rather than destroy. Youth has much to offer in this respect—idealism, generosity, dedication, service. But the last thing a shaken society needs is more shaking. The last thing a noisy, turbulent, disintegrating community needs is more noise, turbulence, and disintegration.

Five years ago, at Berkeley, student activists resorted to the well-tried method of sitting-in to win from the administration the absolute right to speak. Exactly one year ago at Columbia University, student aggressors turned sit-ins into forcible seizure and "liberated" buildings in order to force a redistribution of university power. Several weeks ago at Cornell, the seized building became an armed camp where students claimed they were willing to die and take others with them. Faced with this situation Cornell officials signed an amnesty agreement "to prevent a growing and imminent threat to life."

The majority opinion on large campuses admits that the community recognizes the validity of protest regarding the current burning issues of our society: such as war and peace, especially Vietnam; and civil rights, especially of minority groups. There is also virtual agreement that the university cannot continue to exist as an open society, which is dedicated to the discussion of all issues of importance, if protests are of such a nature that the normal operations of the university are in any way impeded, or if the rights of any member of this community are infringed upon, peacefully or violently. Violence is especially deplored as a violation of everything that the university community stands for.

The days when college presidents reigned as scholars and patriarchs over an intellectual community are long gone, destroyed in part by the exploding number of megaversity, and in part by the accelerating social demands of the young. Now many college presidents have bodyguards, and are just as likely to be judged for their behavior at sit-ins as they are to be judged by their knowledge in riot control. The nightly TV and newspaper battle reports show students and police engaged in pitched street battles, or

young rebels sitting in a university president's office or standing on the balcony of a "liberated" administration building under a picture of Malcolm X. All these upheavals have increased the demands by parents, politicians, and taxpayers that somehow law and order must be restored on the campus. The university presidents are thus caught in the cross fire between radical demonstrators demanding changes which the schools often cannot give and angry trustees and taxpayers fighting movements which the schools frequently cannot control. And administrators now realize that if they do not try to control radical protests themselves, they will lose much of their authority to law forces outside the campus, which will further excite students, and thus continue the vicious circle.

It was the insight of President Kennedy which caused him to say, "These are extraordinary times. We face an extraordinary challenge. But our strength as well as our convictions have imposed" upon us "the long and exacting test of the future of freedom—a test which may well continue for decades to come." Therefore, one may define a student movement as an emancipated mass of students deeply inspired by aims which they try to develop in a free political assertion, and moved by an emotional rebellion in which there is always present a disillusionment with and rejection of the values of the older generation. Moreover, the members of a student movement have the conviction, openly and freely, that their generation has a special mission to fulfill whereas others have failed. But this necessary freedom of ideas gives the students no authority to threaten the liberty of others.

From New England to the West Coast, radical students stepped up their spring offensive against U.S. universities last month, seizing buildings, shutting down schools, often provoking violence—and nowhere were the strife's complexities in clearer focus than at three of the nation's most influential and liberal schools: Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago.

Strongly against these radical activities, the Attorney General of the United States declared that the Nixon Administration's patience was at an end and that "violence-prone aggressors will be prosecuted to the fullest extent." He called "for an end to minority tyranny on the nation's campuses and for the immediate re-establishment of civil peace and protection of individual rights. If arrests must be made, then arrests there should be; if violators must be prosecuted, then prosecution there must be." Therefore, "It is no admission of defeat, as some may claim, to use reasonable physical force to eliminate physical force."

We may sum up the situation in the words of Senator Everett Dirksen, "We are the legatees of a great, strong land. We received it from those who were here before us. The state of our land includes our leadership of the free world, our relations and our respects for law, our devotion to peace, and our willingness to sacrifice even as others have done before us. It includes reason and realism in a world of tumult and confusion."

MR. PUCINSKI ANNOUNCES THE AMOUNT OF IMPACTED AID MONEY IN EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee is presently con-

sidering the fiscal year 1970 budget for all federally supported education programs.

Since the General Subcommittee on Education, which I serve as chairman, has legislative jurisdiction over the impacted aid program, I requested the Of-

fice of Education to prepare a listing of the fiscal year 1969 appropriations for each congressional district under Public Law 81-874.

I am inserting this listing in the RECORD in order to define more clearly the effects of this program throughout

the country. Let me emphasize that this is a listing of the fiscal year 1969 appropriations of \$400 million, when the entitlement was approximately \$650 million.

Mr. Speaker, the chart follows:

CHILDREN AND PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874

State	District	A children	B children	A amount	B amount	A plus B amount	District school
Alabama	01	234	5,179	\$59,853	\$662,342	\$722,195	4
Do	02	516	7,543	131,982	964,674	1,096,657	6
Do	03	730	10,468	186,719	1,338,753	1,525,472	12
Do	04	329	7,634	84,152	976,312	1,060,464	12
Do	05	25	1,035	6,395	132,366	138,761	3
Do	07		2,126		271,894	271,894	3
Do	08	802	23,784	205,136	3,041,736	3,246,871	15
Do	09		1,236		158,072	158,072	2
Do	All	2,636	59,005	674,236	7,546,149	8,220,385	57
Alaska	99	15,240	14,304	10,386,230	2,805,128	13,191,358	23
Do	All	15,240	14,304	10,386,230	2,804,128	13,191,358	23
Arizona	01	808	4,463	253,217	644,748	897,965	12
Do	02	5,144	15,968	1,465,351	2,563,003	4,028,355	47
Do	03	10,354	3,566	2,769,995	510,154	3,280,149	52
Do	78	1,495	3,280	386,443	497,190	883,632	18
Do	All	17,801	27,277	4,875,006	4,215,095	9,090,102	129
Arkansas	01	1,029	689	263,198	88,116	351,314	2
Do	02	1,804	7,579	461,427	969,278	1,430,705	13
Do	03	20	2,439	5,116	311,924	317,039	28
Do	04	45	4,049	11,510	517,827	529,337	14
Do	All	2,898	14,756	741,250	1,887,145	2,628,395	57
California	01	2,644	10,385	832,685	1,701,343	2,534,028	31
Do	02	1,145	5,538	398,880	943,519	1,342,399	63
Do	03	2,716	31,471	824,451	5,138,340	5,962,790	15
Do	04	7,735	18,794	2,449,964	3,007,474	5,457,438	21
Do	07		1,857		292,505	292,505	3
Do	08	1,494	4,058	471,242	578,963	1,050,205	4
Do	09	32	7,090	10,112	1,164,858	1,174,970	12
Do	10	152	8,759	45,115	1,430,040	1,475,155	16
Do	11	4	4,437	1,470	698,488	699,957	12
Do	12	5,454	9,406	1,723,471	1,513,311	3,236,782	18
Do	13	6,528	24,311	2,045,580	3,955,919	6,001,499	34
Do	14	229	10,885	72,142	1,749,706	1,821,848	14
Do	15	87	7,988	27,408	1,300,464	1,327,871	18
Do	16	1,144	4,707	350,812	757,200	1,108,012	16
Do	17		370		51,393	51,393	1
Do	18	8,516	3,767	2,721,284	605,988	3,327,271	20
Do	19		1,773		279,274	279,274	2
Do	20		467		73,560	73,560	1
Do	23		3,836		611,941	611,941	5
Do	24		2,653		417,887	417,887	3
Do	25	6	1,613	2,595	289,685	292,280	5
Do	27	66	8,025	22,002	1,359,061	1,381,063	11
Do	28	8	2,238	2,520	361,100	363,621	6
Do	31	2	396	556	80,573	81,128	2
Do	32	1,616	7,342	509,088	1,156,475	1,665,564	1
Do	33	3,976	21,007	1,236,558	3,363,425	4,599,982	28
Do	34		9,559		1,482,427	1,482,427	13
Do	35	4,706	20,846	1,425,672	3,621,179	5,046,852	40
Do	36	686	4,778	215,813	718,868	934,681	5
Do	37	41	18,898	13,069	2,971,763	2,985,832	7
Do	38	1,829	8,862	574,111	1,412,858	1,986,969	19
Do	60	7	48	3,142	10,773	13,915	1
Do	62	1,175	22,598	37,060	3,559,524	3,929,684	1
Do	64		2,466		388,432	388,432	2
Do	81	2,034	6,950	640,771	1,094,729	1,735,500	1
Do	83		94		13,057	13,057	1
Do	84	5,578	26,430	1,760,073	4,163,121	5,923,194	1
Do	85		2,354		370,790	370,790	1
Do	87	19	601	5,986	94,667	100,652	1
Do	90		301		41,809	41,809	1
Do	92		314		43,615	43,615	1
Do	94		2,000		315,030	315,030	1
Do	95	3	7,975	945	1,256,182	1,257,127	1
Do	96	162	7,999	51,035	1,259,962	1,310,997	2
Do	All	59,803	346,246	18,809,711	55,801,277	74,610,988	461
Colorado	02	317	19,326	116,287	3,847,371	3,963,658	14
Do	03	4,669	29,308	1,902,913	5,662,301	6,565,214	28
Do	04	931	5,854	366,115	1,070,934	1,437,049	31
Do	All	5,917	54,488	2,385,314	10,580,607	12,965,921	73
Connecticut	01		368		78,890	78,890	2
Do	02	2,515	5,354	1,116,319	1,007,239	2,123,558	23
Do	03	41	2,444	14,476	482,188	496,663	4
Do	04		989		169,361	169,361	1
Do	05		1,078		199,967	199,967	4
Do	06		1,348		284,998	284,998	6
Do	All	2,556	11,581	1,130,794	2,222,643	3,353,437	40
Delaware	99	25	4,406	7,874	693,857	701,731	11
Do	All	25	4,406	7,874	693,857	701,731	11
District of Columbia	99	973	37,321	299,217	5,738,477	6,037,694	1
Do	All	973	37,321	299,217	5,738,477	6,037,694	1
Florida	01	3,764	25,797	962,856	3,299,178	4,261,934	6
Do	02	256	4,054	65,480	518,466	583,946	5
Do	02	1,227	12,471	313,842	1,594,916	1,908,758	1
Do	04	10	4,618	2,558	598,653	601,211	3
Do	05	3,055	32,912	781,408	4,209,116	4,990,524	2
Do	06	982	5,084	251,176	650,193	901,369	1
Do	08	5	3,876	1,279	495,702	496,981	1
Do	09	96	81	24,555	10,359	34,914	2
Do	10		501		64,073	64,073	1
Do	12	1,944	1,939	497,236	247,979	745,215	1
Do	82	1,664	6,521	425,618	833,971	1,259,589	1
Do	All	13,003	97,917	3,325,907	12,522,605	15,848,512	24

CHILDREN AND PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874—Continued

State	District	A children	B children	A amount	B amount	A plus B amount	District schools
Georgia	01	659	5,140	\$168,559	\$657,355	\$825,914	8
Do	02	1,000	3,773	255,780	482,529	738,309	6
Do	03	622	24,521	159,095	3,135,991	3,295,086	13
Do	04		3,995		510,921	510,921	2
Do	06	178	9,190	45,529	1,175,309	1,220,838	6
Do	07	33	15,778	8,441	2,017,848	2,026,289	11
Do	08	575	4,257	147,074	544,428	691,501	10
Do	09		1,211		154,875	154,875	4
Do	10	468	12,068	119,705	1,543,377	1,663,082	6
Do	75	117	9,057	29,926	1,158,300	1,188,226	2
Do	All	3,652	88,990	934,109	11,380,931	12,315,040	68
Hawaii	99	15,964	34,788	4,296,232	4,681,073	8,977,305	1
Do	All	15,964	34,788	4,296,232	4,681,073	8,977,305	1
Idaho	01	384	5,272	149,342	808,391	957,733	35
Do	02	2,026	8,335	640,857	1,119,846	1,760,703	23
Do	All	2,410	13,607	790,199	1,928,237	2,718,436	58
Illinois	04		448		95,627	95,627	4
Do	06	5	258	2,038	52,589	54,628	1
Do	10	4	280	3,017	105,591	108,608	1
Do	12	2,931	5,200	1,424,337	1,217,513	2,641,850	30
Do	13	339	13,904	171,280	2,925,714	3,096,993	3
Do	14	73	5,590	27,503	1,207,643	1,235,146	31
Do	15		568		89,183	89,183	8
Do	16	34	683	11,894	107,826	119,721	5
Do	17	9	2,401	2,546	445,073	447,620	19
Do	18	20	3	5,659	424	6,083	1
Do	19	11	2,968	3,779	527,299	531,078	13
Do	20		158		33,783	33,783	3
Do	21	50	1,293	14,147	184,188	198,334	11
Do	22	2,418	3,329	1,002,278	706,337	1,708,616	9
Do	23		823		133,700	133,700	9
Do	24	1,837	7,481	632,036	1,251,141	1,883,176	31
Do	58		206		29,142	29,142	3
Do	All	7,731	45,593	3,300,514	9,112,774	12,413,288	182
Indiana	2		162		24,439	24,439	1
Do	5	1,494	1,953	563,626	309,658	873,283	6
Do	06	9	1,700	2,309	218,042	220,351	16
Do	07	5	2,202	1,283	291,704	292,987	18
Do	08	157	2,754	40,274	353,228	393,502	13
Do	09	87	7,741	24,339	1,029,123	1,053,463	44
Do	10		301		39,631	39,631	3
Do	11	342	6,531	105,525	1,252,243	1,357,768	5
Do	All	2,094	23,344	737,355	3,518,067	4,255,422	106
Iowa	01	80	4,637	32,682	947,177	979,859	16
Do	02	4	97	1,634	19,814	21,448	2
Do	03	36	54	14,707	11,030	25,737	1
Do	04	62	3,058	25,329	624,642	649,971	9
Do	05		1,612		315,680	315,680	10
Do	06	396	938	161,778	191,601	353,378	3
Do	07		909		185,677	185,677	2
Do	All	578	11,305	236,130	2,295,621	2,531,752	43
Kansas	01	24	272	7,208	40,845	48,053	7
Do	02	5,705	8,774	1,732,354	1,326,576	3,058,930	29
Do	03	140	6,814	42,046	1,023,224	1,065,271	23
Do	04	800	14,575	240,264	2,188,655	2,428,919	14
Do	05	1,483	4,930	445,389	140,314	1,185,103	41
Do	All	8,152	35,365	2,467,261	5,319,614	7,786,875	114
Kentucky	01	126	4,855	32,228	820,906	653,134	17
Do	02	24	5,876	6,139	751,482	757,620	12
Do	03	13	11,516	3,325	1,472,781	1,476,106	3
Do	04		87		11,126	11,126	2
Do	05	1	826	256	105,637	105,893	6
Do	06	42	4,562	10,743	583,434	594,177	12
Do	07	7	31	1,790	3,965	5,755	1
Do	12		256		32,740	32,740	1
Do	All	213	28,009	54,481	3,582,071	3,636,552	54
Louisiana	01		520		66,503	66,503	1
Do	02		1,765		225,726	225,726	1
Do	04	1,329	6,433	339,932	822,716	1,162,648	2
Do	06	17	2,446	4,348	32,819	317,167	2
Do	08	246	7,156	62,922	915,181	978,103	4
Do	791	123	3,718	31,461	475,495	506,956	1
Do	All	1,715	22,038	438,663	2,818,440	3,257,103	11
Maine	01	1,061	5,468	367,113	885,183	1,252,296	36
Do	02	3,537	2,927	1,295,046	440,073	1,735,119	38
Do	All	4,598	8,395	1,662,159	1,325,256	2,987,415	74
Maryland	01	1,334	5,994	400,895	1,010,938	1,461,833	4
Do	02	1,531	7,269	539,586	1,280,943	1,820,529	2
Do	05	1,418	49,850	499,760	8,784,567	9,284,327	2
Do	06	619	6,152	202,213	998,669	1,200,882	4
Do	08	169	32,368	59,562	5,703,889	5,763,451	1
Do	76		1,905		335,699	335,699	1
Do	77	111	12,814	38,851	2,119,604	2,158,455	2
Do	78	2,769	11,223	753,279	1,526,552	2,279,831	1
Do	All	7,951	127,575	2,544,146	21,760,861	24,305,007	16
Massachusetts	01	15	3,916	6,914	943,733	950,647	24
Do	02	2,239	4,139	1,056,379	993,977	2,050,356	9
Do	03	2,007	3,456	1,137,180	850,427	1,987,607	33
Do	04	15	2,992	9,888	780,145	790,033	14
Do	05	216	6,894	149,496	1,778,118	1,927,614	21
Do	06	36	2,989	18,355	711,927	730,282	22
Do	07	17	3,793	8,219	994,250	1,002,469	11
Do	08	58	942	38,741	254,025	292,765	3
Do	10	63	1,828	26,479	473,661	505,140	10
Do	11	227	3,645	114,821	815,910	930,731	11
Do	12	2,121	5,687	1,209,820	1,428,076	2,637,895	40
Do	61	13	3,069	6,778	800,012	806,789	1
Do	74		16		6,400	6,400	1
Do	75	2	80	1,598	31,970	33,568	1
Do	All	7,029	43,446	3,784,668	10,867,629	14,652,297	201

CHILDREN AND PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874—Continued

State	District	A children	B children	A amount	B amount	A plus B amount	District schools
Michigan	02	27	488	\$7,249	\$65,512	\$72,761	2
Do	03	382	3,090	102,563	414,817	517,380	7
Do	08	12	251	3,222	33,696	36,917	4
Do	09	17	345	4,564	46,315	50,879	3
Do	10	1,794	1,019	481,671	136,796	618,467	3
Do	11	4,037	2,905	1,083,894	389,982	1,473,876	24
Do	12	1,475	3,340	396,023	448,378	844,401	11
Do	15		380		51,013	51,013	2
Do	16	33	44	8,860	5,907	14,767	1
Do	52		4,832		648,672	648,672	1
Do	All	7,777	16,694	2,088,047	2,241,086	4,329,133	58
Minnesota	01	616	616		87,835	87,835	4
Do	02	24	15	6,844	2,139	8,983	1
Do	03	121	4,073	34,507	580,769	615,276	9
Do	04		4,460		635,951	635,951	5
Do	05		2,520		359,327	359,327	1
Do	06	98	30	27,948	4,278	32,225	2
Do	07	1,072	963	305,713	137,314	443,027	18
Do	08	950	2,391	270,921	340,933	611,854	15
Do	All	2,265	15,068	645,933	2,148,546	2,794,479	55
Mississippi	01	910	976	232,760	124,821	357,580	2
Do	03	8	757	2,046	96,813	98,859	1
Do	04	269	623	68,805	79,675	148,480	2
Do	05	1,993	11,282	509,770	1,442,855	1,952,625	13
Do	All	3,180	13,638	813,380	1,744,164	2,557,544	18
Missouri	01		937		140,414	140,414	3
Do	02	30	5,314	8,659	797,293	805,952	10
Do	03	89	418	26,751	62,819	89,570	1
Do	04	2,440	17,917	733,391	2,840,484	3,573,875	40
Do	05		656		98,587	98,587	1
Do	06	2	2,525	601	378,731	379,332	14
Do	07	11	1,692	2,814	216,390	219,203	17
Do	08	2,891	4,657	868,366	625,414	1,493,779	29
Do	09	23	1,376	5,883	199,559	205,442	11
Do	10	11	35	2,814	4,476	7,290	1
Do	11		101		12,917	12,917	1
Do	78	15	4,509	4,509	846,921	851,430	2
Do	All	5,512	40,308	1,653,786	6,224,005	7,877,791	130
Montana	01	1,695	4,577	874,010	791,861	1,665,872	64
Do	02	6,079	5,353	2,100,117	797,953	2,898,070	46
Do	All	7,774	9,930	2,974,128	1,589,814	4,563,942	110
Nebraska	01	408	1,336	162,543	266,125	428,668	8
Do	02	3,523	7,420	1,403,528	1,478,027	2,881,555	8
Do	03	354	3,147	136,467	626,867	763,333	34
Do	All	4,285	11,903	1,702,538	2,371,018	4,073,556	50
Nevada	99	3,841	17,336	1,055,276	2,381,446	3,436,723	13
Do	All	3,841	17,336	1,055,276	2,381,446	3,436,723	13
New Hampshire	01	1,560	5,783	678,110	1,211,364	1,889,475	35
Do	02	5	685	2,225	161,461	163,685	7
Do	03		68		10,180	10,180	1
Do	13		49		9,786	9,786	1
Do	All	1,565	6,585	680,335	1,392,790	2,073,125	44
New Jersey	01	35	5,700	14,025	1,375,228	1,389,253	44
Do	02	30	2,185	12,055	504,330	516,384	20
Do	03	1,676	11,050	740,228	2,686,546	3,426,774	49
Do	04	1,970	2,721	633,966	636,310	1,270,276	19
Do	05	124	3,100	55,063	752,677	807,740	18
Do	06	3,214	9,282	1,651,918	2,268,089	3,920,006	37
Do	13	125	305	62,073	75,728	137,801	1
Do	51		759		188,452	188,452	1
Do	All	7,174	35,102	3,169,327	8,487,360	11,656,686	189
New Mexico	01	5,502	24,024	1,407,302	3,072,429	4,479,731	12
Do	02	3,719	10,529	951,246	1,346,554	2,297,800	13
Do	99	9,103	6,620	2,328,365	846,632	3,174,997	14
Do	All	18,324	41,173	4,686,913	5,265,615	9,952,528	39
New York	01	542	9,491	370,783	2,161,843	2,532,626	44
Do	02		1,838		428,365	428,365	9
Do	03		603		144,031	144,031	2
Do	04	791	381	374,002	89,951	463,953	2
Do	05		245		57,851	57,851	1
Do	25	8	143	5,617	50,484	56,100	2
Do	27	1,059	3,273	441,285	681,930	1,123,215	6
Do	28	3	301	1,250	62,713	63,963	3
Do	29	101	4,815	42,289	1,077,560	1,119,849	20
Do	30	1,717	2,081	715,474	433,576	1,149,050	19
Do	31	163	1,072	67,922	223,351	291,273	7
Do	32	1,213	5,406	505,457	1,126,340	1,631,797	16
Do	33		1,710		356,279	356,279	6
Do	34	136	735	56,671	153,137	209,808	2
Do	35	155	1,467	64,589	305,649	370,238	10
Do	38		497		103,550	103,550	5
Do	40	498	399	207,517	83,132	290,648	3
Do	54		1,363		283,981	283,981	1
Do	69	1,250	16,800	726,538	4,882,332	5,608,870	2
Do	79		528		150,690	150,690	2
Do	All	7,639	53,148	3,579,393	12,856,745	16,436,138	161
North Carolina	01	1,858	5,326	475,239	681,142	1,156,381	10
Do	03	1,743	12,708	445,825	1,625,226	2,071,051	8
Do	04	5	350	1,279	44,762	46,040	1
Do	07	494	18,862	126,355	2,412,261	2,538,617	7
Do	09	2	771	512	98,603	99,115	4
Do	11	294	982	75,199	125,588	200,787	4
Do	All	4,396	38,999	1,124,409	4,987,582	6,111,991	32
North Dakota	01	3,221	1,605	969,682	187,163	1,237,478	20
Do	02	3,415	1,237	1,050,315	428,394	2,448,390	24
Do	All	6,636	2,842	2,019,997	615,557	2,635,554	44
Ohio	01		63		12,163	12,163	1
Do	02		949		147,112	147,112	5
Do	03	1,830	10,973	468,077	1,829,256	2,297,333	12
Do	04		310		43,203	43,203	2
Do	05		217		37,594	37,594	2
Do	06	40	3,286	10,231	495,328	505,559	23
Do	07	162	12,988	41,346	1,809,638	1,851,074	20
Do	08		235		30,054	30,054	2
Do	09		490		94,602	94,602	1
Do	10	3	1,282	767	183,573	184,340	11

CHILDREN AND PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874—Continued

State	District	A children	B children	A amount	B amount	A plus B amount	District schools
Ohio—Continued	11						2
Do	12	10	2,908	\$2,558	\$371,904	\$374,462	5
Do	13		1,060		176,558	176,558	9
Do	14	24	799	6,139	134,576	140,715	4
Do	15		672		119,312	119,312	3
Do	17		3,084		441,813	441,813	11
Do	23		3,767		727,276	727,276	10
Do	24		2,685		454,508	454,508	6
Do	59		1,655		319,523	319,523	7
Do	68	1,368	11,219	355,512	2,092,023	2,447,535	7
Do	79		499		96,339	96,339	2
Oklahoma	All	3,437	59,141	884,721	9,616,354	10,501,075	139
Do	01	500	7,426	163,494	1,230,050	1,393,543	32
Do	02	1,810	4,419	468,678	575,812	1,044,490	88
Do	03	209	3,829	54,985	493,891	548,876	56
Do	04	710	4,638	195,361	607,937	803,299	73
Do	05	208	18,259	65,185	2,643,224	2,708,410	32
Do	06	6,180	14,820	1,645,180	1,961,670	3,606,850	69
Do	75	408	8,867	138,418	1,504,109	1,642,527	1
Do	All	10,025	62,256	2,731,302	9,016,693	11,747,995	351
Oregon	01	401	566	156,492	114,334	270,826	7
Do	02	634	4,016	816,998	816,998	1,080,860	40
Do	03	40	2,796	27,332	545,877	573,209	4
Do	04	185	2,505	80,215	520,860	601,076	17
Do	All	1,260	9,883	527,901	1,998,069	2,525,970	68
Pennsylvania	06		340		45,693	45,693	2
Do	07		1,866		394,277	394,277	11
Do	08	13	2,554	3,673	441,134	444,807	6
Do	09		967		168,504	168,504	3
Do	10		1,893		254,400	254,400	8
Do	11		1,230		173,274	173,274	6
Do	12		5,330		716,299	716,299	12
Do	13		947		239,432	239,432	4
Do	15	131	332	58,346	73,935	132,281	1
Do	16	63	2,557	16,933	365,500	382,433	12
Do	17		1,856		267,810	267,810	4
Do	18	53	98	21,289	19,774	41,163	1
Do	19	124	5,283	33,246	739,706	773,132	16
Do	23						1
Do	26		110		17,365	17,365	1
Do	27		745		123,960	123,960	4
Do	57		2,720		491,811	491,811	4
Do	63		348		63,045	63,045	1
Do	66	566	15,681	205,611	2,848,218	3,053,829	1
Do	67	80	648	24,112	94,473	118,585	4
Do	All	1,030	45,505	363,490	7,538,610	7,902,101	102
Rhode Island	01	1,823	4,982	723,673	1,053,742	1,777,416	8
Do	02	1,212	5,193	495,104	1,044,242	1,539,346	15
Do	79	1	875	448	195,934	196,382	1
Do	All	3,036	11,050	1,219,225	2,293,919	3,513,144	24
South Carolina	01	3,984	24,218	1,019,028	3,097,240	4,116,268	16
Do	02	233	15,019	59,597	1,920,780	1,980,377	13
Do	03	39	379	9,975	48,470	58,446	3
Do	04		638		81,594	81,594	1
Do	05	998	1,605	255,268	205,263	460,532	1
Do	06	123	790	31,461	101,033	132,494	1
Do	All	5,377	42,649	1,375,329	5,454,381	6,829,710	35
South Dakota	01	480	1,688	165,965	291,821	457,786	21
Do	02	5,556	4,960	1,921,043	809,952	2,730,995	47
Do	All	6,036	6,378	2,087,007	1,101,774	3,188,781	68
Tennessee	01	36	4,359	9,208	557,473	566,681	8
Do	02	25	8,814	6,395	1,127,222	1,133,617	9
Do	03		3,532	1,279	451,707	452,986	10
Do	04	896	8,767	229,179	1,121,212	1,350,391	16
Do	05		2,522		322,539	322,539	1
Do	06		5,420		693,164	693,164	7
Do	07		1,464		187,231	187,231	9
Do	08	36	2,105	9,208	269,208	278,417	6
Do	09	1,029	3,513	263,198	449,278	712,475	1
Do	96		6,000		767,340	767,340	1
Do	All	2,027	46,496	518,466	5,946,373	6,464,840	68
Texas	01	84	10,613	21,486	1,357,297	1,378,782	36
Do	02		261		33,379	33,379	4
Do	03	5	2,107	1,279	289,464	270,743	2
Do	04	332	3,069	84,919	392,494	477,413	14
Do	05	11	1,732	2,814	221,505	224,319	6
Do	06		1,116		142,850	142,850	13
Do	07						2
Do	08	20	2,916	5,116	372,927	378,043	3
Do	09	4	4,709	1,023	602,234	603,257	7
Do	10	877	4,721	224,319	603,769	828,088	10
Do	11	3,610	13,446	923,366	1,719,609	2,642,975	37
Do	12	986	24,629	252,199	3,149,803	3,402,002	16
Do	13	1,417	7,423	262,440	949,327	1,311,768	20
Do	14	325	6,233	83,129	797,138	880,267	5
Do	15	251	1,497	64,201	191,451	255,652	5
Do	16	3,339	20,440	861,348	2,604,980	3,466,328	12
Do	17	1,945	7,916	497,492	1,012,377	1,509,869	24
Do	18	682	2,905	174,710	371,520	546,230	8
Do	19	403	1,730	103,079	21,250	324,329	4
Do	20	838	45,142	214,344	5,773,210	5,987,554	11
Do	21	691	4,756	176,744	608,245	784,989	13
Do	22		659		84,280	84,280	2
Do	23	296	7,158	75,711	915,437	991,148	18
Do	53	16	3,300	4,092	422,037	426,129	1
Do	56	2	2,754	512	352,209	352,721	1
Do	86	3,621	988	1,712,733	146,448	1,859,181	4
Do	All	19,755	182,220	5,847,054	23,315,242	29,162,296	278
Utah	01	2,329	33,617	595,712	4,299,278	4,894,990	18
Do	02	788	13,114	201,555	1,677,149	1,878,704	10
Do	All	3,117	46,731	797,266	5,976,428	6,773,694	28
Vermont	99	11	626	3,219	98,558	101,778	14
Do	All	11	626	3,219	98,558	101,778	14

CHILDREN AND PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874—Continued

State	District	A children	B children	A amount	B amount	A plus B amount	District schools
Virginia	01	4,791	38,849	\$1,332,491	\$5,126,733	\$6,459,225	10
Do	02	3,269	24,985	1,017,709	3,714,117	4,731,826	3
Do	03		4,499		662,101	662,101	3
Do	04	1,478	13,776	378,043	1,761,813	2,139,855	9
Do	05	4	445	1,023	56,911	57,934	1
Do	06	31	3,838	7,929	527,049	534,978	6
Do	07		133		17,009	17,009	1
Do	08	207	14,590	55,183	2,215,710	2,270,893	12
Do	09		3,021		386,356	386,356	7
Do	10	739	64,964	291,271	13,006,663	13,297,934	5
Do	All	10,519	169,100	3,083,650	27,474,462	30,558,111	57
Washington	01	190	6,132	53,916	870,039	923,955	6
Do	02	2,162	7,768	614,319	1,103,174	1,717,493	30
Do	03	367	4,538	119,988	648,311	768,299	32
Do	04	1,634	10,466	464,287	1,502,354	1,966,641	46
Do	05	2,575	4,305	734,043	612,331	1,346,375	32
Do	06	5,654	26,944	1,604,436	3,822,950	5,427,385	18
Do	07	174	3,877	49,376	550,088	599,464	11
Do	All	12,756	64,030	3,640,365	9,109,246	12,749,612	175
West Virginia	02	50	1,770	12,789	226,365	239,154	6
Do	03		590		75,455	75,455	1
Do	04	1	714	256	91,313	91,569	1
Do	All	51	3,074	13,045	393,134	406,179	8
Wisconsin	02	555	2,187	160,020	402,414	562,435	8
Do	03	80	4,014	29,943	740,205	770,148	21
Do	07	124	188	46,412	35,183	81,595	5
Do	08	29	522	10,854	97,790	108,644	3
Do	10	373	2,521	144,303	101,395	245,698	9
Do	55	41	2,374	15,346	444,282	459,628	1
Do	All	1,202	9,806	406,879	1,821,169	2,228,048	47
Wyoming	99	2,113	4,142	1,016,467	641,865	1,658,333	24
Do	All	2,113	4,142	1,016,467	641,865	1,658,333	24
Guam	99	3,647	5,977	932,830	764,399	1,697,228	1
Do	All	3,647	5,977	932,830	764,399	1,697,228	1
Virgin Islands	99		330		42,204	42,204	1
Do	All		330		42,204	42,204	1
Total		348,703	2,221,876	115,523,133	347,325,001	462,848,135	4,235

CONTROL SHEET

PART I—TYPE OF PAYMENT CODE

Item 66

- 99—Ineligibles.
- 98—Consolidation.
- 97—Non-applicant.

PART II—CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT CODING

Item 8

- 99—At large (whole State).
- 98—At large (other congressional district).
- 97—4 & 6.
- 96—7 & 8.
- 95—8 & 9.
- 94—28 & 17.
- 93—19 & 23.
- 92—17 & 31.
- 91—27, & 20, & 28.
- 90—17, 21, 23 & 32.
- 89—19 & 25.
- 88—25 & 24.
- 87—19 & 20.
- 86—20, 21 & 23.
- 85—34 & 35.
- 84—36 & 37.
- 83—9 & 10.
- 82—11 & 12.
- 81—5 & 6.
- 80—3 & 4.
- 79—1 & 2.
- 78—1 & 3.
- 77—3, 4, & 7.
- 76—6 & 8.
- 75—4 & 5.
- 74—3 & 10.
- 73—10 & 12.
- 72—2 & 19.
- 71—15 & 16.
- 70—39 & 41.
- 69—6 & 24.
- 68—12 & 15.
- 67—16 & 17.
- 66—1-5.
- 65—8 & 22.
- 64—7-9.
- 63—8 & 13.
- 62—17, 19-22, 24, 26-32.
- 61—8, 9 & 11.
- 60—35-37.
- 59—20-22.
- 58—14 & 17.
- 57—14, 20 & 27.
- 56—7, 8 & 22.

- 55—4, 5, & 9.
- 54—39 & 41.
- 53—3, 5, 6, & 13.
- 52—1, 12-14, 16 & 17.
- 51—10 & 11.
- 50—1-3, 5-11.
- 49—2 & 4.
- 48—1 & 6.

TRAVELS FOR TRADE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Maurice Stans of the Department of Commerce, has been engaged in what he calls "Travels for Trade" in both Europe and the Far East. He reported on these travels and their significance in implementing the trade policies of the Nixon administration when he addressed the Upper Midwest Conference on U.S. International Trade Policies in Minneapolis, Minn., on May 21, 1969. As chairman of the Task Force on International Trade for the House Republican Conference, I found these remarks most enlightening and I am honored to bring them to the attention of my colleagues. Secretary Stans' "Travels for Trade" address follows:

TRAVELS FOR TRADE

(An address by the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Before the Upper Midwest Conference, U.S. International Trade Policies, Minneapolis, Minn., May 21, 1969)

May I say first what a very great pleasure it is to be back home in Minnesota.

The chance to visit with you here is always welcome, but coming home this week has particular meaning to me in view of the fact that just two days ago I completed Travels for Trade which took me more than half way around the world.

TRIPS ABROAD

In two separate trips between April 11 and May 18 our mission flew more than 30,000 miles to eleven countries and twelve cities in Europe and the Far East. We spent 17 working days abroad, and a count of my schedule shows one hundred and ten public and private meetings in that time.

Throughout these very extensive travels, we discussed the Nixon Administration's policies toward trade and international commerce with government leaders, American and local businessmen and the press. We told them of some specific problems we face, and invited them to join with us in a search for solutions.

But above all, the main purpose of my trips to Europe and Asia was to express President Nixon's great friendship and deep interest toward every country I visited. We carried to each government and to each people the message that our Nation, under President Nixon, is firmly committed to follow the road of international cooperation in commerce and investment.

We extended a hand of friendship across the borders of the world.

I can report to you here tonight that our hand was accepted. It was welcomed. I believe that we are on the threshold of a new day of trading partnerships with Europe and with the countries of the Far East.

REPORT TO THE NATION

Tonight I will discuss my missions abroad with you, and I will offer an assessment of what the future may hold in our efforts to improve and strengthen our economic relations with other countries.

I am especially pleased to make this report to the Nation here in my home state during World Trade Week. I am very grateful to the Minnesota World Trade Association and the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce for giving me this opportunity, and particularly so since this is my first appearance in Minnesota as Secretary of Commerce.

I might add as an interesting coincidence that the Minnesota World Trade Association got started (as the Export Club) just about the same time that I was first introduced to international commerce. Right after I graduated from Shakopee High School in 1925,

I went to work in Chicago as a stenographer for a company that imported sausage casings from Turkey.

Today the community of major trading nations has become very interrelated—or perhaps in view of all the discussions about textiles on my recent trip I should say interwoven. No longer does a nation have any significant trade problem unto itself. What affects one affects another, and most often the problems of one are the problems of many.

This is one of the reasons why, in every country I visited, there was such great interest in learning about the Nixon Administration, its views and its policies.

TOWARD PROGRESS

I have reported to our friends abroad that after four months in office, the pattern has been set for four years of progress.

The President has taken steps toward Peace, offering a realistic proposal for a settlement in Vietnam which we hope will break the logjam in Paris.

The President has revived our friendships in Europe, he has exercised "preventive diplomacy" in the Middle East crisis, and he has opened new channels of communication with the Soviet Union.

He has made progress toward National Security, with a courageous proposal for a modified anti-ballistic missile system. All of the facts were available to him in this matter, and he made the considered judgment that it is needed for America.

Throughout the Administration there has been progress toward Responsible Government. The National Security Council has been revitalized. We have a new Urban Affairs Council, and a new Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy. Steps have been launched to take the Post Office Department out of politics.

INFLATION

As for the fight against inflation, I have told our friends abroad that President Nixon regards this as the most urgent domestic matter in America today.

We are now paying the price for inflationary pressures which have been building up for four years—but he has put into effect the right mixture of fiscal and monetary policies to bring the matter under control.

He has reworked the federal budget into a surplus of nearly six billion dollars.

He has asked for a limited extension of the surcharge on income taxes.

He has recommended repeal of the 7 percent investment credit.

He has offered extensive tax reform proposals to reduce inequities which contribute to social unrest.

At the same time, the Federal Reserve System is holding down the growth of the money supply.

Already there are signs that these and other steps being taken have begun to reverse the inflationary psychology in our country.

Let me assure you that our friends abroad listened to this report with the greatest of interest. The trading world depends on the strength of the American dollar—and those with whom we deal understand, as we do, the grave threat posed by inflation in the United States.

Gradually it has begun to price us out of their markets. It has helped reduce our balance of trade from five billion dollars three years ago to less than one billion last year—and this year we face the threat of a trade deficit. In 1968, mostly because of inflation, our imports went up 23 percent while our exports grew only 9 percent.

We need a large favorable balance of trade to help offset other needs in our balance of payments. Our travel deficit is two billion dollars a year. Our overseas investment requirements run to another two billion or more. We need a healthy balance of trade, in addition, to help finance our military activities and our aid programs overseas.

And so it is obvious that we must curb inflation.

We will do so.

GROWING PROTECTIONISM

But at the same time other factors also are seriously affecting our balance of trade and our position as a major trading force in the world. These matters developed rapidly in recent years, and I went abroad early in the history of this new Administration because President Nixon wanted to repair those relationships which had been damaged and begin to resolve the frictions which existed before they became unmanageable.

There are several such problems.

Protectionist trends are growing in every major area of the world, including Europe, Asia and the United States.

In Europe, American businessmen are confronted with increasingly complex and costly non-tariff barriers.

Border taxes and export subsidies are one example.

In many countries it is difficult if not impossible for Americans to sell to the government or to its controlled business entities.

Artificial technical restrictions are placed on American products in the name of safety or other standards.

Some of our agricultural products face the threat of taxes which would cause extensive damage to American producers.

We are seriously concerned about protectionist aspects of the common agricultural policy in Europe.

In Japan there are rigid restrictions on American investments which effectively block United States companies from any meaningful participation in the second largest economy in the free world.

These and many other barriers to freer trade have contributed greatly to the growth of protectionist efforts in the United States. Some three hundred bills to limit or control trade in one way or another have been introduced in the Congress this year alone.

FREER TRADE

But President Nixon does not believe that protectionism is the answer to America's needs or the solution to the trading problems of the world.

The commitment of this Administration is to build a two-way street instead of a one-way wall on the path of global commerce.

In every country I visited, I expressed the United States dedication to freer trade in the strongest possible terms.

Our record in this direction over the past 35 years has no equal among the major nations of the world. Since 1934 our tariffs have dropped from an average of 47 percent to 11 percent today—and the level will drop even lower when the Kennedy Round reductions take full effect in 1972.

But tariffs are no longer our main problem. We must deal now with the wide variety of non-tariff barriers that increasingly impede the pipelines of international commerce.

To this end I have proposed an "Open Table" principle for all countries under which all non-tariff barriers will be brought fully into the open, be measured, probed and diagnosed, and finally dealt with in the same reciprocal manner as was done so effectively with tariffs in the Kennedy Round.

I can report to you tonight that this proposal was enthusiastically received in almost all of my discussions in Europe and Asia. Across two continents hope was expressed to me that the United States would continue its initiative along this line.

FOUR FREEDOMS

But the American pursuit of freer trade is only one cornerstone of the principles and policies I have expressed abroad. There are, in fact, four economic freedoms which I believe describe the tone of the Nixon Administration's commitment to a more open world, freedoms which can serve as highways across the borders to a better life for all. These are:

Freedom to Travel.

Freedom to Trade.

Freedom to Invest, and Freedom to Exchange Technology.

These freedoms already have proved their great value, to the extent that they have been used. They have the power in the years ahead to build a society of human comfort and security for all.

Again, in each country, our own American commitment to the four economic freedoms has been welcomed almost without reservation. Only in Japan, where resistance runs high to free and open investment and to free markets, did I sense reservation.

This is the kind of reality we must face in the pursuit of these freedoms.

To those who resist freedom to invest, I expressed an American challenge to open their borders to foreign investment up to one hundred percent.

To those who have restrictions on travel, I reaffirmed the Administration's pledge not to impose restraints on international travel by the American people.

And in each of our discussions the response was encouraging for a freer exchange of technology among all peoples, limited only by the property rights of owners and investors.

Our commitment to the four economic freedoms does not mean, however, that there could not be exceptional cases in which it becomes necessary for us to act in the best interests of a major American industry suffering from an abuse of the freedom to trade.

TEXTILES A PROBLEM

Today there is such an industry in the case of American textiles. Our industry apparently is expected by low-cost producers in other parts of the world to survive a swiftly rising flood of imports whose share of the American market is growing by the hour. This it cannot do, without growing jeopardy to a tremendous industry of 36,000 plants and 2½ million employees.

As a Nation determined to move toward freer trade, we have asked other countries to join us in an international conference to discuss ways and means of governing the world flow of man-made fibre and wool textiles into the United States.

We do not seek and we do not want to close our borders to imported textiles.

We want every country to have the privilege of sharing in the growth of our market.

We ask only that the rate of growth be slowed by voluntary agreements, so that we will not face sudden disaster for hundreds of American companies and thousands of employees.

This is a reasonable solution to a problem that affects us all.

The Congress is very alert to this particular problem. Restrictive legislation on imports of textiles has been introduced, and whether we like it or not the chances are that such legislation will be adopted if a voluntary agreement is not reached to slow down the growth of imports.

The Nixon Administration is fully aware of the hazards of legislative quotas. They provoke retaliation from other nations. They tend to spread from one item to another. We believe that if we were to get a textile quota law, it could become a "Christmas tree" bill limiting the imports of a broad scope of other products and commodities.

Furthermore, if we do not reach a voluntary agreement among the textile-producing nations of the world, our own chances of moving toward freer trade will be severely limited.

A package of proposed trade legislation soon will be submitted to the Congress. Much of it will be based on recommendations that stem from my mission to Europe and Asia. We hope this package will liberalize our trade policies in many respects.

But realistically we cannot expect passage of trade liberalization bills as long as the textile question threatens a basic American industry.

PROGRAM FOR EXPORTS

The road we seek is the road to a more open international economy. Not only does this road lead to broad benefits for all nations, but very practically it gives American companies wider access to the markets of the world.

In recent weeks we have heard other nations say they must export or die. I believe the United States must export more or decline.

The challenge we face is enormous.

For too many American companies, exporting is not much more than a sideline. Satisfied with a prosperous market at home, they see no reason to tackle markets overseas.

Look at the result.

Imports into the United States have grown much faster than exports for the past three years.

Our trade surplus has virtually vanished and this year we ran the first quarterly trade deficit since 1950.

We urgently need American business to allocate money, staff and determination to develop overseas markets just as they do domestic markets.

Unless our business community orients itself to the export markets of the world, we will find ourselves seriously out of step with the new age of international business.

President Nixon has reactivated the Cabinet Committee on Export Expansion, of which I am Chairman. All of the agencies in the Executive Branch concerned with foreign trade are represented in the Committee.

We have set an export goal of \$50 billion by 1973. This compares with \$34 billion in 1968. The Department of Commerce, for its part, will do everything possible to stimulate and help the marketing campaigns of those who seek a greater share of the markets of the world. There are many things we can do for medium- and small-sized companies. Ask us!

CONCLUSION

President Nixon has called for "an open world . . . open to the exchange of goods and people."

The expansion of American exports is a meaningful response to that call.

So is our commitment not to impose restraints on American travel abroad.

It is in the spirit of that call that we have invited other countries to join us in pursuit of the Four Economic Freedoms, and have offered the "Open Table" principle to eliminate barriers to world trade.

We want to see highways of commerce, not walls of protectionism, between us and our trading partners around the world. This is the message I have conveyed in my travels for trade in Europe and Asia.

If we succeed in tearing down restrictions, and in building up the flow of goods and people among nations, we will have gone far to build a better world in which all people live in comfort, peace and security.

ETHICS GROUP WOULD SERVE AS WATCHDOG FOR ALL MEDIA

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every man in public life, at one time or another, has felt that his comments had either been misquoted or else slanted out of context so as to provide a completely different shade of meaning than what he had actually intended. Sometimes this could be attributed to just plain sloppy reporting but,

more seriously, too often it is the result of deliberate and biased motives. In recent years this tendency to slant the news has grown to alarming proportions, so much so that dedicated and objective newsmen have determined that some effort must be made to restore fairness and objectivity to reporting by all media.

Frank L. Kluckhohn, longtime correspondent for the New York Times, has taken the lead in this effort to set up a "watchdog" organization for all media of news reporting. In announcing this movement, Kluckhohn writes:

News coverage in America has become so one-sided that it is almost impossible to get anything approaching the truth from newspapers, TV, or radio.

He adds:

If our American way of life is to survive, then something must be done—and done soon—to correct this problem of one-sided reporting.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Kluckhohn and those serving with him in this effort. The May 17 issue of Publishers' Auxiliary, a trade paper for newspapermen, features a story by Ed Seneff describing the efforts of this group. I commend this article to my colleagues and insert it at this point in the RECORD:

[From Publishers' Auxiliary, May 17, 1969]
ETHICS GROUP WOULD SERVE AS WATCHDOG FOR ALL MEDIA
(By Ed Seneff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"If our American way of life is to survive, then something must be done—and done soon—to correct this problem of one-sided reporting."

So states Frank L. Kluckhohn, long-time correspondent for the New York Times, in announcing the formation of a Press Ethics Committee "to serve as a 'watchdog' organization for all media of news reporting."

In a letter soliciting support for the Committee, which has its headquarters in the offices of the Committee to End Aid to the Soviet Enemy (CEASE) in the National Press Building here, Kluckhohn writes that "news coverage in America has become so one-sided that it is almost impossible to get anything approaching the truth from newspapers, TV or radio."

"The constant stream of propaganda poured out daily is, to say the least," says Kluckhohn, chairman of the new press watchdog committee, "sickening and disgusting."

"Sadly, there are millions of Americans who still believe what they read or hear on TV or radio and who are being brainwashed without mercy by the subversive and anti-American forces who dominate the media."

He points out that the news media "glorify rioters, demonstrators, hippies and yuppies . . . we see pleas for surrender in Vietnam, while draft card burners are publicized nation-wide . . . we see declarations that the U.S. has no right to defend itself against nuclear bombs. . . . we see heroes made out of Black Power advocates who openly cry for revolutions and incite riots . . . we see yells of 'police brutality'—our policemen as vicious bullies, while lawless mobs receive sympathetic treatment. . . ."

Included in Kluckhohn's letter, which states ". . . and those in authority have demonstrated that they cannot, or will not, take steps to restore objective reporting," is a folder containing objectives of the new committee, a code of ethics and biographical data on founding members.

Objectives include:

To establish an Assn. of Weekly Newspaper Editors who will subscribe to the Code

of Ethics. "Such an association will be able to get our statements and denunciations," so says the folder, "to the public if the electronic or mechanical media refuse to do so. . ."

To condemn, publicly, all instances of slanted reporting which is brought to the Committee's attention. "By the use of press releases and press conferences," says the folder, "those who 'create' news or push sociological theories as news will be exposed."

To present annual awards to those in the profession for outstanding accomplishments or work in the field of journalism.

To keep all supporters of the Press Ethics Committee advised of the work being done, to issue "periodic ratings exposing those in the profession who are constantly misusing their trust," the folder continues, and to advise the public how they can help "by bringing coordinated pressure to bear upon advertisers in newspapers or sponsors of TV and radio programs which are obviously slanted."

"I recognize that our free American society depends upon our citizens getting full and accurate information upon which to make decisions," the Code of Ethics begins. "I therefore regard the providing of such information as my honored responsibility and trust."

The code then asks members of the committee "as far as humanly possible" to:

Provide unbiased news, acknowledging that there are two sides to most issues and problems.

Get all essential facts and not suppress any of them in connection with news published.

Keep my own opinions out of news reports and to confine them to the editorial page or to label them editorial.

Place the news in proper perspective, recognizing that playing news up or down is a most important editorial responsibility.

Apply these principles to the reporting of all forms of news—local, national or international.

"I believe a people must be informed to be free," the Code concludes, "and that no misinformed people are free. Our Republic can be destroyed if our people base their decisions upon one-sided propaganda instead of facts."

Serving with Chairman Kluckhohn, who emphasizes in his biographical material that he was both a Washington and Foreign Correspondent of the New York Times "in the days when the Times had an international reputation as a newspaper of record," on the new committee are:

John Chamberlain, syndicated columnist and former editor of Life magazine and The Freeman.

John M. Fisher, editor and publisher of the Washington Report of the American Security Council.

Horace Greely Jr., a New York physician and grandson of the pioneering newspaper editor. "Although not a member of the profession," his biographical notes read, "Dr. Greely is a student of the subject and is vitally interested in restoring honor to reporting."

Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, retired Navy officer.

Sara McClendon, Washington columnist, the type of reporter, says her biographical sketch, "now rapidly disappearing, who follows any news lead to its end and who refuses to soften a news report for anyone, including Presidents. When she raised her arm in his press conferences President Kennedy cringed and Lyndon Johnson found her outside his managed news capabilities."

Edgar Ansell Mower, winner of a Pulitzer Prize for Overseas Reporting in 1932, now a syndicated columnist and regarded as the "Dean of American writers on foreign affairs," as his biographical item puts it.

Louie B. Nunn, Governor of Kentucky, first Republican to be elected governor of the Blue Grass State since 1943.

Ivan H. (Cy) Peterman, (director of the Insurance Information Office of Pennsylvania whose newspaper career spanned 25 years of general reporting, sports writing and war and foreign correspondence.

Walter Trohan, chief Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune since 1947, whose career began with the Tribune in 1929.

DEATH OF LEE ALLEN

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, people in Cincinnati and baseball fans across the country were saddened to hear of the untimely death of baseball historian Lee Allen who died of a heart attack in Syracuse, N.Y., on May 20. He had lived a full and active life at 54. He had suffered an earlier attack 5 years ago and had slowed down his pace somewhat, but he had such a zest for living and the pursuit of knowledge, little could be done to alter his way of life.

Lee Allen's writing, research, and speaking talents were being utilized in this year's 100th anniversary of professional baseball. He was on the centennial committee for this observance and no one was more ideally prepared for such an assignment. Having lived and worked for many years in Cincinnati, he had a special interest and capability in compiling the history of the Cincinnati Red Stockings, organized as the first professional team to play baseball in 1869. His interesting account was published in the anniversary edition of the Sporting News on April 5, 1969.

He was particularly adept at researching the early history of baseball. Tracing down the records of early players, some of whom played under assumed names, took him into strange places in different parts of the country. Finding out that one of the early major leaguers was named Harry Truman, Mr. Allen communicated this to President Truman in 1951. The Chief Executive gave the baseball historian national attention by mentioning this at a press conference on the opening day of that season.

Lee Allen was born and grew up in the Cincinnati area. He served as public relations director for the Reds and was a feature writer for the Cincinnati Enquirer. He also conducted radio and television programs in Cincinnati and Philadelphia, and wrote a weekly column for the Sporting News. For the past 10 years he was historian for the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y. He authored a dozen books on baseball and was recognized as the leading authority on the history of the game. The Saturday Review said of him:

Lee Allen covers the field like Joe Di Maggio and follows through like Ted Williams.

On May 18, Mr. Allen was in Cincinnati to participate in ceremonies honoring the club's alltime major league team. The next day he drove to Cooperstown, but on the outskirts of Syracuse

he felt heart pains. He was helped to a hospital but died there early Tuesday morning. Funeral services and burial took place in Boca Raton, Fla., where the Allens had a winter home. Survivors include his wife, the former Adele Felix of Cincinnati, and 10-year-old twins, Roxanne and Randall.

Lee Allen will be greatly missed by the baseball community in this anniversary year. Although he never was an active player, he had a driving curiosity about the sport and a phenomenal memory for recording statistics and humorous sidelights which impressed and amused his readers and the audiences he addressed at numerous hot stove sessions. He did a great deal to stimulate interest in baseball and he did it out of a genuine love for the game.

BANK OPERATED MUTUAL FUNDS

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Banking and Currency Committee passed S. 2224, a bill amending the Investment Company Act of 1940. That bill contains some salutary amendments which will update the present truth in mutual funds law, and it contains some features which I think are anti-small business and contrary to the best interests of mutual fund investors, such as the encouragement of shareholder suits against mutual funds. One of its worst features, in my judgment, is its use as a vehicle for permitting some 17,000 commercial banks to enter the mutual fund business by partial repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act without consideration by the House Banking and Currency Committee. I am not against commercial banks engaging in investment banking or the mutual fund business, as long as it does not injure the soundness of our national banking system. Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, fears it might cause another stock market crash. He expressed his views in a letter to the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, of which I am a member, last year on a similar proposal. Contrarily, Chairman William McCh. Martin of the Federal Reserve System Board of Governors advised our subcommittee last year that such a proposal would not "impair the ability of commercial banks to devote themselves singlemindedly to their primary function of serving their depositors, borrowers," and so forth.

I consider repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act a major change in our national banking policy. Such a far-reaching change in our financial institutions deserves the most careful consideration by the banking experts in Congress, and should not be bootlegged, piggybacked, or smuggled into the law as an obscure paragraph in a mutual fund bill. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to authorize commercial banks to engage in the maintenance

and sale of mutual funds, and I request that it be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, where, I hope, it will be the subject of early hearings.

WE CARE

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Robert Sullivan of Altadena, Calif., who is connected with the "Mothers of Servicemen" of South Pasadena, Calif., and who is a constituent of mine, has requested that I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very fine letter which she received from Maj. James N. Rowe. I am pleased to comply with her request and include the letter herewith:

FEBRUARY 9, 1969.

DEAR MRS. SUTHERLAND: My most sincere thanks to you and the Mothers of Servicemen for conveying the message, "We Care." With that unique intuition granted only to a mother, you have come upon the one thing which is most important to our people serving in Viet Nam, and for that matter, our people serving anywhere in the world; knowledge that there are those at home who care.

I am fortunate that in my home there exists such a closeness that even though I was physically separated from my family and friends, I never doubted that there were those who cared. At times, because of the constant deluge of propaganda by the Viet Cong concerning the campus riots, disorders, anti-war demonstrations, dissent within the government, draft card burners, and deserters, I sometimes wondered just how many people really cared and how many people actually supported our efforts in Viet Nam. The Viet Cong make maximum possible use of all U.S. news media reporting anti-war, anti-government, anti-U.S. effort in VN type news. For a POW, it is a lonely world, made more so when one hears of opposition and nonsupport from the very people for whom we were fighting.

No one hates war more than those who are face to face with the killing, the maiming, the destruction. No one has a greater desire for peace than the men who are putting their lives on the line to try to secure peace. I am sorry that there are those in the United States who take advantage of the freedoms and privileges granted under our form of government and seek to destroy that which protects them . . . offering no better alternative in return. I am certain that your efforts to assure those in combat that they are supported by the American people, that their sacrifices are not in vain, provides the moral support and strength essential in gaining victory.

There are those here in America who scoff at Faith in God. This is their privilege. You will find very few, if any, men who have faced death that do not have a deep belief that there is a Supreme Being. Perhaps it is not fully understood, perhaps the ritual of our Churches still seems unclear, but the Communion of one man and his God is stronger than any dogma. Those who have not tried to understand or have denounced Faith as a weakness confine themselves to a very small, mundane existence.

Thank you very much for considering an issue which would mention me. It will be an honor to be included in your publication.

Sincerely,

Maj. JAMES N. ROWE,
U.S. Special Forces.

A NEW DAY IN TRANSPORTATION?

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House and the Members of the other body to seriously consider the remarks of Dr. Paul W. Cherington, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Policy and International Affairs, which he made before the board of directors, Transport Association of America, in Washington, D.C., on May 6, 1969.

I believe Dr. Cherington has presented an excellent analysis of the difficulties which face all of us who are interested in the transportation problems of our Nation today.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS PREPARED BY PAUL W. CHERINGTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The new Administration under Secretary John Volpe has already made certain highly significant organizational alterations in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. First, my own office was a merger of two Assistant Secretaryships—Policy Development and International Affairs. We hope that this combination will enable us to transport our policies as far as our carriers.

A second step was the creation of an Assistant Secretaryship of Environment and Urban Systems. The former Mayor of Seattle, James Braman, has been appointed to this office. Though this office started with only a handful of people, the Mayor will develop a staff organization to handle the critical relationship of transportation to urban areas. This office will also consider the relationship of transportation to other urban programs of the Administration which involve the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education and Welfare, and the Office of Daniel P. Moynihan.

Most of us to date have been involved in firefighting operations, becoming oriented and helping Secretary Volpe to implement some of his initial ideas. We have also just about completed the work on the SST decision, a revised airport/airway program and a much expanded program for urban public transport. But we are beginning to identify some key areas which we believe need more attention, and it is two of these which I would like to discuss this noon—our relations with industry and the role of the Department in transportation planning.

The development of a healthy, responsible relationship with the transportation industry—both management and labor—is of deep concern to both President Nixon and Secretary Volpe and should be a significant part of the work of the Department of Transportation. We found that there was in the Department a good deal of suspicion of the various segments of industry. There was a certain reluctance to enter into a free dialogue with industry on their problems and policy suggestions and some tendency to move into a polarized and doctrinaire position on policy issues from which no retreat was permitted and which tended to foreclose further discussion.

I do not mean to imply that under the new Administration we will spend all of our time in reading, and heeding, industry's letters to Santa Claus. We intend to maintain a measure of skepticism, particularly when we believe that a certain amount of over-reaching is going on. But I think that you will find that we are willing to listen and to enter into a dialogue with you as to data—and I mean

hard facts—you may have and its policy implications.

As President Nixon said in his Inaugural Address, "... We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices. For its part, government will listen. . ."

It is sometimes said that in academic life, you are supposed to be "right" and that in consulting, you are supposed to be "helpful." In Government, the aim is to be both. Our motives in trying to be both are not entirely unselfish. For we believe that if Government serves as a sounding board and independent examiner for the various interest groups in industry, the chances will be greatly increased that those same interest groups will step up their own dialogue and reach reasonable compromise positions. That, I suppose, is the theory and, in fact, the practice of the TAA. It has worked in the past; it has recently worked in connection with the airport/airway bill; we hope that it will work effectively in other instances.

After all, DOT must see that our actions and policies have an orderly impact on the entire transportation economy of the nation. Indeed, I believe that the time has come for us to more closely heed the requirement placed upon the Department under our enabling act, "to facilitate the development and improvement of coordinated transportation service, to be provided by private enterprise to the maximum extent feasible." The keys to providing coordinated transportation service are two-fold: good communication with the various segments of private industry and planning. It is to our planning function that I would like to turn. And the theme that I would like to stress is that "we cannot plan without you."

Embarking on a program of realistic planning in the public sector requires recognition of the interdependence between public programs and the private sector in transportation. The growth of industrial technology in the private sector is not under the control of the public authorities. It is difficult for the government to plan for the development of air transportation when you must provide, and raise the money for, the capital equipment around which much planning must be centered. We are asked to plan for highway development when we have no say over the patterns of utilization of automobiles by each individual in this country or on the numbers that will be produced by our thriving automobile industry. We are asked to encourage sound railroad development when the only railroad we own is the Alaska Railroad. In the motor freight field, the Government regulates common carrier movement, but our regulations do not affect the large number of private and exempt carriers of highway freight. It is these interrelationships between public planning and private ownership that make transportation planning particularly complex.

Up to now with certain exceptions such as in encouraging the development of the aviation industry, the Federal Government to the extent that it has tried to accomplish planning, has more often followed a "Thou shalt not" approach by means of regulating the activities of the transportation industry in terms of routes, weights and rates. But regulation only touches a portion of the transportation activity which DOT programs must accommodate, if we are to create a balanced transportation system. Nor does it consider the kinds of things that could be done through long-range planning for transportation. It is for this reason that I come to you today to discuss with you the possibilities of joint planning. Traditionally the transportation industry has had its hands full in trying to make sure that one component does not gain a significant advantage over another mode under the regulatory

process. As a result, you have had very little time to consider the affirmative question of whether there is a role for joint public-private planning for transportation development.

It is not very popular today to say nice things about the relations between the Department of Defense and the weapons industry, but it is probably the most significant example today of encouraging joint public-private development. DOD develops military requirements based on an estimate of the world's political future and in light of available technologies. These technologies, in turn, are developed and applied through close coordination with industry. There is a continuing interchange between DOD and industry as to requirements and technology, and both industry's and Government's plans are being modified.

There is a need for a similar link between our transportation responsibilities and the industrial complex. In our two years of existence, we have only barely begun to talk to the transportation industry as a whole. We have not yet been able to seriously explore possibilities for transferring information and technological achievements from one mode to another. Just recently, for instance, I was explaining to a leading aircraft manufacturing firm the necessity for them to look into future urban transportation requirements that are on the horizon such as the expansion of VTOL and VSTOL. In order for this company to enter into this field, it would have to deal with a plethora of overlapping interests, including not only municipal, State and county governments but also small private transportation companies. This is very different from their usual customers who are well defined air transportation entities. It is in this area that my Department, through its relations with local governments and through developing its relations with the transportation industry, could provide a natural link. But to perform such a role, we must explore possibilities for new relationships between public and private planning within the transportation field. Unlike the Department of Defense, which is the principal decision making agency in the defense of our country, there is a multitude of decisions makers in our field. We must consider how we can coordinate our plans and the private plans of industry and the independent decisions of the individual consumer. It seems worthwhile then to propose to this meeting composed of representatives from different modes, their bankers and their users, to consider what they can do to create an atmosphere in which we could assist each other in planning for the overall transportation needs of the United States.

To make this effort succeed, we must first focus on what is to be moved, rather than on a particular mode. To give you an example of what I mean: In this room, for instance, are representatives of the possibilities for moving freight by air, rail, truck or water. Joint planning in your case would insure that comparable cost data and other statistical information regarding the flow of traffic are available. We in the Department are now taking a first step in that direction. Shortly, we will be advertising to request proposals for the development of a rail and a highway data information system. This system will maintain and produce current comparable information on the movements of freight. We hope that shortly thereafter we will be able to expand this system so that it will be applicable to all modes on a comparable basis. Only with the assistance of industry can we begin to accumulate the kind of data base necessary to become aware of flows of traffic and costs of handling it so that we can maximize efficiency.

The development of this data base will provide the Department with a tool which will permit us to depart from basing our decisions on the aspirations or wishing list of

each mode and instead develop more realistic criteria. Without such information, we can only continue with the kind of imbalances that can be observed in the resource allocation among the modes within the Department. If you consider that highways receive nearly 75 percent of the available funds, and aviation nearly 13 percent, it does not leave much left for other modes or for the development of urban alternatives that I mentioned earlier, and it is obvious that the basis for planning for transportation over and above the individual modal programs has not yet been established. Until we have some other ways to allocate resources, we will only be able to follow the trends implicit in these figures.

Another area in which industry and government planning must be intertwined is in the facilitation of the movement of international cargo. My office will continue to work with the export industry to reduce the paperwork requirements or to try, with your assistance, to bring them into line with the way you do business.

The need for such planning is evident. Right now, for instance, in our urban areas in which over 70 percent of our population resides, we have approximately 77 automobiles registered for each mile of urban roads and nearly half the vehicle miles of travel in the U.S. are driven on the 14 percent of our urban streets. The resulting congestion is not going to be eased by building more highways to bring in more cars. Only by means of sound transportation planning which emphasizes alternative technologies, can we assure that we are not perpetuating this congestion.

This congestion spills over to affect all modes of transportation. If each of you suboptimizes his own system as one would expect you to do, this congestion will intensify. The aviation industry suffers from urban congestion both in terms of airport access and in terms of air cargo movements. It does the aviation industry no good at all for a prospective air passenger to require a half hour travel time during peak hours between the central business district and the airport averaged over 20 major urban areas. This taken with the minimum times allowed for processing passengers indicates that for an airport-to-airport trip of up to 500 miles, about half the total trip time will be spent in ground travel, according to a recent study.

In terms of air cargo movement, the aviation industry must also be deeply concerned with the problems arising from urban congestion. Indirect costs, which include all costs incurred and moving the payload between the aircraft and its urban area destination, provide about 50 percent of the total costs of combination carriers and 35 percent of the cost for the all cargo carriers.

The truck freight system also suffers from urban congestion. The lack of efficient freight terminals in urban areas is a serious source of urban congestion. We know from visual experience that large numbers of trucks try to arrive in the same area to unload, but we do not have any reliable measurements of urban freight movement that would permit us to embark on a program to streamline urban terminals. There is no reason why, with industrial cooperation, initiatives could not be exercised to relieve this problem. The government could provide a forum for the review of requirements in the design and development of improved terminals.

Even the rail industry suffers from this congestion because it is dependent on the urban distribution system to provide loading points with freight. This brings us to the crunch of why joint planning is vital. As you know, President Richard M. Nixon is committed to restricting the Federal budget in order to stem the tide of runaway inflation. In terms of this limitation on resources, the competition for available public funds becomes all the stiffer. The Department of

Transportation cannot afford to make believe that it is above this competition. Our recent experiences with developing justifications for transportation trust funds seem to indicate that transportation may be forced to make its case along with other urgent public needs in order to feed from the general public revenues. It is for this reason that you here in this room are going to have to advise us where to put our money in terms of priorities. Given the limited funds available, you must tell us whether to choose to first improve airport capacity or access to airports and is it more critical to improve access for people or freight? You in the freight moving industry generally must tell us whether the time has come to let up on improving our highway system and instead make substantial improvements in urban distribution of freight.

It has been estimated by State highway departments in 1968 that rural and intercity highway needs would be twice as much for the post interstate (1973-1985) period as the current (1965-1972) rate of expenditure. Thus, we may have to make a choice of whether to continue to improve intercity highways on the basis of projections such as these, or to allocate additional resources to urban areas.

These are not easy choices and they are not ones that can be made unilaterally either by you or by us. Together, through joint planning, we can ascertain our priorities and so concentrate our efforts that we will be able to make a strong enough case that we will be able to receive the funds necessary for the continued expansion of a transportation system that will be balanced to the benefit of all modes.

NEW CIVIL RIGHTS BATTLEGROUND

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ronald Sarro, from the May 21 edition of the Washington, D.C., Star.

NEW CIVIL RIGHTS BATTLEGROUND

(By Ronald Sarro)

CHARLESTON, S.C.—Mary Moultrie is a soft-spoken, almost shy black woman who is trying to move a mountain of Southern tradition and economic power.

The 27-year-old nurses' aide, a native of Charleston, where the Civil War started 108 years ago, is the leader of workers who have been striking two hospitals in this city of 80,000—half Negro, half white—since late March.

"She has always been quiet," said a fellow worker at the South Carolina Medical College Hospital. "But she was brave enough to take the leadership."

The 500 hospital workers, mostly Negro women, went on strike over union recognition, discrimination and wages. Since Miss Moultrie took them out, there have been these developments:

The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which had other civil rights plans for the spring, has committed itself to helping the Charleston strikers indefinitely.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council last week established a Charleston Hospital Strike Fund with \$25,000, and urged all affiliates to support the strike.

United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther has given \$10,000 to the strikers as

a "down payment," and is providing \$500 a week to SCLC to aid Charleston activities.

President Nixon has sent Justice Department representatives here to apprise him of strike developments, and has called for the disputing parties to "resolve their differences in a calm atmosphere of mutual good faith."

Seventeen U.S. senators have urged Nixon to send a federal mediator to Charleston, emphasizing that the strike "is a test of the principle of nonviolence at a time when many in America are losing faith in that principle as a strategy for social change." South Carolina's two senators objected.

A Mother's Day rally and march supporting the strikers was attended by 7,000 to 10,000 persons, including union and civil rights officials from throughout the nation and five congressmen. SCLC officials said they were surprised by the number of Charleston whites who hand-signalized the "V" for victory during the march. "We've never had this in a Southern town," said the Rev. Andrew Young, executive vice president of the SCLC.

What started out essentially as a labor dispute has developed into the number one civil rights test of the year. It promises to equal Montgomery, Selma, Birmingham, and Memphis as a milestone of the movement led by SCLC.

It is a test, too, for South Carolina and Charleston, where the first shots in the Civil War were fired against Fort Sumter 108 years ago.

Charleston and South Carolina have so far escaped the major racial confrontations that have hit other areas. The city has always prided itself on its genteel heritage. Now the lines are drawn and they are hardening.

Says Gov. Robert E. McNair: "This is a test really of our whole government system as we have known it in South Carolina."

"Before we are finished," says Reuther, "we are going to have the governor of this state catch up to the twentieth century."

Although the workers have been seeking union recognition since last August, the crisis didn't develop until March 17, when 12 of them, including Miss Moultrie, were fired in a dispute with hospital officials.

As a result, about 400 janitors, kitchen workers, laundry workers, maids, nurses' aides, orderlies and practical nurses walked out of the 550-bed Medical College Hospital, largest of six in the city, on March 20. Another 100 struck Charleston County Hospital, which is the city's second largest with 150 beds, on March 28.

Both hospitals have been struggling along since with the aid of volunteers and extra duty by working employees. The College Hospital has cut back its patients by 35 percent.

The conflict boils down to this: The workers want Hospital and Nursing Home Workers local 1199B or some other agreed-upon association to represent them. The state's policy is that union recognition for any government employes is against the public interest.

Union officials say meetings with Gov. McNair are fruitless, and the latest attempt—on May 8—to get the workers and hospital trustees together disintegrated in a dispute over the presence of national union officials.

The prospect for another meeting? "We have met with Miss Moultrie before," said William Hoff, a vice president at the Medical College.

Meanwhile, Charleston's economy has been crippled by the effects of the strike.

UNIONISM AT ISSUE

There has been sporadic violence, and about 300 state highway patrolmen and 700 National Guardsmen have patrolled the city day and night since April 25, when they were sent in to curb the threat of further violence.

A curfew has been in effect since May 1.

More than 650 persons have been arrested on charges of violating the curfew of a court injunction, which first prohibited strike activities, then was modified to allow picketing.

The stakes in South Carolina are considerably bigger than those sought by the hospital workers alone. Only about 7 percent of the workers in the state are unionized, despite its growing industrial development.

Textile magnates fear the labor movement could spread in a state where cheap labor and a "right to work" law have helped attract industry. State and local government officials fear all government employes, from garbage workers to teachers, would organize once the door was opened.

The union movement, with its support from civil rights and union officials, has been severely attacked. Leaders have been accused of Communist connections, "using" poor people, and Nazi and Mafia tactics. Local newspapers and politicians have emphasized what they see as divisions in the movement.

Racial slurs from the patrolling troops—most, if not all white, and many from rural areas—are not uncommon.

But the strikers' supporters vow to stand by them to the end.

Dr. Martin Luther King's widow, Coretta, and 13 other civil rights leaders issued a public statement saying, "We view the struggle in Charleston" as "part of the largest fight in our nation . . . against all forms of degradation that result from poverty and misery."

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, SCLC president, told the strikers, "As long as there is life in my body, I will never desert you until you are recognized."

When asked the minimum the strikers would accept, Mary Moultrie says, "We are going to have to have some kind of recognition" even if it is only some kind of grievance committee.

WAGE RISE SOUGHT

On wages, the strikers seek an unspecified increase in their \$1.30 an hour minimum, which hospital officials say most exceed handsomely and which is scheduled to rise to \$1.45 on July 1.

Unless the dispute is settled soon, South Carolina could be in for greater economic losses and mounting tensions as the summer gets hotter.

SCLC could get serious about a boycott of stores it now describes as "half-hearted." And it is the kind of fight that could attract college students who soon will be getting out of school for the summer.

In the battle, the county government, which has a similar policy against unionizing, is letting the state government fight it out with the strikers. Most of the strikers' attacks are aimed at the governor, and the Medical College and its president, Dr. William M. McCord.

McCord is quoted as telling Business Week Magazine, "I am not about to turn a \$25 million complex over to a bunch of people who don't have a grammar school education."

Union officials say McCord has upset scheduled meetings with them, and they point to a staff memo he sent out saying:

"I have notified this union that I am sure that a majority of you would not want to get mixed up in an outfit such as this and I, of course, have no intention of meeting with this tobacco workers' union."

The parent union also represents tobacco workers.

McCord is backed by 16 statewide business and industrial groups and a resolution of the state Legislature.

In addition to state policy, the governor's office also points to the scheduled increase in the hospital workers pay, saying the strikers' demand for bargaining would upset plans to equalize pay for similar jobs.

The scene of the dispute is a quiet Southern city which boasts the traditions of the Old South. It is noted for its magnolia, cypress and azalea gardens and old plantation

mansions. The Cooper and Ashley Rivers flow by the city into Charleston Bay, where Fort Sumter is located on an island.

Miss Moultrie went to Burke High School in Charleston and has lived in the same area all of her life except for five years in New York City. She has been a nurses' aide for three years at College Hospital.

Her movement to organize workers there started in January 1968, after three practical nurses and two nurses' aides were fired, then reinstated.

Workers started discussing a union and meeting weekly with organizers, Miss Moultrie said, and in August, a letter was sent Dr. McCord asking for an initial meeting to discuss a union. Other meetings—with the governor, citizens groups, "anyone who could help us"—followed.

A key session was set for 10 a.m. on March 17 which led to the strike.

UNION FOES AT TALK

McCord brought eight workers all "definitely against the union," Miss Moultrie said, and she and her committee of seven objected.

And, because she had informed her membership of the meeting, some 265 on-duty personnel also showed up. McCord called off the session, the workers staged a sit-in, police were called and they returned to work by noon.

At quitting time, Miss Moultrie and the 11 others who worked on the same floor with her were dismissed because of the incident—for abandoning patients on an entire floor.

Miss Moultrie said she then asked for help from the SCLC. "There was no other group we could think of, and then do it in a non-violent way," she said.

But as strike activities increased, with marches and rallies and scattered violence, tension in the city rose, and Gov. McNair first sent in the patrolmen and Guard, then on May 1 put into effect a 9 p.m. to 5 a.m. curfew.

The parking lot of the Francis Marion Hotel on Calhoun Square looks like a used car lot for police cruisers. In the lobby, where there is a display of Civil War antiques including a rebel flag, police gather and trade stories and eat.

But "we wouldn't have any business at all if the highway patrol wasn't staying here," said the owner of the hotel, reflecting the bitter complaints of other hotelmen, cab drivers and bar owners about the way business has fallen off.

F. William Broome, executive director of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, minimized the effect of the strike on the city's business in general and its \$34-million-a-year tourist trade. "Only four or five conventions actually cancelled," he said, although he acknowledged a heavier impact on night-time business.

PRESSURE DISCOUNTED

He maintained that business in Charleston was not putting on pressure for a settlement. Businessmen are more concerned with principle than economics, he said.

On May 12, McNair shortened the curfew hours to 11 p.m. to 5 a.m. Wayne Seal, his press secretary, said:

"Businessmen have been suffering pretty badly financially. We want to keep the economy moving."

SCLC officials say the situation ultimately is going to have to be settled by the businessmen.

"It is only when you create the same kind of a crisis in the life of the community as you have in the lives of the workers that the community will give in," Young said.

The official center for this community's business, the city hall, is, like many buildings here, historic. It was built in 1801 as a bank, with solid brick walls. The city council chamber doubles as a gallery for portraits of Southern heroes.

Presiding as mayor the past 10 years has

been J. Palmer Gallard Jr. A Democrat, he supported Republican Richard M. Nixon for president last year. He is a longtime friend of the area's congressman, conservative Democrat L. Mendel Rivers.

On the strike—an issue between the state and its workers—Gallard is a man in the middle in a racially split city where political futures could be decided by a man's stance during the dispute.

Asked where he stands, he said hospital officials and the state "made it abundantly clear they will not recognize the union." What will eventually happen, he said, is that the workers and administrators will get together and talk it out.

STREETS CLEARED

Gallard set up a special committee, not to recommend a solution, but "to get the problem off the streets and onto the conference table." But it failed in its attempt to get the two sides to a meeting.

Despite the businesses losses, the curfew and troops "did the trick," he said. "It cleared the streets and got the troublemakers off the streets."

The chief of Charleston's police, John F. Conroy, agrees the troops have prevented violence from erupting.

"I don't question their sincerity in not wanting violence," he said of the SCLC. "I question their ability to prevent it."

Conroy, a native of New York State who was a Marine for 22 years and studied criminology at Florida State University, is in his rookie year as chief of the 150-man department which includes 22 blacks.

He and the SCLC have one big thing in common—they find each other easy to work with, as he puts the emphasis on restraint.

He has used plainclothesmen to hold down vandalism and small fires, instead of more provocative uniformed men in cars with flashing lights. He did not make arrests when stragglers in the Mothers Day march technically violated the 9 p.m. curfew.

Over-all, he said, "We are trying to avoid the racial aspect of the thing and keep it in the labor context—a dispute between the workers and the hospitals."

The labor headquarters for the strikers is the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union's hall at 655 East Bay St.

NEW YORK MINIMUM

The local, 1199B, is named after another arm of the RWDSU, Local 1199 in New York City, which was formed 18 months ago to represent hospital workers ranging from janitors to research technicians. Last July it negotiated a \$100 a week minimum covering 30,000 workers in private New York City hospitals.

The rundown union hall here—a former VFW building which has several bullet holes in the walls, apparently from some of the livelier dances—is the scene of constant activity and daily meetings.

Many of the strikers start coming in around 6 a.m. They help process contributions and handle a growing number of union applications coming in from other parts of the state.

The strikers are allowed two meals a day, plus snacks, and \$15 a week in benefits. Churches and members of the community help keep them in food.

There are outdoor rallies at churches and almost daily marches led by SCLC officials along King Street, a main business street where the featured attraction at the Lincoln Theater last week was "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

At one union meeting, in February, Mrs. King said, "My husband always used to say that 1199 was his favorite union because 1199 is always out front, always in the lead in our battle for justice . . . You see a nation in which two million hospital and nursing home workers earn as little as \$50 or \$60 a week and you want them to do better . . ."

Beyond Charleston, there is the prospect

of organizing the more than 2 million similar hospital workers throughout the nation—many of them blacks, Puerto Ricans and poor whites—who constitute the largest bloc of unorganized workers in the nation.

As one of the signs carried in the Mother's Day march said: "The world is watching 1199 B."

LAW DAY ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT E. JONES OF ALABAMA

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, a colleague, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES of Alabama, delivered the annual Law Day address to the Huntsville and Madison County, Ala., Bar Association earlier this month.

His remarks trace the contributions of the legal profession to the development of political thought in our Nation. He included the great contributions of the legal profession of Madison County to the development of the State of Alabama and our Nation in his comments.

So that all of my colleagues will have a chance to read Congressman JONES' remarks, I submit them for inclusion in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE BOB JONES TO THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF HUNTSVILLE AND FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

I am honored to be with you tonight for the 12th annual observance of Law Day.

It is a pleasure to visit with you at any time.

I agree with the philosophy often expressed by Harrison Tweed, one of the wise leaders of the American Bar, who has been quoted as saying that lawyers are more fun to do business with, to talk with, to dine and to drink with than any other people on earth.

The reason lawyers are more fun to be around than any other people on earth is the vital and significant role they have taken in politics, that is, in the conception and implementation of institutional forms embracing the changing economic, social and legal thought which is the foundation of our progress and prosperity today.

This has been true from the earliest days of our country.

Lawyers and the law were important to the early colonists who left the cities of Europe for the wilderness of the new world.

Lawyers gave immortal eloquence to the resentment of the English colonists against the denial of their rights by the British Crown. Lawyers channelled and directed the passionate protest which led to independence. The wisdom of lawyers hammered out what Gladstone described as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man"—our Constitution.

Even laymen today recall with respect the names from those early days—John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Thomas Cushing, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Madison, Richard Henry Lee, John Jay, John Marshall and others.

This formative period has been called the "Golden Age" of American law and the American legal profession. The creative legal accomplishments of this period are favorably compared with the legal achievements of any epoch in Western history.

This was a period concerned with the application of traditional legal materials to the

specific American circumstances. The lawyers argued, displayed, and determined what was applicable and what was not applicable to the new and unique American social scene.

They created an apparatus of rules and precepts equal to the early American life. Thus, the young legal profession helped the courts in developing and stabilizing a body of laws and in so doing rose to unprecedented heights of professional excellence and accomplishments.

Later, the legal profession displayed extraordinary ingenuity in devising the legal forms and concepts—corporate arrangements, common and preferred stocks, bonds secured by corporate mortgages, and unsecured debentures—that brought together the aggregations of men, money, and machines which produced our high standard of living and throbbing economic power.

In Madison County the contributions of the legal profession to the development of our nation and our state have been many. Undoubtedly, the record of Madison County attorneys exceeds that of any other area in our state.

The brilliant record extends all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. From 1837 to 1852, John McKinley was a Justice of the High Court. Judge McKinley had practiced law and served in public office from Madison County before election to the Congress and to the Senate.

The first Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court was from Madison County, The Honorable Clement C. Clay, who also served as Governor of this state, United States Senator and Member of Congress.

Madison County's history for providing outstanding lawyers to the United States Senate is remarkable. In addition to Judges McKinley and Clay, Clement C. Clay, Jr., John W. Walker, Jeremiah Clements, Lewis E. Parsons, and of course, John J. Sparkman, have all served in the United States Senate.

Five Governors have practiced law in Madison County: Clement C. Clay, Reuben Chapman, Henry Collier, Lewis E. Parsons and David P. Lewis.

There have been a number of Madison County attorneys who have served on the Courts of the State and Nation: Judges John W. Walker, D. D. Shelby and Richard W. Walker were Members of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Alabama Supreme Court Justices from Madison County number eleven, the last of which was Judge Robert C. Brickell.

Members of Congress who were practicing attorneys in Madison County were John McKinley, Clement C. Clay, Reuben Chapman, William W. Garth, William M. Lowe, William B. Bankhead, who was also Speaker of the House of Representatives, and John J. Sparkman.

Madison County attorneys were leaders during the War Between the States, and worthy of particular mention was Leroy Pope Walker, who was Secretary of War of the Confederate States of America.

The first commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Alabama was a Madison County native and prominent attorney, Edward C. Betts.

Madison County has had seven Presidents of the Alabama Bar Association, beginning with Milton Humes, who served twice, and followed by Daniel Coleman, John D. Brandon, D. D. Shelby, W. L. Clay, Lawrence Cooper, and now Patrick W. Richardson.

In more recent years, outstanding Madison County attorneys and leaders of the State Bar included Tancred Betts, General Edward C. Betts, Earl Smith, Paul Speake, Robert E. Spragins, James H. Pride, David A. Grayson, George P. Cooper, Schuyler H. Richardson, Milton H. Lanier, Addison White, M. U. Griffin, Douglas Taylor, Edward D. Johnston, Clarence L. Watts, Robert K. Bell, John R. Thomas, Elbert H. Parsons, and Walter J. Price.

By training, by temperament and by practice, we, as lawyers, evidence and excel in the same qualities characteristic of those who created the instruments which give order to our lives.

We are persistently concerned with the resolution of disputes and the organization of human endeavors in ways that enable a society to achieve its goals with a minimum of force and a maximum of reason.

In this regard, I would like to commend the President for his balanced approach to the most disgusting situation in our country today—the violence and destruction on college campuses. The President has called on college officials to meet student dissent with flexibility and student violence with backbone.

In each case of student turmoil, the aim of student violence has been to take by force that which cannot be gained by reason.

The terror of the violent few must be matched by firmness and reason on the part of college officials.

Neither educational institutions nor any other element of our society can long function under the violence and force of a disorderly mob. Nor can it compromise with criminal offenders.

Whether we deal in constitutional issues, advice to corporations, collective labor agreements, or wills and domestic relations, we are concerned with the rules and forms of human organization—helping people live together not by power but by what reason tells them is just.

As lawyers, we are trained in expression, experienced in the formulation of ideas and in the draftsmanship of documents of public and private interest.

We have the ability to step back from a problem and take an independent and unemotional view. From this stance, we can engage our experience and training and speak to the issue unfettered by the self-interest which is sometimes attributed, often unjustly, to other groups and professions.

In view of the traditions and the vast reservoir of talent and ability in the legal profession, can we, as individuals or as a group, find the acclaim today that was accorded the lawyer in earlier times?

We face a challenge which exceeds the day-to-day demands of the business of practicing law. It is also part of our job as lawyers to guide political thought and political response to the vast public issues of our day. To do less would be a disassociation to the cause of our profession.

Requirements for progress with public order and reason lead us, as a profession, to be architects of public endeavors. This has been true in the past. We dare not abandon this role now. We must participate in public issues to fashion the future design of our Republic.

I am aware of the trends toward specialization with the legal profession. The cause of the trends, the increasing complexity in modern life, makes it even more incumbent on lawyers, legislators, doctors, and every other segment of our society to devote more attention to the politics of the community.

The building of our nation did not stop with this ratification of the Constitution or the addition of the 50th state. In our area, we have hardly begun to realize the potentials which can be ours.

Huntsville has always been one of the strong centers of the legal profession in Alabama as well as a center of commercial activity.

Thoughtful consideration of the advantages in our area leads to the conclusion that we have more reason than most to realize an increasingly greater share of our nation's future growth.

We have the people, intelligent, industrious, and eager;
the land, in quantity and in quality;
the power, economical and in great supply;

the transportation facilities, varied and well-connected;

the rising personal wealth, increasing at a greater rate than the national average; and, perhaps most important, the water tamed, of superior quality, and amazing quantity.

We also have a three-pronged scientific base which anchors our claim for an even larger share of the future.

At the forefront of world technology in their respective fields are the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center here in Huntsville with vast accumulations of scientific talent; the TVA's Browns Ferry nuclear power plant a few miles to the west, which introduces a new technology and power into the Valley; and the TVA's National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals, which is advancing the science, engineering, and economics of food and fiber production.

The foundations of our area are so firm, the prospects so great, that we can only be deterred by drastic upheaval or a concerted effort to hold back progress.

As lawyers, you will share in this improved standard of living and increased prosperity.

Because of this, and especially because lawyers, by training, temperament, and practice, have leadership qualities found in no other group, there is an obligation, to self and to the community, to see that the changes which will and must take place are timely and based in reason, order, and justice.

There is a middle ground between the strict practice of law and full-time public service as a judge, legislator, educator, or government official. It is the middle ground where each of you can use your special talents with benefit to others and to yourself.

Many of you are called on to serve on the boards of schools, colleges, hospitals and charitable organizations. Here your qualifications bring about more orderly administration of the work of the institution itself and a better relationship with other individuals, organizations, and governmental bodies.

Many of you devote part of your time to the vital work of your bar associations. The importance of this work which involves the public interest will gain in public acclaim through improvement of the law and the courts and advancement of justice under changing conditions.

Changes will take place in the institutions of our nation and our community with the increasing population; greater urbanization; more concentrated use of rural areas of production, recreation and residence; increased industrial development; heavier demands on natural resources, and greater levels of affluence.

Lawyers, probably more than any other group, realize that men living in close proximity must rely on the rule of law to bring orderly process into a society.

Changes of this nature present a great challenge to your vision and to your skills as a lawyer in devising the instruments of government and commerce which fall into a political framework acceptable to the people. The challenge is as diverse as the many social, economic, and legal problems which face our citizens.

The opportunities are equally diverse for engagement of the special vision and skills of lawyers to bring orderly conduct in the affairs of the community.

By speaking out and helping to clarify the fundamental issues of our period, lawyers can lessen the sense of despair which seems to grip many individuals in the face of major social and economic trends.

As lawyers, we bring unique advantages to the public forum in background, training, practice and tradition of dedication to the public interest.

These unique characteristics can be engaged to muster public understanding and support for solutions to the problems which will be superior to those now facing our nation.

There has never been a time when we could put our skills to such productive good in helping channel the vital forces at work in the community along the lines of reason and justice.

In addition to helping clarify the issues, lawyers have unique opportunities to play a vital role in the development of programs essential to orderly public growth. This involves developing and updating the requirements of our society in keeping our communities habitable and, hopefully, even more attractive, pleasant, and enjoyable.

This may deal with such every-day things as adequate housing, water supplies, or proper disposition of wastes. The changing conditions may call for fashioning of new institutional forms or the adaptation of the old to meet the new needs. It involves the very basic problem of making government in a free society the effective servant of the people.

A fitting challenge to public service was issued by a legal scholar of a century ago, Horace Binney. He observed: "If a lawyer confines himself to the profession and refuses public life, though it is best for his own happiness, it makes sad work with his biography. You might almost as well undertake to write the biography of a mill-horse. It is at best a succession of concentric circles, widening a little perhaps from year to year, but never, when most enlarged, getting away from the original center. The life of the best practical lawyer that ever lived, if confined to the history of his practice, would in general be truly summed up as the biography of a mill-horse."

Breaking from the unending circles of the mill-horse is not the task of the lawyer alone. The lawyer, however, is best prepared by tradition, training, and practices to chart new and exciting courses for the community with reason and order.

I urge you to maintain the leadership of the profession in originating and developing the political framework which will assure the realization of the greatest potential.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the Prime Minister, Forbes Burnham of the Republic of Guyana; and Guyana's Ambassador to the United States, Sir John Carter, on the occasion of the third anniversary of Guyana's independence.

On May 26, the Republic of Guyana celebrates the third anniversary of its independence. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to Prime Minister Forbes Burnham and all cities of Guyana on this important day.

Guyana, formerly a British colony, is located on the northeastern coast of South America. Originally discovered by Columbus, Guyana has been ruled in turn by the Dutch, the French, and the British.

This English-speaking country of Latin America has a population of 700,000. In

composition, the country is 50 percent of East Indian descent, and 30 percent of African descent, a division which has led to many years of racial strife and difficulties. The topography of the country has forced the vast majority of the population to live along the coastal plain. It is also on this coastal plain that the major agricultural exports—sugar and rice—are grown, and the major mineral exports—bauxite and manganese—are mined.

For many years progress in Guyana has been stifled by unrest. Since gaining its independence in 1966, Guyana has been barraged with both internal and external threats to its nationhood. Border disputes with neighboring nations, internal secession attempts, and racial unrest have all threatened the stability and progress of this developing nation.

The task of Prime Minister Burnham since he first came to office in 1964 has been to reduce the tension between the two major racial groups. In his victory in the elections of this past December, Prime Minister Burnham was able to gain support from both major racial groups, and all three major political parties. This unified his country for the first time behind his goal of "peace and economic progress."

The potential for progress is great indeed. Guyana now cultivates only 1 percent of the total land area. Ninety percent of the Guyanese live on 5 percent of the land. Recently, attempts have been made to open more land to agricultural production. The many rivers of Guyana are a potential source of hydroelectric power. Preliminary exploration of the interior undeveloped area indicates great mineral deposits.

In addition to these natural resources, Guyana has great wealth in human resources. Recent figures state that Guyana has a literacy rate of 86 percent. The gross national product is \$300 per capita, well above that of most developing countries.

Clearly, Guyana has both the human and the natural resources necessary to become a stable and prosperous nation. We wish the Guyanese great success in the work begun by Prime Minister Burnham and his people in 1966. May the goal of "peace and economic progress" espoused by the president in his recent campaign soon be attained.

FARGO SENIORS HEAR INSPIRING MESSAGE

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to read an unusually fine and inspiring commencement address delivered at exercises for the graduating seniors of Fargo High School, in Fargo, Okla.

The address, delivered by Mrs. Margaret M. Larason, is rich in common-sense and love of country.

I believe my colleagues and many others will enjoy reading it, and will thank Divine Providence that such a message is being delivered to young Americans in this year of 1969.

The text of Mrs. Larason's fine speech follows:

COMMENCEMENT SPEECH TO FARGO SENIORS
MAY 13, 1969

(By Margaret M. Larason)

I hope all of you know how pleased I am to be a part of this important day in your lives, a day to which you have looked forward during twelve years of school.

I understand that all of you are planning to enter college this fall. This is unusual even in these days when a high percentage of graduates continue their education, even unusual for this school which has always exceeded state and national percentages in the number of our students who continue their education. This fact says a great deal for you, your parents, for this school and this community.

Tonight all of you are concerned about the future, not some far-off future, but the future that has arrived . . . the tomorrow that has suddenly become today. You are thinking about how you will make a living, and you are thinking seriously about the kind of life you want to build for yourselves and the family you expect to have. This future is what I want to talk to you about. We can not move backward; we must go forward. There is no exit but the future, and it will be the kind of future you make it.

First, how will you make a living? I think you probably realize tonight that the diploma you will be handed is a piece of paper with little intrinsic value. What is important is what you have learned, what you can do. To an even greater degree is this true of college training. You must use these next few years to learn a skill or prepare for a profession. I have no doubt that all of you will find a productive place in society. However, I want to urge you to consider career choices that serve a useful purpose, that serve mankind in a broad sense. Man's work, to be worthwhile, to be significant, must do more than provide a livelihood.

The immediate future consists of your years on a college campus. I could not speak tonight and dodge the painful question of what is happening on the campuses of our nation. It is imperative that we look at this situation, not only because of its effect on you during the next four years, but also because this activity has implications far beyond the college campus; it has a direct bearing on the life you will make for yourself and your family, a direct bearing on the world in which we all must live.

Let's look at the causes of the student unrest, at the groups involved in the disturbances, at what they want . . . or say they want . . . and then consider what should be done about it.

The present worldwide wave of student rebellion started in the United States several years ago, partly as a demand for more freedom and power of decision on campuses. It was stimulated, and complicated, by two larger emotional issues—Viet Nam and civil rights. To gain a proper perspective, we must separate the groups that are agitating for changes and reforms, and who have, in the process, engaged in violence and unlawful procedures.

First, we have the Afro-American group which has brought force to the campus. This racial issue is a part of the greater struggle by this minority group for civil rights. Next, we have a very small but radical group, generally belonging to one of the far-out, far-left, student organizations. Some of these people are self-avowed revolutionaries, dedicated to destroying institutions and democratic procedures. Then we have groups of

students who are asking for specific changes in specific institutions; many of their proposals are legitimate requests. Finally, we have a group of idealistic students who perceive a great gulf between their concept of the world as it should be and the world as it is. These students dream of a society in which there is no poverty, no war, no injustice or inequalities. They look at our world and find it lacking in all these areas. We look at the same world, from our vantage point of experience, and say it is a better world than that of fifty years ago, or forty or thirty years ago. We have progressed far since the days of the depression. We have seen the change from a root-hog-or-die social concept to one where we take the responsibility, as a nation, for the welfare of the poor, the disadvantaged, the crippled, the handicapped. We have watched the growth of labor movements that have provided legislation to protect our working people. We have watched the growth of civil rights legislation that is designed to protect the rights of our minority groups and to give them equal rights under the law. We can look back on our work and say it is good. Youth looks at our work and says it is not good enough.

Idealism and reform movements are perfectly normal and desirable. But the danger lies in the fact that these idealistic youngsters are being pulled into the whirlpool of disorderly procedures and unlawful acts by the radical elements.

It is one thing to recognize and face the troubles that beset our society. But these ills are not insoluble; they are not direct threats to the very existence of the nation. They can and will be solved by the people of this nation, by the youth of this nation, through orderly processes of civilized law and order.

We must not completely disregard these voices of protest or the student wish to be a part of policy making, to be heard. Student participation can be beneficial; student involvement in politics should be encouraged . . . but student abuse of the democratic processes must be resisted.

What do these students want? Here again the demands vary from one institution to another. Some people attempt to compare the student power movement with the civil rights movement. But there is one important difference: students will not always be students, but the Negro will always be black. What these militant students want, what they think, not only are the issues involved on campuses today, but also are the issues they will take with them into the adult world when they cease to be students. Some of these demands strike directly at the foundation of our educational system. Some students demand no entrance requirements, no rules, no grades . . . someone said what they were looking for was not a university but a honky-tonk. Other students are protesting the draft system, demanding elimination of ROTC on campuses, and openly defying all recognized authority. These issues strike at the very foundation of our nation.

There is an all-important difference between student advice and student control, a difference between legitimate requests and civil disobedience, a difference between petitions and riot, a difference between protest and guns. We must restore order on our campuses.

I ask you, what would have happened after Pearl Harbor without this great reserve of trained civilian soldiers, trained through ROTC courses in our colleges and universities. I ask you, what would have happened after Pearl Harbor without this great army of patriotic young men who quietly closed their textbooks and walked to the nearest recruiting center. From colleges and universities, from high schools all over the country, from this high school, fine young men walked through those doors and down those steps to join in defense of their country. What would

happen if we had a Pearl Harbor tomorrow, with our universities infiltrated with revolutionaries who feel no responsibility to their country, who defile the flag and burn draft cards publicly. These students by their acts repudiate their heritage and ridicule all those who served in that fight for survival as a nation.

I quote from a speech given last week by a young public official at the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion in Oklahoma: "I do not want to put my stamp of approval on war. But I am not for peace at any price. If you can't fight for this country, at least serve it. And if you can't love it, leave it."

What has all this to do with us, you ask. It has this to do with you—you are going to have to get involved in this struggle, on the side of law and order, or the life you want to build will bear little resemblance to the reality.

Never before has it been so clear—that the decision and responsibility for the future rests squarely on the shoulders of the new generations. You can not dodge, you can not evade the decisions; There is no exit but the future. The kind of future is up to you . . . and you are the ones who will have to live in it.

Let me tell you a story; you've probably heard it before, but it makes my point. There was once an old hermit who was known far and wide for his wisdom. One day a youth decided to test that wisdom, so he approached the hermit with a bird held in his hands behind his back. "Tell me, old man, what is it I have in my hands behind my back?" "A bird," the hermit replied. "It is alive or dead?" asked the youth. The old man thought for a moment, for he realized that if he said the bird was alive, the boy would crush it to death; but, if he replied that it was dead, the boy would allow it to be free. Finally he answered, "It is as you would have it." It is as you would have it.

Approximately four million high school seniors are graduating tonight. Almost two million of these will go on to college next fall. This is a terrific force, for good or evil; a tremendous power if used for order or for disorder. It is as you would have it.

People like us, from rural areas like this, give stability to existing institutions, to government itself. We have always been the counter-balance against excess.

Middle class people like us—rural people like us—people who respect the heritage of the family, people who have a firm belief in God, people who honor their country, people who have to work for a living—these are the people who have given stability to our nation. You youngsters with your innate respect for authority, with your love for family and country, I say you are the ones who can and will continue to give stability to our land. Areas like this community are the true pockets of hope for our nation. It is as you would have it.

Students from communities such as this far outnumber the rebellious minority. For the one person who rejects his national heritage by burning his draft card, communities like this will supply hundreds who are willing to accept their responsibility to their country. For the one person who resorts to civil disobedience and destruction of property, communities like this will supply hundreds to bring order out of disorder. For the one person who demands privileges beyond those rightfully his, we will supply people who will correct injustices through established procedures.

Under the Constitution of the United States, no man is above or below the law. Because as a nation we believe in the principle of liberty and justice for all, it becomes increasingly important for us to remember that whatever is done in the name of progress must operate within the framework of the law. Respect for the law and obedience

to it must be an inexorable rule. We, as a nation, cannot survive otherwise. He who seeks respect and protection from the law must give the law loyalty and respect in equal measure. It is as you would have it.

We live in a great nation, the envy of the world. We believe in the rights of the individual to have freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom to own property, and freedom to change existing social evils through the ballot box. We believe in the rights of free men everywhere. We enjoy freedom unequalled in any other place in the world. But freedom is not license to overthrow existing institutions; liberty is not a mandate to destroy. Freedom is a sacred trust that carries with it responsibilities and duties. Freedom exists only so long as someone assumes the responsibilities that make such freedom possible.

How much responsibility are you willing to take? How much are you willing to sacrifice? Are you willing to pay the price necessary to maintain our heritage, to keep what is good, and build a better world for tomorrow?

What price are you willing to pay? There are five essentials that you must provide. First is involvement. It is vitally important that you be involved in shaping those forces which govern your life. Get involved—get involved in student and campus affairs and make your voice heard—the voice of moderation, the voice of orderly procedures. And after college, get involved in civic affairs—yes, even in politics. Our system of education, programs for health and welfare, economic policy, . . . our own government and the governments of the world—all these are subject to change and control through individual action with collective purpose. Get involved. All too often the only voices heard are those of the radical.

The next essential is the element of responsibility. If you believe in the system of government under which you live, you have the responsibility to preserve it. This means not only action but responsible action. Two recent events serve to illustrate both kinds of action, responsible and destructive: the Democratic convention in Chicago in June and then in January the inauguration of a new President. We all watched TV with unbelieving eyes as groups attempted to disrupt orderly procedures of government, orderly changes. What we saw on the screen was like a nightmare; it was something that couldn't happen here—but it did happen here. It did happen here. We must take responsible action to preserve our form of government. It is as you would have it.

The third essential is principle. What do you believe in, what principles guide your actions in areas of political thought, moral issues, problems of understanding between different racial and religious groups. These principles of behavior are the ideas and attitudes that have become a part of you. Basically you absorb these values from parents, teachers, church, and community. Be able to say: This is the way I was taught; I believe this is right.

You must have the fourth element, courage, to maintain your principles once they have been established; courage to stand up for what is right, courage to fight down an action that is irresponsible, one not in conformity with accepted procedures, courage to stand up and be counted whether you are in the minority or the majority. Don't be apologetic about coming from a small community, from a small school. Sound ideas and moral principles need no apology.

We now have four of the five keys to the price you must pay to maintain freedom: principles, responsibility, involvement, and courage. The last essential is energy. Here you have a distinct advantage over those of us on the wrong side of the generation gap. As we grow older we tend to put up with things

as they are rather than go through the upheaval of change. But youth has always been willing to accept a challenge. Use this abundant energy in constructive ways to build a better future.

Take the first letter of each of the five essentials and you spell PRICE: P for principles, R for responsibility, I for involvement, C for courage, and E for energy. Those elements truly are the price of living in a free society and preserving that society for your children and your children's children.

It is as you would have it. Such is the power that your generation has over the world. You can crush freedom, you can destroy democracy. . . . or you can let it live; you can take the wings of the morning and soar to new heights of civilization. The decision, the responsibility is yours. This is the price you have to pay for being a new generation of Americans.

In closing, I want to repeat the American's Creed, the creed of an American citizen. I hope this creed becomes a part of you and that you can truly echo these words in your hearts:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

There is no exit but the future. It is as you would have it.

MICHIGAN WEEK

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20 I called the attention of my colleagues to the celebration of Michigan Week. Pursuant to my remarks, I am submitting the last two of a series of articles appearing in the latest issue of Michigan Challenge. These articles are one by Leroy Augenstein entitled "Broad View of Education"; and one by Ralph C. Fuller entitled "Tourism Means Fun, Business."

The articles follow:

[From Michigan Challenge, April 1969]

BROAD VIEW OF EDUCATION

(By Leroy Augenstein, Michigan State Board of Education)

Perhaps the greatest attribute of Michigan education is the balance we have achieved between the various levels. That is, we not only have the usual kindergarten through high school programs in all communities, but an almost state-wide community college program, 66 colleges and universities, plus extensive special, vocational, and adult education programs.

This balance is also reflected in the proportion of funds which are allocated at the various levels. For example, Michigan ranks 10th among the states in total income per person, with per capita earnings 110 per cent of the national average. Consistent with this standing, our total expenditure of \$1.7 billion for all educational purposes is 121 per cent of the national average, and our overall expenditure of more than \$600 per pupil (both state

and local) for K-12 programs is 102 per cent of the national average.

Although we have some rough spots, a strong basic framework exists. Both local units and the state government have made an ongoing commitment to develop a broadly-based, well-balanced educational system to serve the needs of people from about five years of age on up.

Even at the K-12 level our almost 2.5 million pupils have a choice of where they can attend. While 86 per cent of our youngsters are educated in the public schools, the other 14 per cent attend the more than 1,000 schools run either by a private corporation or church group. (About 85 per cent of the latter attend schools operated by the Catholic Church.)

The determination of operating philosophy and details in the K-12 program resides at a number of levels. The State Board of Education has the constitutional responsibility for overall leadership of education from preschool up through the grades, on into college and professional training. The Department of Education then administers the policies established by the State Board. Because of the overall administrative structure, and the fact that approximately 50 per cent of the support for K-12 education is provided locally, most of the major decisions are made by the individual local school boards.

Extensive re-organization and consolidation have been undertaken in the last 25 years to make certain that the local districts can carry out their proper functions. In 1945 there were almost 6,000 independent school districts. In 1948 this number was still more than 5,000, but in the next 10 years this was reduced to 2,300. Today there are only 644 independent school districts, of which 531 operate a full K-12 program.

Interspersed between the state and the local units are 60 intermediate school districts. Administratively this area needs the greatest attention at the moment because some of these units provide extensive services whereas others have little to offer.

Complementing this broadly based program for elementary and secondary education is a very extensive higher education network serving about 350,000 students. Of the 11 public colleges and universities (plus four branch campuses), six have enrollments of 14,000 or greater. Michigan State is the largest with 43,000 students. The character of these outstanding schools differs appreciably.

The University of Michigan, one of the oldest universities in the nation, has a very diverse program with great emphasis on professional training in medicine and law.

Michigan State, which has always devoted considerable effort to extension programs to get information out to the public, has increasingly emphasized research and graduate training in recent years.

Wayne State University, too, is unique in character. It is a major urban university.

Western Michigan, Eastern Michigan and Central Michigan Universities are just now deciding their general character as they determine what areas they should emphasize at the graduate level.

A number of Michigan's colleges have found it necessary to limit out-of-state enrollments. Compared to Michigan a number of other states have put far more of their funds in the K-12 level than in their college programs. This has resulted in their students seeking higher education in Michigan.

In addition to these colleges and universities, funded and operated by the public, there are 51 private colleges and universities. All of Michigan's colleges and universities place great emphasis on teacher training. The state ranked 5th in the nation last year with its production of 13,000 new teachers. Actually six of the Michigan institutions are in the top 16 producers of teachers in the whole country. Michigan State ranked first and Western Michigan second.

In addition to these schools, many students seeking higher education in Michigan are served by our very extensive system of community colleges. There are 28 community colleges now operating around the state, and a total of 32 districts are projected to be in operation soon. In general, there is reasonable coverage except for worrisome gaps in Detroit, portions of the Upper Peninsula, and the Thumb.

Currently, close to one half of the freshman students entering public institutions are enrolling in the community colleges. Of all the students in higher education, approximately one-fourth are enrolled in the community colleges.

Efforts to expand and upgrade the level of vocational education throughout the state are continuing. To coordinate this program with community colleges, the boundaries of most vocational education areas will be co-terminus with those of the community college districts. Of the 531 K-12 school districts, 456 currently operate vocational education programs. In addition, some of the community colleges have vocational programs available either at the secondary or at an advanced level. In addition to these facilities, 152 trade schools have been recognized and licensed by the State Board of Education.

Considerable expansion of adult education programs is needed throughout Michigan, since most workers must be retained three or four times during their lifetime if they are to remain truly productive. Fortunately, 230 K-12 school districts already have adult education programs serving 388,000 people. In addition to this resource, a number of the colleges and universities have extension programs at various campuses and centers. Ten of the community colleges have adult education programs for their communities.

In trying to achieve thorough educational coverage, Michigan has also devoted considerable resources to special education. Approximately 450 of the 531 K-12 school districts have some form of special educational program. In general, this provides approximately 50 per cent of the services needed. However, only 25 per cent of those who receive special education at the elementary grades ever get into a secondary program. Although this must be corrected, it still is considerably better than the national average where this number is less than 6 per cent. Michigan's expenditure on special education is about 4 per cent of the total budget.

Perhaps the most worrisome feature of our present educational structure is that along with other local revenues, the funding for K-12 programs is derived very heavily from the property tax. Many taxpayers, "fed up" with taxes at the federal and state level, find that the local educational millage is the only tax which they can vote against. Thus, last year we lost one third of our millage votes. To further complicate the situation some districts approve high millages but cannot provide proper educational opportunities for their children simply because they do not have an adequate financial base. (The actual dollars behind each child varies by about a factor of 30 from the richest to the poorest district.) As a consequence, 74 of our school districts were in debt at the end of last year. Additional ones will be in debt this year (Detroit may go in the red \$5-30 million) and so approximately 20 per cent of our youngsters are on either half-day sessions or greatly curtailed schedules.

A number of proposals have been made to change this funding pattern. Although the present scheme has drawbacks, one of its very important virtues is local control, since approximately 50 percent of the funds come from the local districts.

The State Board of Education is also wrestling hard to establish methods for

assessing whether or not our elementary and secondary students are receiving the education which they need in today's complex, technological world. And whether the taxpayers are getting their dollar's worth.

Like all states having large cities, the educational attainment of our ghetto youngsters is far below what we desire and what they need to compete in society. Unfortunately, many of the students graduating from our inner-city high schools—like those throughout the country—have an average competence level of only 7-9 grade. It is no wonder so few of them are able to get good jobs or go to college. Hopefully, with more adequate funding of special programs for disadvantaged youngsters and the establishment of needed community college facilities in Detroit, we will be able to break the vicious cycle of ignorance breeding ignorance and incompetence perpetuating incompetence.

There are some additional yardsticks which indicate that we need to upgrade our quality of education in other K-12 areas. For example, recently Michigan has ranked low in terms of the number of merit scholar finalists, and the number of Westinghouse science talent search finalists which we have each year. Also, while our youngsters are just slightly above the national average in terms of securing advanced placement when they go on to college, still only one-fifth as many of our students secure this advantage as is the case for students from the ten best states in this regard. Also, far more of our young men are flunking the pre-induction mental tests given by the Armed Forces than is the case for some neighboring states.

It is our hope that within the next year or two we can develop an assessment system which will not place the local districts in an unwarranted strait jacket, but will begin to give indicators to people in many walks of life as to whether education is doing its job, and if not, what can be done to correct the situation.

In summary, Michigan has striven for broad, in-depth coverage by making education readily available to practically all of its interested citizens. While there are some rough spots in our various programs, we are aware of these. Hopefully, within the next year or two, real inroads can be made in re-vamping our funding schemes, and also in assessing and improving the overall quality. Basically, education in Michigan is a very healthy patient, which needs an enrichment of diet and a few vitamin pills to bring it up to the pink of condition which we all desire.

TOURISM MEANS FUN, BUSINESS

(By Ralph C. Fuller, chairman, Michigan Tourist Council)

During the past decade, spending by visitors bent on recreational travel in Michigan has almost doubled, reaching an all-time high in 1968 of \$1.17 billion. Of this, more than \$75 million was returned directly to the state treasury in the form of tourist-generated tax dollars.

Concurrent with this, from 1958 to 1968, the annual budget of the Michigan Tourist Council invested to advertise and promote Michigan's vacation opportunities was increased from \$416,000 to \$1 million.

The volume of dollar return in relation to dollar investment is part of the Council's amazing success story and reflects an actual net profit of \$74 for every dollar put to work. Unique in state government, it is a dollar-producing agency that helps to support important state agencies such as mental health, education and other vital programs serving the public needs.

Historically, the investment of money in the promotion of Michigan tourism has always produced enormous profits. As early as 1950 the Council's budget of \$250,000 produced \$400 million, a generous amount of

which was turned back to the state in collected taxes.

Much of the success of the Council programs can be traced back to strong, well-planned, aggressive promotion and to the system which makes it work.

Currently, \$240,000 of the Council's budget is distributed among the four regional tourist associations on a matching-fund basis. The \$60,000 each association receives annually is tagged for promotional and advertising purposes only and cannot be touched for overhead costs or any other administrative expenditures.

Dovetailing with the financial and promotional arrangement, each of the secretary-managers of the associations, who are elected to that position by their individual association memberships, become permanent members of the nine-man policy making Michigan Tourist Council. The remaining five members are appointed by the Governor to rotating five-year terms. Senate confirmation is necessary.

The remainder of the budget is spread among the various Council programs which include advertising, publicity, field promotion and administration. The lion's share, of course, is allocated to advertising which is the backbone of the Council's efforts. Administration receives the least.

The advertising budget is spent primarily for magazine insertions at national and regional levels, supplemented by a strong television and radio level, announcement schedule placed in midwest markets.

The Council's publicity section produces news features and releases about Michigan's vacation facilities and attractions, and distributes them nationwide. A staff photographer moves around the state 12 months of the year, assigned to capture on film all of the Michigan flavor designed to attract vacationers and tourists.

In addition to these basic duties, the publicity section serves a huge volume of requests for editorial information and photographs from editors, publishers and freelance writers from all over the world. Michigan Tourist Council photographs frequently appear on magazine covers and as illustrations for editorial content of prominent national publications.

Prints of Council-produced motion pictures are made available for loan to civic groups, sportsmen's clubs and other organizations as well as to television stations. Six million persons viewed at least one Council motion picture during 1968.

Unique in concept, the field promotion program concentrates on direct mail approaches and face-to-face contacts with persons in positions to open doors for mass exposure of Michigan's vacation opportunities. Under the program, two Council field representatives make direct personal contacts with travel agencies, industrial firms, sporting goods stores and other influential groups and persons in the 13-state area immediately surrounding Michigan. Literature packs, counter posters and inquiry cards are placed with the contacts for display and for distribution to employees and customers.

One of the main objectives of advertising, publicity, and field promotion is to whet the interest of prospective vacationers enough to inquire for Michigan vacation literature.

Backing up the advertising and promotional efforts is a comprehensive literature production and distribution system geared to furnish the appropriate general and seasonal literature to individuals responding to whatever of the Council's programs has motivated them.

Included in all of the literature sent out to each individual is a sheet of four postcards, each pre-addressed to each of the four regional tourist associations. The prospective vacationer may then send any or all of the postcards to the association in the region in which he is interested for additional and more detailed information.

Tourist industry leaders view the immediate years ahead with cautious optimism, based on expectations that economic factors will continue their established trends, that negative influences will keep minimal, and that these factors will be the basis on which to build stronger and still more aggressive advertising and promotional campaigns.

Tourism is becoming more dynamic in its economic importance, not only nationwide, but internationally.

Michigan must maintain a strong position to meet the new challenges which are partners to a bright future.

A MODERATE STUDENT SPEAKS OUT

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in reading the May 13 issue of the University of Tennessee Daily Beacon, I came across a forceful, articulate article written by one of the university's many responsible students. I feel that it speaks to the real source of many of the difficulties we are witnessing on campuses throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, you will also be glad to know that this article was written by Jim Duncan, the son of our distinguished colleague, JOHN DUNCAN of Tennessee. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House as a firsthand source of information on contemporary campus conditions.

The article referred to follows:

LIBERALS HAVE NO MONOPOLY ON TRUTH
(By Jim Duncan)

The demands made by the black students here last week were certainly not surprising. Similar demands have been made at almost every other large university in the nation.

What was interesting, though, was that the students said they were being discriminated against in the classroom. This is one charge that has not been made too many places (and it was probably not justified here either), because most college professors are so "liberal" that they go out of their way to be kind to Negroes.

Harvey Hukari, a graduate student in Communications at Stanford and a columnist for the student newspaper there, put it a little more bluntly in an article he wrote a few months ago.

His column came about after Johnnie Scott, a Stanford black militant, began a column of his own. Scott immediately charged that Stanford was a racist institution and that it was committing cultural genocide against black people.

Hukari countered by writing: "Listen Johnnie Scott, as far as Stanford is concerned, you are one of the chosen few. Those liberal white administrators and professors are going to do everything they can to make life beautiful for you. They're going to give scholarships to your black brothers and sisters, offer them employment, listen to your complaints and demands, and point to you proudly as fine examples of how liberal they really are. And the only thing you have to do is make them feel guilty."

"No thought is given to the possibility," he added, "that the real discrimination which exists at this university is against creativity, free thinking, and those who refuse to accept the intellectual dictums handed down by a liberal academic establishment."

Hukari then branched out: "You Johnnie Scott, may be sick of all those stereotyped visions in which black people eat watermelons, lust after white women, tap dance, and pick cotton. Well, I'm sick of all those stereotypes of conservatives in which they are portrayed as greedy, sexually obsessed businessmen, puritanical little old ladies with hair growing out of their ears, and trigger-happy Army generals who are paranoid about communism."

"You're sick of racism," he continued, "and I'm sick of having to be exposed to the intellectual hypocrisy vomited forth daily in classrooms all around the Quad by professors who make snide references to Ronald Reagan, misrepresent the meaning of conservatism, allow their teacher assistants to make appeals for the Peace and Freedom party in class, and treat students who may profess a certain affinity for free enterprise and individual responsibility with the condescending attitude which one reserves for the mentally retarded."

Hukari also noted that Richard Nixon was called a racist for choosing Spiro Agnew as his vice president but that Adlai Stevenson was never called one for taking John Sparkman of Alabama as his running mate in 1952.

He also wrote that he was "tired of professors who speak strongly about academic freedom and then assign a reading list which does not contain one author whose political philosophy is to the right of *Ramparts* magazine."

The Stanford student said that while black students complain about the scarcity of Negroes in the faculty, he doubted there were any Republicans in the political science department.

"You think having a black skin is some kind of a drawback here?" Hukari asked. "Try wearing a Nixon button to class. If you try to point out that Barry Goldwater had some valid programs for ending the draft and curtailing the growth of government power, your fellow students smile and shake their heads in mock pity. If you acknowledge in class that you are a conservative, immediately you are marked as a Bircher, a racist, an advocate of nuclear bombing, and as a fundamental Baptist."

Hukari commented appropriately: "You think that black people are the only ones who have trouble with discrimination and stereotypes in an academic community. Pass that watermelon over this way, Johnnie."

This was a hard-hitting column, to say the least, and Hukari got hit hard in return. He had attacked some of the most sacred of the sacred cows, and the wrath of the liberals was immediately cast down upon him. In their minds, for some reason, criticizing black people is like falling asleep in church. It's just unholly, and it's not to be tolerated.

But Hukari's column was not a blatant attempt to smear black people, as some people thought. No, the point of his column was that many people have a very distorted view of conservatives, just as many do of Negroes. To these people, it is just not possible to be both conservative and intelligent. As Hukari put it: "The niggers at Stanford are no longer black students, they're conservatives." And this could be said of almost any school in the country.

Here, for instance, many conservative students are afraid to speak out in class for fear of getting in bad with their teacher. Speakers programs are generally overbalanced to the left. Professors frequently present only one side in the classroom. And one would have to search far and wide to find a book by a conservative author on any reading list.

It is almost enough to make one think that today's "liberals" are afraid of something. Perhaps they fear a confrontation of ideas because they're afraid they would come out on the losing side. (Maybe this is why the SDS believes in revolution rather than reason.) Perhaps, deep inside, liberals realize

they do not actually have a monopoly on the truth. Someday they might even admit it. However, it would not be wise to hold your breath waiting for that day.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LILIUOKALANI KAWANANAKOA MORRIS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute and honor to a great lady of my State who died this May 19 at her home in Hawaii. She is Mrs. Liliuokalani Kawanakoa Morris, a descendant of the ancient kings of Hawaii, and the niece of Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, who served in this body from 1902 until 1922 as Hawaii's second delegate to the U.S. Congress.

Mrs. Morris devoted much of her life to the interests of the Hawaiian people, and her last years were spent working on the restoration of Iolani Palace in Honolulu, the only royal palace in the United States, and the palace from which she might well have ruled as Queen, had fate so decreed, since her father, Prince Kawanakoa, was in the direct line of succession to the throne of King Kalakaua.

Mrs. Morris was active in the Hawaiian civic clubs and also served on the Hawaiian Homes Commission, which oversees the Hawaiian homestead lands. She was a regent of the Hale O Na Alii and a lifetime member of the Kaahumanu Society and the Daughters of Hawaii.

In 1965, Gov. John A. Burns appointed Mrs. Morris to take charge of the restoration of Iolani Palace, the work to which she devoted the remainder of her life.

Her death is deeply mourned by the sons and daughters of Hawaii.

At this point, I submit an article on Mrs. Liliuokalani Kawanakoa Morris, which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 21, 1969, as follows:

LILIUOKALANI MORRIS DIES; DESCENDANT OF ISLE KINGS
(By Gene Hunter)

Mrs. Liliuokalani Kawanakoa Morris, who spent her last years overseeing the restoration of the palace where she might have ruled as queen of Hawaii, is dead at the age of 63.

The stately, regal Mrs. Morris—known to many Hawaiians as Princess Liliuokalani in spite of the fact that officially there are no royal titles in the United States—died of cancer at 11 p.m. Monday at her home at 935 Waiholo St., Wai'alae.

At her request, her funeral will be conducted with none of the pomp and ceremony which once surrounded the rites of a member of Hawaiian royalty.

Simple graveside services will be held at 11 a.m. tomorrow at Nuuanu Memorial Park, with Williams Mortuary in charge of arrangements.

In lieu of flowers the family has requested that donations be made in Mrs. Morris' memory to the Friends of Iolani Palace, of which she was president.

Mrs. Morris is survived by her husband, Charles E. Morris; a daughter, Abigail Kin-oiki Kekaulike Kawanakoa; two aunts, Mrs. Alice Kamokila Campbell of Ewa and

Mrs. Francis Wrigley of California; two nieces, Poomai Kalani Kawananaoia of Honolulu and the Marchesa Kapiolani Marignoll of Rome, and a nephew, Edward Keliiahonui Kawananaoia of Honolulu.

Mrs. Morris was born July 22, 1906, and was the last surviving child of Prince David Kawananaoia and the former Abigail Wahikaahuua Campbell. The other children were Mrs. Kapiolani Field and David Kalakaua Kawananaoia.

Mrs. Morris was descended from the ancient line of Keawe, once king of the Big Island, and from Kaunuaalii, last king of Kauai.

Her parental grandmother was a niaupio—a descendant of two high chiefs, the highest possible rank in Hawaiian genealogy.

Her father was a second cousin of King Kalakaua and a nephew of Kalakaua's consort, Queen Kapiolani. Her father's brother was Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, Hawaii's second delegate to Congress.

King Kalakaua, who was childless, was elected to the throne in 1874. Wishing to assure that there would be no more elected kings and that the throne would remain always with his family, he named four ali'i to succeed him.

They were his younger brother, Leleihoku; his sister, Lydia; his niece, the beautiful Princess Kalulani, and his cousin, Prince Kawananaoia, Mrs. Morris' father.

Leleihoku died while Kalakaua was king. At Kalakaua's death in 1891 he was succeeded by his sister, who ruled for two years as Queen Liliuokalani until she was overthrown in 1893, when Hawaii became a republic.

Princess Kalulani, to whom Prince Kawananaoia, was betrothed, died in 1899 at the age of 24. In 1902 the prince, the direct heir to the throne, married Abigail Campbell.

Mrs. Morris was named Lydia Kamakaeha Liliuokalani after her royal relative. In recent years Mrs. Morris, as president of the Friends of Iolani Palace, frequently guided distinguished visitors through the Palace built by Kalakaua, where she would have lived had the monarchy continued.

Mrs. Morris was married four times. Her first marriage was in 1925, when she was 19, to automobile salesman William J. Ellerbrock. They were divorced in 1927.

Mrs. Morris' only daughter was from this marriage. The child was adopted by Mrs. Morris' mother, Princess Kawananaoia, and dropped the Ellerbrock name.

In 1936 Mrs. Morris met newspaperman Clark G. Lee, who came to Honolulu that year as Associated Press bureau chief. He was transferred to Tokyo in 1938, as war spread in the Far East.

Mrs. Morris joined him in the Orient and they were married in Hong Kong in 1938. They lived in Tokyo and in Shanghai until she returned here in August, 1941. Lee, covering the Far East and the South Pacific for Associated Press and later for International News Service, became one of the most famed correspondents of World War II.

He was the author of several best-selling books about the war. His first, "They Call It Pacific," was dedicated to his wife and to her daughter.

The Lees moved to Pebble Beach, Calif., in 1946. He died there of a heart attack in 1953 and his widow returned to Hawaii.

The following year she married Charles E. Morris Jr. of Kona. They were divorced in 1959 and were remarried last year.

As one of the heirs to the Campbell Estate founded by her mother's father, Mrs. Morris enjoyed a large annual income. But in spite of her affluence, she was deeply interested in the welfare of her less fortunate fellow Hawaiians.

While they realized that the title "princess" was only honorary in the Islands of today, many Hawaiians looked up to Mrs. Morris as their mentor, seeking her guidance and counsel in their affairs.

Although her uncle, Prince Kuhio, was a long-time politician and a leader of the Republican party and her mother was a power behind the scenes in the GOP, Mrs. Morris took no part in politics.

She once told an interviewer: "I would prefer to stay out of partisan politics. I would never presume to tell any Hawaiians how to vote nor in any way dictate their politics."

Mrs. Morris was active in the Hawaiian Civic Clubs, founded by her uncle, and had served on the Hawaiian Homes Commission, which oversees Hawaiian homestead lands. She was a regent of the Hale O Na Alii and a life member of the Kaahumanu Society and of the Daughters of Hawaii.

Mrs. Morris—known as Liliu, the diminutive of Liliuokalani, to her closest friends—lived surrounded by mementos of her royal heritage. These included beautifully bound volumes from the library of Queen Kapiolani and gifts to King Kalakaua from Emperor Meiji of Japan.

In 1965 Gov. John A. Burns named Mrs. Morris to head the restoration of Iolani Palace, which is to become a museum now that the State government has moved across the street into the new Capitol.

Two years ago doctors informed Mrs. Morris that she was suffering from cancer and had but a short time to live.

She continued active in the palace restoration project, although she spent much of last summer in critical condition at the Queen's Medical Center.

The 11th annual convention of the Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs held in Kailua-Kona in February was dedicated to Mrs. Morris. She was able to attend the convention and accepted the dedication plaque.

Also in February, Mrs. Morris was re-elected president of the Friends of Iolani Palace.

During her last years, when health permitted, she spent much of her time at the palace where her father was groomed to become king, planning its conversion into a museum.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with previously adopted policy of disclosure, I am at this time making public a statement of receipts and expenditures of the supplementary expense fund raised for newsletter, unreimbursed travel, and office expenses. As I stated in my disclosure last year, there is no provision under the law for any reporting, but I feel it is best to do so.

Last year, the Senate officially sanctioned arrangements to supplement legitimate office expenses, clearly raising the objection to any personal use of these moneys by a Member of that body. I feel the House should take such affirmative action but should definitely include full disclosure.

The disclosure follows:

Statement for fiscal year 1968

Balance, beginning Jan. 1, 1968.....	\$5,552.65
Total contributions, 1968.....	12,666.06
Subtotal.....	18,218.71
Expenditures, 1968.....	12,036.05
Ending balance, Dec. 31, 1968.....	6,182.66

Statement for fiscal year 1968—Continued

ITEMIZED EXPENSES	
Newsletter.....	\$6,182.56
Unreimbursed travel expense.....	5,553.49
Salary, summer program for securing jobs for underprivileged.....	500.00
Total expenses.....	12,236.05

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO H.R. 10344, NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT OF 1969

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., of Denver, Colo., is interested in the National Timber Supply Act of 1969, as embodied in H.R. 10344, and I am pleased to place for the consideration of the House the statement of Mr. E. R. Weiner, president of the Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., as follows:

The Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council, Inc., a Colorado corporation not-for-profit, serves as a coordinating structure for currently twenty-four recreational conservation organizations throughout the State of Colorado, with cumulative memberships of approximately 25,000 citizens. The purpose of COSC is to "work for the preservation, wise use and appreciation of scenic, historic, open space, wilderness and outdoor recreational resources . . . for the cultural, educational, physical, health, spiritual and economic benefit" of the citizens of Colorado and the nation.

COSC is not submitting this statement to register outright opposition to H.R. 10344. COSC believes in good timber management, according to sound ecological principles, and in the scientific practice of forestry; it has so stated on many occasions. COSC, and responsible conservationists everywhere, recognize the nation's needs for timber; COSC is not against people or jobs or housing. However, COSC cannot give support to H.R. 10344 unless certain revisions in the bill are made. We would like to comment as follows:

"Sec. 2—This section presumes, mostly on the evidence submitted by the timber industry itself, that the nation's wood products supply is going to be met primarily by increased yields from the national forests. We would strike the words "the timber yield from national forest commercial timberlands in order to increase" so as to refrain from giving this prejudicial and arguable presumption the status of an Act of Congress.

"Various timber experts have estimated that half of the nation's timber lands are in small, poorly managed tracts which, with proper management, could increase their production by a factor of 5! But Senator Sparkman (Cong. Rec. April 18, 1969, S. 3803) stated: "Industry witnesses were unanimous in pointing out that since privately owned forest lands are now operated at peak capacities, the necessary increase must come from the great timber reservoir of the Federal forests . . ." Such testimony is highly arguable if not outright false. It should be obvious that some private timber companies would prefer that the federal government and the taxpayers bear the cost of intensified timber management, thus decreasing the investments they should be making on private lands.

"Without providing some incentives, federal assistance and even partial subsidies to

finance better timber management practices on private lands, this proposed Act goes only part of the way. Either this bill or companion legislation should mitigate this glaring deficiency. We would favor tax incentives to private producers, federal agricultural assistance programs, and in particular federal assistance for state departments of forestry, such as we have in Colorado.

"Further, as this bill is deficient in not providing incentives for intensified management on private lands, it is also deficient in not attempting to control exports. Without such controls, we are asking the American taxpayers to invest more money in timber management and harvesting necessitated in part by the ability of private industry to reap a greater profit in Japan than elsewhere. Admittedly, we do not have all the facts on exports but an export volume of 2.2 billion board feet in 1968 must have some relationship to the "timber shortage." And is exportation from U.S. Forest Service lands even legal under various Acts of Congress?

"Sec. 3—The definition of 'commercial timberlands' is much, much too broad and gives the Forest Service, under constant and unrelenting pressure from the industry, extremely broad discretionary powers. The commercial timberlands to be covered by the Act should be spelled out in detail, right down to naming the actual forests or portions thereof. Also, the Fund should be made to apply only to Site I, II and III lands—those of highest production capability. Certainly, the Forest Service has available data on the forests that really need intensified management. No 'special study' should be necessary to gather this information.

"Many areas of the national forests are not productive, particularly in the Rocky Mountain region, the least productive of all the nation's timber lands (see 'Timber Trends in the United States,' Forest Service, USDA, Report No. 17, Feb. 1965). The Forest Service has classified many marginal lands as 'commercial' under 16 U.S.C. 581. These are site IV and V lands, with lowest production potential. Under the Act as written, these marginal lands—where most 'wilderness' is situated, for example—would be included.

"Sec. 4—There are always dangers inherent in earmarking funds for any purpose. Forest Service timber sale receipts are now earmarked in part—25% reimbursement (in lieu payments) to the states and 10% for roads and trails. This bill would have the effect of earmarking the vast majority of timber sale receipts for timber production—65%. Even though the funds have to be appropriated under Sec. 5, can we be certain that the Forest Service will place as much emphasis on planning, research and development for watershed, recreation, wildlife, wilderness, grazing and other multiple uses which are not blessed with earmarked funds? We think there is evidence that some regions of the Forest Service place such great emphasis on road construction because they feel they can rely on the 10% kitty set aside for the purpose.

"Has the Forest Service established a 'case' to justify their need for all of the remaining 65% for timber management? Can they do the job for 25% or even 50%? And why must the Act run until 1994 (which means forever)? Why not 10 years, instead of 25, a reasonable time in which to test the Act's effectiveness? These are hard questions that should be answered.

"Sec. 6—It seems to us that authorizing expenditures from the Fund for any particular forest only in the proportion that said forest has contributed to the Fund would serve only to make poor land poorer and rich land richer, in terms of timber management. Timber management practices as outlined in Section 6 obviously do not cost the same for every acre of timber land regardless of where located. The necessary timber management investment varies considerably

from place to place. Has the Forest Service carefully examined this section?

"Sub-section (6) provides for funding of more road construction, in addition to the 10% allowed for roads and trails under 16 U.S.C. 501. We submit that of all the timber management devices listed in Sec. 6, road building will receive the greatest immediate emphasis, particularly in the West where 'lack of access' is almost always equated with lack of supply. To meet the 'emergency' that it is contended exists (and which control of exports from Alaska and elsewhere could greatly alleviate), the industry and the Forest Service will cry 'cut!' And to do this they will need roads to bring out the harvest. Unless some legislative brakes are put on Sec. 6(6), many wilderness-type in the West is likely to be threatened with a new road invasion, with the blessing of the Congress. We think a limitation should be put on the amount of the fund that can be expended for road building—say, another 10%."

COSC has reason to believe that this bill will be cited frequently by wilderness opponents. If it is not used as a rationale for asking Congressional permission to invade existing primitive areas, it will certainly make it more difficult to include qualifying wilderness lands adjacent primitive areas in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Certain portions of S. 1832 mistakenly recognize the cries of "timber shortage" that the timber industry has long wanted to have validated.

We are reluctant to give the Forest Service and the timber industry the "carte blanche" for logging they have asked for all these years, with no strings attached, on the very tenuous grounds that there is some sort of national timber "emergency."

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BURLISON, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the United States of America were a primitive, isolated village of 20 persons, and if one of those 20 produced all of the food—and much of the fiber for clothing—consumed by the other 19, that one man would be hailed by his fellows as the preeminent contributor to the commonweal. For they would see clearly—in these simple circumstances—that they depended on this single individual for the most basic necessities of life itself.

This great Nation is not, of course, a primitive village—far from it. Yet one American on the farm does, in fact, produce nearly all of the food and fiber consumed by 19 of his fellow citizens.

Not only is this fact little understood today by the 94.4 percent of our people who live in cities and towns, but the whole vast scope of our amazingly productive agricultural economy is a foreign subject to tens of millions of our citizens:

Many of our children undoubtedly think milk originates in cartons;

They may believe that meat and poultry begin their trip to market wrapped in plastic;

They are probably not aware that a woolen suit or cotton shirt did not just grow that way.

These children's parents would not make these mistakes, of course, but they,

too, are likely to be unaware of conditions on the farm today, and of the fact that agriculture is still the very cornerstone of our modern way of life.

It has been pointed out in many reports of the Committee on Appropriations that the economic welfare of the Nation's economy is dependent on the economic strength of each segment thereof. Time has proved that labor and industry can be prosperous only to the extent that the agricultural economy is strong and healthy.

Agriculture is the principal source of new wealth. It is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates \$7 of income throughout the rest of the economy.

Agriculture is our largest industry. Its assets exceed those of any of the next 10 largest industries. It employs more workers than any other major industry. It employs seven times the number of people in the mining industry, 23 times the number in the oil and coal industry, and five times the number in the automobile industry. In addition, it supports directly another 10 percent of our non-farm population which supplies the farmer with his needs and processes and markets his products.

Agriculture is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. It spends more for equipment than any of the other large industries. Agriculture uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

But over the years, in spite of Government farm programs, industry and labor's share of the consumer's food dollar has risen substantially. Compared with 1950, retail food prices were up almost 40 percent by 1968. But during that same period, prices received by farmers, while fluctuating from year to year, remained unchanged in the aggregate.

In 1950, the farmer's share of the retail food dollar was 47 cents. By 1968, it was down to 39 cents. Taking several specific examples:

The farmer receives only 3.3 cents of the retail cost of a loaf of bread, which averaged 22.4 cents in 1968.

In the same year, he received only 23 cents of the \$4.60 retail price of a cotton business shirt.

The farmer's component of the 87-cent-per-pound average retail price of beef was only 52 cents per pound.

One of the important contributions of American agriculture to the national economy has been its contribution to our balance of payments abroad.

Total agricultural exports increased from \$4.5 billion in 1960 to \$6.3 billion in 1968. Exports for dollars rose from \$3.2 to \$4.7 billion during this period. During the calendar year 1967, agricultural exports for dollars exceeded agricultural imports by \$585 million. This more than

offset the trade deficit for commercial trade of \$400 million in 1967.

From 1961 through 1968, agricultural exports contributed over \$32 billion to our balance of payments. Even though only about 22 percent of total exports are agricultural commodities, they account for over 50 percent of our favorable trade balance.

The efficiency and productivity of U.S. agriculture has made this country the world's largest exporter of food to the many nations of the world. In recent years the export of U.S. agricultural commodities has increased to the point where production from 1 out of each 4 acres is sold abroad. In addition to supplying much needed foreign exchange, this has contributed to the domestic economy by providing about 1 million jobs in the agribusiness fields.

American agriculture continues to make a major contribution to the national welfare through the production of bountiful supplies of high-quality and low-cost foods for the Nation's consumers. Food is one of today's best bargains.

This is apparent at the supermarkets, where city consumers can choose from thousands of safe, wholesome, and delicious foods—products of the farms of our 50 States. Using only 17 percent of their income, American consumers can select foods with a knowledge of nutrition and balanced diets that makes this a Nation of healthy and well-fed people. Many people in the world spend half or more of their available income on food. In underdeveloped areas people spend most of their time grubbing a living from the earth.

In 1929, 23.4 percent of consumer income in the United States went for food. This decreased to 22.2 percent in 1950, 20 percent in 1960, and 17 percent last year. This steady decrease has occurred despite the increasing portion of food costs which go for marketing and related services. If the 1960 level of 20 percent had continued through 1968, U.S. consumers would have had \$18 billion less to spend for the products of industry and labor.

Mr. Speaker, the above has been emphasized by the committee as some compelling reasons why it is realistic to expect our Government to help agriculture, because to help agriculture is to help our entire Nation. I subscribe to this philosophy. The bill—H.R. 11612—does not provide as much as some of us would like. However, we must remember that our Nation faces many pressing priorities. When this is kept in mind, the proposal constitutes sound farm legislation.

THE METRO SYSTEM

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters has been a prime mover of the concept and development of a rapid rail transit system for the metropolitan Washington region. As a Repre-

sentative from this metropolitan area, I have consistently supported the development of this metro system as well as all other aspects of our long-planned regional transportation system. The league, in their continuing efforts to see the implementation of this system, has directed to the Vice President and the Speaker its expression of urgent need for the appropriations of construction moneys for the metro system.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the expressions of concern of the league as set forth in this communication which follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL,
May 19, 1969.

The Honorable SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER McCORMACK: This letter is written in this manner to bring to the attention of all members of the Senate and the House of Representatives the urgent concern of the League of Women Voters of Metropolitan Washington because of the continued delay of the release of construction monies for the Regional Rapid Rail Transit System.

We hear daily that each day's delay impairs the carefully worked out financing of the rapid rail transit system because of escalating costs.

We experience daily the frustrations of automobile-clogged streets for which there is no foreseeable relief. The only existing system of mass public transportation (buses) is delayed on the same traffic-jammed streets.

The voters of the Washington Metropolitan Area on November 5, 1968, indicated by an overwhelming affirmative vote their desire to have construction of a regional rapid rail transit system begin immediately. These same voters even indicated their willingness to be taxed locally to achieve this goal.

The League of Women Voters of Metropolitan Washington must then ask these questions:

Why, if the contracts are ready to be let, and why, if the voters say yes, has not the Congress responded to the will of the people?
Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN H. BEIDLER, *Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Alexandria, Virginia: Mrs. George Weber.
Arlington County, Virginia: Mrs. Robert F. Cocklin.

Fairfax County, Virginia: Mrs. John Lindberg.

Falls Church, Virginia: Mrs. Jerome Blystone.

District of Columbia: Mrs. Philip G. Fortune.

Montgomery County, Maryland: Mrs. Ernest L. Heimann.

Prince George's County, Maryland: Mrs. Charles Cunningham.

PAN AMERICAN AIR FARE
REDUCTIONS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, with every American feeling the increasing pinch of higher and higher prices, it is refreshing to see any effort to hold the line or achieve reductions.

It is with that in mind that I call attention to steps taken by Pan American

World Airways to reduce fares this summer for passengers traveling between the United States and Europe on weekend flights.

The new fares, approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, will reduce the cost of weekend travel from \$399 to \$360 roundtrip between New York and London, for example, during normal travel periods. The weekend fare reductions have been accomplished by extending the 14- to 21-day excursion fares, now in effect, to cover weekends and certain other peak summer travel periods previously excluded.

I understand that in addition to weekend travel, passengers may now use the 14- to 21-day excursion fares during the peak travel periods of June 9 through July 3 and between August 4 through August 21 for travel originating in the United States, and from June 2 through June 19 and August 18 through 24 for travel originating in Europe.

Pan Am, I am told, plans to further lower fares between the United States and Europe when it introduced bulk inclusive tour fares on November 1.

Mr. Speaker, there have been occasions on which I found it necessary to criticize the action—or inaction—of the airlines. But I feel any effort to bring fares within the reach of the average American traveler deserves appropriate recognition.

PITTSBURGH'S OPPORTUNITY
SCHOOL

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I never heard of a school where poor attendance records and trouble with the police were prerequisites for admission, but such is the case in Pittsburgh's newest youth project, Opportunity School, located on the North Side.

This is an exciting and innovative effort to reach young truants and engage them in a meaningful program, before they arrive at the point of becoming full dropouts.

The Christian Science Monitor of May 10 carried the full story, citing already-realized major achievements of this 3-month project.

I include the article for the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

PITTSBURGH YOUTH PROJECT PRAISED

PITTSBURGH.—They call it Opportunity School.

The enrollment is small—just 30 boys—but to get in, the youth must be sentenced by a Juvenile Court judge.

So far, this pilot program to give boys who have poor school-attendance records and have been in trouble with the police, is creating quite a name for itself. Just the other day, State Attorney General William Sennett, in Pittsburgh for a speaking engagement, went out of his way to view the program.

The success of the school, located in a YMCA in the city's North Side area, is mirrored in the attendance records of the 30 boys.

And although the school has been in operation for just three months, Juvenile Court Judge Richard T. Wentley already sees these results:

Youths saying for the first time in their lives that they look forward to Monday so they can go back to school.

A real possibility that two of the students may be admitted to college.

Half of the youths volunteering to attend a summer-school extension of the program.

No behavioral problems.

Preparation now to readmit several youths to their old schools.

The school was established by the Pittsburgh Public School Board on the recommendation of Judge Maurice B. Cohill Jr. and Judge Wentley.

A cab picks up each student at his home every morning at 8:30 and drops him off at his home every evening at 8:30.

Each student gets 2½ hours daily of individualized academic instruction.

NO SCHOOL RECORD

During the remainder of each school day, the student receives counseling; engages in a cultural program including music, art, and arts and crafts; and takes part in an athletic program.

Although the enrollee must be sentenced to the school by the two Juvenile Court judges, no record will show the student was ever enrolled there. Instead, the boy will be classified as a transfer student at a nearby public high school.

The success of the program has led Judge Wentley to say he is anxious to see the program expanded to five or six such schools throughout the city.

Moreover, he says, "I think they [school officials] are as excited about it as I am and will put as much money into it as they can get their hands on."

Attorney General Sennett remarked after his tour of the school, "Certain state and federal funds can be made available to continue these projects all over the state. Through projects such as this we can put boys back into an educational setting."

DECLARATION FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST ON OCCASION OF ISRAEL'S 21ST BIRTHDAY

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, our distinguished colleague from New York, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, placed into the RECORD the text of a declaration for peace in the Middle East signed by 226 Members of Congress on the occasion of Israel's 21st birthday.

Through an oversight, I missed the opportunity to be recorded as one of those in support of this declaration, which I wish to rectify at this point.

The points enumerated in this declaration are wise, and could be the cornerstones of lasting peace in the Middle East if complied with by the Arab nations and by the United Nations. The valiant people of Israel have had my full support in the past, and I shall continue to direct my endeavors in Congress in support of those proposals leading to a just and lasting peace for the Middle East, with full sovereignty for the nation of Israel.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) and concur fully with his statement.

PROJECT CONCERN

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, "love" is one of the most misused and maligned words in the language of our time. Today, however, JOHN BRADEMAS and I are introducing a resolution to honor a man and an organization that truly exemplify the meaning of the word "love" in its deepest sense. We ask Congress to proclaim February 1970 as "Project Concern Month" in recognition of the humanitarian and unselfish service of this nonprofit, nonsectarian medical relief organization and its founder, Dr. James W. Turpin.

A decade ago Jim Turpin was a bright young doctor with a well-established, lucrative private practice in Coronado, one of San Diego County's finest cities. He and his wife, Martha, volunteered their services on a once-a-week basis in a medical clinic in the poverty-stricken sections of the nearby Mexican border town of Tijuana. The Turpins found this work so meaningful that they decided to devote themselves entirely to medical relief for the underprivileged and helpless of the world. Dr. Turpin conceived the idea of "Project Concern," which he hoped would generate a response from others who feel a personal desire to help the world's needy directly. Today, Project Concern is helping to bring a better way of life to people in Hong Kong, Mexico, South Vietnam, and Appalachia. One example of those Project Concern has helped is the "boat people" of Hong Kong. With a staggering housing shortage, dating back to World War II and greatly aggravated by the continued influx of refugees from Red China, Hong Kong is unable to provide decent housing for many of its people. Mainland housing is so scarce that several hundred thousand people live in disease and squalor on sampans and junks with no medical assistance whatsoever. Many have lived their entire lives on these boats and are too poor or too superstitious to go ashore for medical care when available. Dr. Turpin's typically simple approach was to bring in a specially designed Chinese junk, to move among the people and minister to their medical needs.

In recent years our world has witnessed more than its share of heartlessness and brutality. Yet we all strive to leave our children a legacy of peace, not war, and I think it is most fitting to pay tribute to Dr. Turpin and Project Concern for their selfless efforts toward this goal. In closing, I would like to share with my colleagues Dr. Turpin's opening prayer in the Senate on January 6 of this year, for these words express far better than I can the meaning and depth of Project Concern and I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting this resolution:

PROJECT CONCERN: OPENING PRAYER OF U.S. SENATE, JANUARY 6, 1969

(By James W. Turpin, M.D.)

Our Father, Creator of an expanding universe, Lord of a shrinking planet, we acknowl-

edge more fully your awesome love, patience and forgiveness.

Teach us that our world has now grown too small for anything less than brotherhood; that life has become too precious for anything less than peace; that human relations have become too critical for anything less than love.

Give us a sense of family. Make us realize that in our struggle for greatness it is not so much how deep in space we can go, but how far we can reach in solving the immediate problems of Your beloved earth's people. Help us to know, that until a hollow-eyed, emaciated, pot-bellied child of the Montagnard, Ibo or American Indian becomes "our child," we have not yet achieved our national purpose.

Give us a sense of peace. Teach us to wage peace as eagerly and enthusiastically as we have waged war. Make us to experience no real satisfaction if we win a war and lose a people. May peace become not just the static absence of fighting and dying, but the imaginative, dynamic situation where every man is at peace with himself because his family has enough.

And, Father, give us a sense of love. As the world's hungry, poor and sick ask, "Do you understand? Is it possible that you can feel our feelings?" Let this be our reply: "Love you? I am you!"

While others doubt, even scoff, let us direct our vast resources toward a world where every child eats enough, every woman is adequately attended in childbirth, and every man knows the dignity of supporting his own.

May this be our glorious quest. Amen.

ADDRESS OF JAMES REYNOLDS AT BALTIMORE PROPELLER CLUB MARITIME DAY LUNCHEON

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, because the port of Baltimore and its many activities are of such tremendous value to the State of Maryland, the Propeller Club of Baltimore makes special efforts to obtain the best possible speakers for their Maritime Day luncheons.

This year they were extremely fortunate in being able to hear from Jim Reynolds, the president of the newly formed American Institute of Merchant Shipping, known as AIMS.

AIMS is the strongest organization of American shipowners ever joined together and represents an impressive total of more than 540 American-flag ships, which is more than half of the active American merchant fleet. Therefore, as president, he is the principal management spokesman and his remarks are of special interest to us at this time when our merchant fleet is in such critical condition.

In the belief that all of you will be eager to learn what he had to say at that Maritime Day luncheon, I am including his remarks in the RECORD for your perusal:

MARITIME DAY ADDRESS BY JAMES J. REYNOLDS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MERCHANT SHIPPING, PROPELLER CLUB, BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 22, 1969

You kind people of the Propeller Club could not have done me a nicer favor than to invite me to Baltimore on Maritime Day, 1969. I know of no city where the special

atmosphere of seaports in more pervasive, or where interest in the Merchant Marine is more intense and constructive.

The Port of Baltimore has three characteristics relevant to what I want to say to you today. It is ancient, which means, really, that nature intended it to be a port. It is modern, which means that its people have insisted upon keeping up with change. And it has before it an ever-brighter future because you and your fellow Baltimoreans are not simply waiting for that future to be delivered—neatly containerized—but are going after it.

I want the United States merchant marine to go after its own future with the same kind of energy and imagination.

Our merchant marine, too, is ancient. It, too, has kept up with change, although perhaps not always in perfect synchronization with the opportunity and the need. But today it has got to move and move fast to seize the future.

I think we will do it. I find myself spouting optimistic utterance about the merchant marine during Maritime Week. I guess the news in that is not that I'm saying it, but that I say it with real conviction.

My intensive orientation course as president of the American Institute of Merchant Shipping has made me optimistic. I sense on all sides a new spirit, a can-do spirit, a will-do spirit, among those who desire a bright new era for the merchant marine.

I find this in Congress. There, your own Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, has just registered an extraordinary exploit of leadership. He has won committee approval and House approval of an authorization bill for construction and operating subsidies, and other merchant marine needs, which is the highest in a decade. And he calls it only a stopgap.

I find this new spirit in the Executive branch as well. President Nixon is preparing a comprehensive program to give effect to his campaign pledges—which he has reaffirmed since entering the White House—to “vastly improve the state of the American merchant marine.”

The new Maritime Administrator, Andrew E. Gibson, has declared: “I joined the Nixon team and went to Washington for a single purpose—to put our merchant marine back on the map of the world.” And Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans is preparing an all-out program to increase United States participation in the liner trades—“Ship American,” trade expansion, a solid increase of American cargoes in American ships.

In the industry itself there is evident an exciting spirit of adventure, just at a moment when technology is ready to make those adventures successful. The Naval Architects and Marine Engineers are breaking molds literally centuries old and giving their creative imaginations free rein. The operators are ordering the results, and the yards are building them—right now.

Not least important is a new sense of unity, of rapport, among those concerned with our merchant ships and their style of existence. In the industry, this has produced, in this year 1969, the formation of the organization I head, the American Institute of Merchant Shipping. The merchant marine is profiting from cooperation between the industry and the government.

I might express the hope that the same spirit of constructive unity would find expression in the ranks of labor. No labor union leaders have done more for their members than the leaders of the maritime unions. I know. In 1924 I shipped out as a deck boy on the America. I saw the conditions under which crews lived in those days—floating slums. I drew the kind of pay they drew.

The union leaders have accomplished wonders. If they would now only show the same tenacity and determination in the task of achieving a ceasefire among themselves, and

reasonable relations with management, a major obstacle to the realization of today's great promise for the merchant marine would be removed.

My conviction that the merchant marine will seize its future has as its partner the conviction that it can. To paraphrase the title of a song from not too far back, technology is bustin' out all over, in the merchant marine, and that one fact is a cornucopia of good auspices.

The basic meaning of this technological offensive is that the U.S. merchant fleet is going to become vastly more efficient. Greater efficiency means greater prosperity, not only for the ships but for all the other components of the system into which they fit—such as ports. Experience shows, I'm glad to note, that prosperity breeds prosperity.

To help speed this advance in efficiency, AIMS only a fortnight ago, as one of its first major actions, set in motion the organization of a Research Committee. We attach great importance to this. It is contemplated that the Committee will work closely in conjunction with the Office of Research and Development of the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce.

The new Maritime Administrator, Andrew Gibson—whose appointment was another of those encouraging auguries I have mentioned—is anxious that Marad's experts should join with our people in the broad field of research now demanding exploration.

The special areas have been pretty well marked out, and to define them is one way of defining the promises of technology.

The Marad research program in shipbuilding looks for ways to reduce the cost of building in U.S. yards and thereby decrease the construction differential subsidy. Jointly we will seek new breakthroughs in more efficient hull configuration—counter revolving and reversible propellers—more effective on board cargo handling equipment, etc.

A joint research program, by decreasing the magnitude of ship operating costs at sea, will hopefully make U.S. ships more competitive, and reduce operating differential subsidy.

The port research program seeks to increase productivity in port operations and thereby, decrease the total cost of transportation.

Let me pause for a parenthesis, touching on a vital matter. I would like to emphasize that the search for technological efficiency does not contemplate the elimination of human beings and their livelihood from the merchant marine.

Research on ship operations, for example, specifically undertakes to determine the optimum combination of hardware and manpower over the life of a ship. In this connection, attention is given to a definition and understanding of the problems, needs, and requirements of labor as well as of management and regulatory bodies. That language is largely the official language of Marad.

Technology and automation do present problems in adjustment for labor. I can say, because I know, that the industry not only fully recognizes this, but is completely committed to devising, with the people who work aboard American ships, the means of meeting the concerns of labor in making that adjustment. I am confident that the period of adjustment is one of transition, and that on the other side of the transition, technology and automation will produce an increase in maritime employment, not a decrease.

I fitted the parenthesis in where I did because the first three areas of research I mentioned—shipbuilding, ship operations, and port operations—bear most directly on employment, and do so right now. An affirmation of the industry's interest in the welfare of its workers seemed called for, and I am glad to give it.

Other areas of research in which we are intensely interested have to do with advanced ships—for example, nuclear ships and surface effect ships.

As you know, individual companies in the maritime industry conduct their own research programs, some of them extensive, and often extremely fruitful. What we are seeing today is a joining of the imaginations and skills of marine designers and engineers with resourcefulness of builders and the adventurous instincts inherent in the free enterprise of operators. Containerships and barge ships are a prime example of the results.

Let me note, also, as a sign of Congressional interest in this particular field, that the House authorization bill I have mentioned doubled, to \$15 million, the amount asked for merchant marine research and development. Another salute is due Congressman Garmatz for that.

The cooperation between the AIMS R & D Committee and the Marad R & D people is the kind of teamwork that pays off.

One of the circumstances which makes the need for technological audacity in shipping so great at this moment is that this country, thank heaven, is still expanding its frontiers and developing new terrain which must be served in new ways.

Who could fail to be fascinated by what is happening on the Alaskan North Slope? Some of you may have attended the recent Tanker Conference of the American Petroleum Institute up in the Poconos. One of its highlights was a talk by a Canadian expert on the Arctic, Commodore O.C.S. Robertson.

The movement of petroleum from the new fields on the North Slope and the Canadian Yukon will require, he said, a new type of ship and new kinds of men. He used new phrases—“ice knowledgeable scientists,” “ice-competent shipmasters,” and “ice-able ships.” The three phrases sum up a great new challenge to maritime technology and human intelligence. Success in meeting the challenge will mean fulfillment of a centuries-old dream of seafarers, the safe and regular—perhaps even almost continuous navigation of the Northwest Passage. That would be a triumph of turning mythology into reality.

American participation in this vast, novel, and complex enterprise provides as good an example as you could want of that bold acceptance of challenge which is part of the new spirit I have been talking about in the American merchant marine.

There was one passage in Commodore Robertson's remarks which I'm going to quote just for the fun of it, because it combines so neatly in one package both the reality and the romance of shipping. They don't always go well together.

Of the mariners who must deal with that forbidding part of the world, he said:

“These men do not have adventures. Adventures are wasteful, inefficient, costly and dangerous. They have no place in the Arctic.”

I would not differ with him. I would only call your attention to a further meaning of his words which is that the adventures must nevertheless be undertaken, though somewhere short of the Arctic. They must take place on the drawing boards, the shipyards, in the minds and nerves of seafaring men, and, yes, in the board rooms of the enterprises which buy and operate ships, and—yes, again—in government offices over in Washington.

Apart from the special challenges of the Arctic, change is presenting new challenges and new opportunities for the American merchant marine in its traditional trade around the world.

The fruits of technology, in regular trade, are much higher levels of capability in vital areas of merchant ship performance. These include rapid cargo handling, very fast turnaround, speed on voyages port-to-port, and a versatility in serving ports from the most sophisticated to the most primitive.

For example, container ships can't be beat for serving container ports. At present, not all ports are equipped to take advantage of

the container revolution. Eventually, one may suppose, all major ports will be so equipped. In the meantime, there are parts of the world where ports which are the coronary valves of struggling national economies still depend upon lighterage to move their cargoes in and out.

Even in some of the so-called more advanced countries, great vessels tie up alongside quays built in antiquity, and must depend upon the sheer muscle of the local cargo gangs to load and discharge. For such ports, barge ships provide an innovative means of sustaining service during the transition to modernity, and yet are capable of performing as container vessels when the ports are ready.

The process is one of progressive realization of the promise of technology. As one of our leading ship operators said recently, "When a vessel can go into a port and load or unload cargo in one day instead of five or 10 or even 15 days, the ship operator can gain as much as 70 percent in the number of new voyages." And since containers and barges are interchangeable from one ship to another in a fraction of the time traditionally required for trans-shipment, there exists the solid prospect of developing new intercontinental trade routes not economically practicable in other days, using old methods.

We at the American Institute of Merchant Shipping have studies which show that with ultra-modern vessels, half the number of cargo liners now under the U.S. merchant flag could carry twice the present amount of liner cargo.

To put it another way, only 69 vessels of the revolutionary container and ocean-going barge-ship types now being built could completely replace the annual lift capacity of the 322 ships in the present U.S. subsidized liner fleet. Those 69 ships would have a lift capacity equal to 260 ships of a type we now call fast and modern—the C-4s.

But technological brilliance falls short of realizing its full potential unless it is translated into ships. We need ships, and the ships need cargo.

I prefer not to talk in terms of building enough ships to equal present performance. I like to talk about carrying a lot more cargo.

President Nixon has suggested that the U.S. flag fleet should carry at least 30 percent of U.S. ocean-borne cargo. I know of no reason why we should not shoot for a figure of 50 percent.

The ship operators are ready to expand and modernize their fleets. AIMS found in a recent canvass that 19 companies—subsidized and unsubsidized—have an urgent need for 82 vessels—containerships, bulk carriers, LASH (Lighter Aboard Ship) barge carriers, a tanker, and a number of major conversions.

It is not my intention to suggest that the whole hefty shopping list of the merchant marine can be checked off in one trip to the store. But I do feel that we are closer to making a good beginning on it than we have been for a long time.

As a preparatory step before receiving the promised new Nixon merchant marine program, the House authorization bill Congressman Garmatz did so much to shape would, if the appropriation followed suit, provide \$145 million in new money for merchant marine construction subsidies instead of the \$15 million asked in the final Johnson budget proposal. Together with funds previously approved but not spent, the new figure would bring the total available to \$246 million. And the authorization bill proposes \$212 million for operating subsidies, up to \$17 million from the budget request.

Without counting chickens before they're hatched, it is possible to expect that we are, indeed, going to get more money for ships than we have been getting.

I'd like now to be a bit more parochial for a minute. I've been dealing with the mer-

chant marine from a national standpoint. I certainly have not lost sight of the importance of Baltimore and that huge part of Maryland's life and the nation's life which ties in to your port.

We are counting on Baltimore to take advantage of these developing opportunities for its own sake, and to help us at AIMS to make the most of them. Your record to date makes us look to Baltimore as a sort of powerful auxiliary of AIMS.

The merchant marine cannot forget that from spontaneous beginnings in colonial times, even before there was a Baltimore, this two-way relay point between America and the world has grown to be the nation's fifth largest port. Every year more than 40 million tons of cargo cross its piers inbound and outbound, supplying industry and commerce with their needs and providing markets the world over.

Anyone even casually familiar with the Baltimore story knows that most of this happened because you were determined that it should. You boosted Baltimore to its present ranking against stiff competition from other ports up and down the coast. Alert port management, superb service, vigorous selling in the United States and abroad, making the most of what you had, building what you needed, have made this a magnificent example of how a port can thrive, and what a thriving port can return in benefits to the environment in which it exists.

An historically-minded friend tells me that Rolling Road, on the outskirts of your city, got its name from the practice of rolling hogheads of tobacco along its path to ships loading in the Patapsco River—a very early form of containerization. So, the timely introduction and rapid development of modern container facilities in the Port of Baltimore are only the latest example of a process which as nearly as I can gather will go on as long as the channels of the Chesapeake Bay and the canal to the Delaware are even slightly moist.

The American merchant marine can profit immeasurably from your ideas and your exertions. As the port of Baltimore prospers, so does the merchant marine, and as the merchant marine prospers, so does Baltimore. I can't think of a sounder basis for a long and happy life together.

DEFENSE ON THE DEFENSIVE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week's colloquy here on the House floor between the chairmen of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees obviously is receiving much attention not because of what was said, but because of who said it.

Indeed, that heralded verbal exchange may not go down in the annals as one of Congress' "great debates," yet I find it significant that criticism of the Military Establishment now seems to be coming from all directions—not just from a small grouping of continual critics of the military.

And, with this new criticism, we also see a much deeper analysis of overall national direction and priority. Hopefully, all of this can—and soon will—be converted into a true reordering of this Nation's goals and objectives, with the emphasis on a free, just, and equitable society open to all men.

Last Friday's Wall Street Journal carries an editorial commenting upon the Mahon-Rivers dialog and upon the various implications arising from this new criticism of the military complex. I would now like to insert the editorial, entitled "Defense on the Defensive" into the Record at this point:

DEFENSE ON THE DEFENSIVE

If there was any question that the Pentagon faced a new atmosphere in Congress, Rep. Mahon dispelled the doubts the other day. The Texas Democrat, who heads both the Appropriations Committee and its Defense subcommittee, long has been one of the staunchest supporters of military spending. Yet he rose on the House floor to protest that the Pentagon was impairing public confidence with its "many mistakes."

Indeed it is. Perhaps the timing was only coincidental, but in the past few days the public has heard charges that a fleet of Air Force cargo planes will cost \$1.2 billion (or is it \$2 billion?) more than estimated; it has read that the Army may lose \$200 million or so on a big helicopter; it has noted the sinking of a \$50 million Navy submarine at its construction dock.

In the circumstances it does nothing to bolster public confidence to hear Rep. Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and still a Pentagon champion, "explain" that there really have been no cost "overruns"—merely some "inaccurate" estimates of cost.

Like most Americans, Congressmen always have firmly believed that the nation should have an adequate defense. Like most people, too, the lawmakers have assumed that military men are likely to know more about military matter than ordinary citizens do.

From these two valid premises, Congress leaped to an invalid conclusion: That the legislators should give the Pentagon whatever it wanted. More than that, Congress often has pushed on the Defense Department even more money than it sought.

In doing so the lawmakers abdicated their proper role. Sure, they should give heavy weight to the Pentagon's views on defense, just as they should mull the Agriculture Department's ideas on farming and the Transportation Department's thoughts on highways and railroads. But Congress has an obligation to consider critically the whole Government, and whether money is being allocated wisely and is likely to be well-spent.

Part of the problem is that the Government, and especially the Defense Department has grown so large that it's difficult for Congress to survey it properly. Even that doesn't excuse the lawmakers, though, since they could have been doing a far better job if they had overhauled their own antiquated appropriations procedures—and then mustered the will to use them.

The current Congressional criticism stems from several sources. For some lawmakers, the main incentive is their distaste for the Vietnam War; they eye with special care any money to be spent on it. Many in Congress were rightfully disturbed by apparent Johnson Administration efforts to conceal rising outlays in Southeast Asia.

A lot of Congressmen also are quite correctly concerned about inflation. Spending priorities and avoidance of waste, always important, are now even more so.

For the most part the Pentagon's recent difficulties had their origins years ago, and so can't be laid to the current Administration. In Deputy Secretary Packard, the Defense Department now has an able administrator who can, if he chooses, improve the Pentagon's own housekeeping. In Secretary Laird, the Department has a Congressional veterans who can, if he chooses, encourage the process of legislative review.

Rep. Rivers seems to think that Rep. Mahon and other critics of the Pentagon are "playing into the hands of the enemies of the military," and there may be a chance that the attacks will go too far. We would like to believe, however, that the new atmosphere will only help encourage Congress to do what it should have been doing all along: Keeping a close watch on all Federal spending.

Whatever the "enemies" of the military think about that, a lot of us would consider it a welcome development.

SUBSIDIZED SEDITION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers, very much against their will, are being forced to subsidize Marxist rebellion in which the poor exploited Negroes are nothing but misled cannon fodder.

Last November the taxpayers thought they had delivered a plain message to the new administration that they wanted no more federally subsidized violence—only now they learn that the present administration prefers not to alter the former administration's policies.

The most recent revulsion to American taxpayers is today's announcement by the OEO of a grant of nearly \$1 million to finance black capitalism by a band of self-declared insurrectionists at Durham, N.C.

A clipping from the New Hampshire Sunday News of March 23, 1969, and from the Evening Star of May 26, 1969, follow:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Sunday News, Mar. 23, 1969]

REACHING LEVEL OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT: REVEAL MANY BLACK REBELS ON FEDERAL PAYROLL

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The White House has received disturbing intelligence that the black revolutionary movement is spreading so rapidly among negro youth that it has reached the level of a national security threat.

A hard core of urban guerrillas is being trained by hate-filled racists to lie, cheat, steal and burn—in short, to destroy American society as it exists today. Their handiwork is help to foment current U.S. campus explosions and slum violence.

To make matters worse, many of the revolutionaries are supported by federal funds. Some are on the payroll of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) as local anti-poverty workers. Others are "separatist" college faculty members drawing federal grants.

Although congressional probes and newspaper exposes have linked local OEO Community Action groups with black militants, the full extent of the corruption is only now being conveyed to the administration. A forthcoming report on the OEO by the General Accounting Office is said to contain "hair-raising" revelations of local mismanagement and swindling.

Two clashing viewpoints on how to deal with the situation exist among the President's top advisers.

MOYNIHAN AND CO.

Presidential assistant Daniel "Pat" Moynihan and his group of urban specialists are aware of the "takeover" of some OEO programs by racial firebrands and overly per-

missive local officials, but favor keeping the agency essentially as is, perhaps adding tougher accounting and monitoring measures.

They are working currently on guidelines for a broad federal welfare approach.

Other presidential advisers, however, are alarmed at the inroads the militants are making in the negro community.

They advocate a two-pronged attack. They would continue the traditional effort to wipe out the roots of poverty with education, jobs and welfare.

But they would simultaneously wage a tough campaign to quell black violence.

They do not want to telegraph their punches but appear to be thinking in terms of sophisticated counter-intelligence aimed at rooting out subversives from federally-funded programs. The activity, according to one proposal, would head up to a secret White House command post.

The latter group, of which counsel John Ehrlichman is said to belong, believes it has the President's ear. Mr. Nixon is described as disappointed with the failure of Moynihan's people thus far to develop really new approaches to urban problems.

Much of the intelligence now reaching the administration is drawn from sizzling reports in the files of OEO which have hitherto been pushed under the rug or leaked back to militants. Now they are being leaked to the White House.

While U.S. Ambassador to France, R. Sargent Shriver was chief of OEO, programs were funded too fast in many cases to check local personnel. "Black Panthers" and other violence-prone militants were hired.

Gerson Green, director of research and development in OEO's Community Action Program, worked closely with Shriver to authorize the programs. Their philosophy was highly permissive, favoring "payoffs" to militants to keep them from rioting.

Green is now a top-level consultant to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch.

The Shriver-Green coalition permitted hard core revolutionaries to siphon off poverty funds in Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco and other cities.

BRIBES

Some U.S. mayors openly describe OEO's youth programs as "bribes" to keep young negroes from rioting, but are eager nevertheless to keep receiving the money for whatever insurance it may provide against disturbances.

Messrs. Shriver and Green approved funding for a Los Angeles Community Action Program which hired Ron Karenga (formerly Ron Everett), a notorious advocate of violence.

Karenga drew a federal salary as a full-time "tutor" last summer while heading a gang known as "US." Other militants headed rival gangs, among them Billy Tidwell ("Sons of Watts"), Ronald Leroy Crook ("Community Alert Patrol"), Bo Simmons ("Young Men for Total Democracy"), and Tommy Jacquette ("Self-Leadership for All Nationalities Today," known as "Slant").

Karenga's employment was discovered, but quickly hushed up, about the time Mr. Shriver was due to visit the annual summer festival at Watts.

ADVOCATES OF VIOLENCE

Jacquette, who advocated "burning all of America down," was employed as a field worker-counselor at the Westminster Project, the biggest and best-known anti-poverty activity in Watts, which received more than a million dollars of federal money in 1967.

In San Francisco, a group of Hunters Point negro youths employed in the local summer program, accompanied by their boss Charles Sizemore, entered the office of area director George Jackson, held a knife to his throat,

and demanded a month's extension of their salaries.

Sizemore, Arnold Perkins and George Murray, other local poverty workers, used their positions to encourage virulent black racism among negro youths.

In Washington, D.C., federal funds pay the salary of James Garrett, a black racist on the faculty of Federal City College, who earlier helped foment violence on the campus of San Francisco State College. He was one of a group referred to by acting president S. I. Hayakawa before a House Sub-Committee as "dedicated revolutionaries."

Recently, Garrett lectured students at the University of Oregon on techniques of making firebombs and hand grenades.

MURDERERS ON PAYROLL

Evaluations last summer of the Woodlawn Project in Chicago showed criminals in top positions. Five murders were committed by people in the project while it was under discussion at OEO.

In San Francisco, Black Panther Bobby Seale told youth employment program participants to "get guns, get organized, and shoot it out." In that area, local poverty leaders had purposely hired as summer program coordinators in five target areas "articulate radicals," "gang leaders," and "real hard core, anti-establishment people."

The realization appears to be growing that it is a mistake to assume only the white community has the solution to racial problems and negroes are only passive witnesses to the riots and crime emanating from their communities.

One possible approach might be to require security clearance for all those hired in federally-funded programs to make certain they are, first of all, loyal to the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 26, 1969]

OEO GRANT TO DURHAM NEGROES IS PROTESTED (By Richard Critchfield)

White North Carolina Republicans are protesting a \$900,000 Office of Economic Opportunity grant to a Negro foundation in Durham which they say is a spawning ground for revolution-bent guerrillas.

The grant, announced April 24, is catching the Nixon administration in the middle.

President Nixon's choice to head OEO, Donald Rumsfeld, was not sworn as the new director of the federal anti-poverty agency until today and holdover Johnson administration aides have been making most of the policy decisions.

The grant is now nearing the end of a 30-day processing period and "the money will be dispersed" soon, OEO said in a statement.

The White House apparently does not want to overturn the commitment, but a Nixon aide said the foundation will be watched closely to make sure that no OEO funds are misused.

The grant, funded under OEO's Special Impact program, is important both as the Nixon administration's first big pilot project in minority business enterprise and because it illustrates the problem of trying to separate the federal war on poverty from the Negro revolt against poverty.

It represents the first of \$10 million in OEO grants to be allocated before June 30 to businesses owned by minority groups. In his 1970 budget request, President Nixon has asked the program be expanded next year to \$46 million.

BLACKS BUY STOCK

The controversial project would establish a black-owned supermarket, jam and preserves factory, and an enterprise to produce coffins. They would be run by a new business, United Durham, Inc., and would be expected to produce about \$3 million in gross sales and create jobs initially for 125 people and later on for 3,000.

Durham's black community is proud of the project and has already bought \$46,000 of stock in the supermarket in mostly \$5 shares.

The problem, as many of Durham's white leaders see it, is that the money will first be channeled through the town's 15-month-old Foundation for Community Development, whose black staff includes militants some whites say were involved in campus riots and fire-bombings this spring.

Jim Holshouser, chairman of the North Carolina Republican party, has urged federal funds "not be used to feed the fires of unrest which cross North Carolina today." He has appealed to Rumsfeld to hold up the grant until he has time to investigate the foundation.

The Republican chairman's chief objection, shared apparently by many whites in Durham, was the role of the foundation's militant "training director," Howard Fuller, in campus disorders this spring at the University of North Carolina, Duke and Belmont Abbey.

Fuller was arrested April 29 on the Belmont Abbey campus on a trespassing charge after black students seized a college building just after hearing him deliver a speech. Last month five Negro youths, riding in a car belonging to the foundation and registered in Fuller's name, were arrested and charged with throwing fire-bombs into Duke University woodlands.

JUST RHETORIC

Earlier this year Fuller was instrumental in helping black students from Duke establish a makeshift "Malcolm X. Liberation University" in downtown Durham. At the dedication ceremony, Fuller said, "We will teach here why we must destroy capitalism."

At a national conference of community action agency directors here at the Shoreham Hotel March 10, Fuller told a cheering audience it must destroy OEO's antipoverty program "either from within or without." He also called integration "a flop," saying, "If you get ready to fight a war you do not bring your enemy into your discussions of strategy."

"It's just rhetoric," said Edward Stewart, an official of OEO's successful Project Outreach in Durham, which promotes small Negro businesses. "Howard's not a nut. He knows how to keep the kids in check."

But Durham's white community is more inclined to take Fuller's words at face value.

Ed Martin, assistant city editor of the Durham Herald, who has just completed a series of investigative articles on Fuller and the Foundation for Community Development voiced the suspicion the foundation may be just a facade for Fuller's activities to organize and radicalize North Carolina's black students.

GRANT QUESTIONED

Martin also said he was "appalled by OEO's investigation before making the grant." He said, "They didn't check with more than four or five people in town here before making what is almost a million-dollar grant."

Interviewed in Washington, Geoffrey Faux, chief of OEO's development branch, said: "Fuller's relationship with the foundation is really irrelevant to what we're doing. We envision no role for Mr. Fuller and he is not to be paid out of Special Impact project funds."

Faux produced a list of those interviewed in Durham during the investigation. It included the president of Durham's black bank and its first Negro county commissioner as well as one of two Negro city councilmen. The others were either officials of the recipient foundation itself or members of Durham's community action agency. The only outside white person contacted was Jack J. Priss, a Duke University sociology professor defeated in a city council election last week who has been active in campus demonstrations.

One white newspaper editor said "radical tension and an almost constant threat of disruption" had gripped Durham since Fuller began operating there and that a number of Negro families were opposed to his militant activities but were afraid to speak out. He said the towns-people were "incensed" over the grant.

In contrast, Negro leaders praised Nathan T. Garrett, the foundation's executive director, Fuller and the foundation, saying the OEO grant would bring real benefit to the black community of Durham. Said one: "Fuller has organized the black community here. All he's giving the whites is the same thing the black man in Durham has experienced so long a time."

In a letter to OEO, Garrett pledged Fuller would have "no policy responsibilities" in administering the \$900,000 grant. He described Fuller's role as heading a staff "devoted to training neighborhood workers and leadership for the poor . . . and with nonacademic employ groups in colleges and universities throughout the state so that these persons can seek better working conditions."

ALL CITIZENS SHOULD FOLLOW THE ESTABLISHED PROCEDURE BY WHICH A CITIZEN CAN FILE A FORMAL COMPLAINT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, once again the militant leader of Pride, Inc., the Labor Department's pet make-work program in the District of Columbia, has made headlines by assaulting a police officer.

Once again Mr. Barry has, by bringing his teenage gang of hoodlums into the District building, forced Commissioner Washington into hysterical action—in this case appointment of a "top priority investigation" of the police officer's conduct by the policeman's boss, the Public Safety Director, assisted by the District of Columbia Human Relations Commission and the militant Mr. Barry's attorneys.

Mr. Speaker, Carl W. Beatty, president of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia, has written an open letter to Commissioner Washington expressing the grave concern of his organization over the District Building hysteria which followed Mr. Barry's antics. I believe his comments should be studied carefully by all our colleagues, in whom the Constitution has vested final responsibility of maintaining law and order in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Beatty's letter reads as follows:

POLICEMAN'S ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington D.C., May 15, 1969.

Open letter to:
Mayor WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAYOR WASHINGTON: I am writing as president of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia, whose membership is comprised of over 4,700 active and retired policemen. On behalf of the men on the force, and to express their strong feelings, I write to protest the manner in which the investigation of the arrest of Marlon Barry is being handled.

If a policeman on the Metropolitan Police force has allegedly engaged in misconduct, there is a procedure established by which a citizen can file a formal complaint, which will be processed in an orderly, established manner, which will result in an investigation and a report. We on the force do not understand why a complaint by Mr. Barry is handled any differently or why you, as the Mayor, must order a top priority investigation by the Public Safety Director, assisted by the District of Columbia Human Relations Commission and Mr. Barry's lawyers, as was reported in the daily papers. It has been publicly announced by one of Mr. Barry's lawyers that he intends to file a civil action for damages. I suppose this will involve the individual policeman and the District of Columbia government. To the men on the force who are on the streets day in and day out, trying to maintain law and order, it is difficult to understand why the Public Safety Director, who is their boss, is working with the attorneys for a person who intends to sue the policeman and the District.

In this day and age, and in the atmosphere in the District created by people like Mr. Barry, who makes public pronouncements that police are like mad dogs, a policeman tried before a jury in this jurisdiction is at a complete disadvantage. When this is compounded by the Public Safety Director and the Human Relations Commission being directed to work with attorneys representing Mr. Barry, then the police office is indeed in a sad way.

We do not understand how Mr. Duncan, as Safety Director, can personally conduct an investigation of a police officer, since ultimately, he must be the judge of the police officer's conduct following investigation. Since a police officer has neither the means nor the opportunity to conduct his own investigation, it seems that the only proper procedure is to have such investigation conducted by a totally and completely impartial, disinterested Board. Upon complaint, properly filed, Mr. Barry would have the right to present his case to the Citizen Complaint Review Board, who would determine if there is sufficient evidence upon which to bring charges before a Trial Board. This is the only function of an investigation by officials of the District of Columbia. It is not, and cannot be, to assist a complainant's attorneys in gathering evidence for a civil suit.

We members of the force would also like to know, once and for all, whether we are supposed to enforce the law as it is written. The law includes within it traffic regulations and other provisions which to many people seem to be inconsequential. We would like to know, Mr. Mayor, what we are supposed to do if every person we gave a ticket to tore it up and threw it in our faces. If Mr. Barry can do it, why can't every citizen do it? And if every citizen can do it, what is our function? We feel that we should have the right to enforce the law with the full and complete support of you and the Public Safety Director, as well as the Chief of Police. If improper action by a police officer has been taken in enforcing the law, the courts are there to protect the citizen. We on the force do not feel that we must justify our decisions and our judgment on the public streets, for to be required to do so would, in fact, create innumerable disturbances and ill will. It seems to us, therefore, that the District government should strongly support us in doing a job which we are paid to do, and to which we are dedicated. To be confronted by a "top priority investigation" every time we enforce the law against someone like Mr. Barry is to destroy the morale of the men who can very properly say: "Why make an arrest? Why enforce the law? Let's put in our eight hours and pick up our check." If this is what you want, and I am sure it is not, just tell us.

We sincerely trust that the men on the force, in enforcing the law, will have your

full and complete support. We also hope that procedures established by law will be followed in judging the complaint of Mr. Barry, as it would be in any other case.

Respectfully,

CARL W. BEATTY,
President.

A 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in an eloquent address before an audience in the Douglas Gardens Jewish Home for the Aged in Miami, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, urged enactment of a 10-point program for senior citizens.

It is with pleasure and an honor for me to have the distinction of inserting Mr. Cohen's speech in the RECORD:

A 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS*

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, professor of education, the University of Michigan)

It is a pleasure to meet today with my senior citizen friends in Miami. I welcomed your invitation because it gives me the opportunity to discuss with you the policies that I believe our Nation should pursue to achieve the goal of a better and more meaningful life for the Older American. I believe that this is the time when we can take additional steps to bring us closer to that goal.

A 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

I intend to work for:

1. The Right to Adequate Retirement Income.

Raise social security benefits by 50 percent, and the minimum to at least \$100 a month. Make the levels of benefits "inflation-proof" by automatic increases in line with increased living costs.

2. The Right to Comprehensive Health Care.

Broaden Medicare to protect against the heavy costs of prescription drugs and to include preventive services.

Finance medical as well as hospital insurance under Medicare through contributions from employers, employees, and the Federal Government.

Expand comprehensive out-of-institution health services for the elderly.

3. The Right to Decent Housing.

Establish and maintain standards for health and safety in rental housing.

Expand rent-supplement programs for low-income elderly.

Expand long-term insured and direct housing loan programs at rates within the means of the elderly.

4. The Right to Rehabilitative Services.

Provide special rehabilitation services for older Americans, including training, counseling, placement, and follow-up.

Expand homemaker, home health, and other services to enable older people to remain at home if they so desire.

5. The Right to Meaningful Employment Opportunities.

Eliminate arbitrary age discrimination in employment.

Expand work opportunities, and education and training programs for older workers.

6. The Right to Comprehensive Community Services.

Develop a full range of community services, such as friendly visitors, legal and protective services, nutritional service, information and referral services—conveniently located and accessible in the neighborhood.

7. The Right to Life-long Learning. Encourage learning as a life-long pursuit. Devise special adult education programs to prepare for new careers in the retirement years.

8. The Right to Full Participation. Assure the elderly a role in the recreational and cultural life of the community.

Expand senior centers, opportunities for volunteer services, and recreational and cultural programs.

9. The Right to Services Based on New Knowledge.

Expand health research, particularly in the chronic and degenerative diseases.

Expand research in social services, retirement counseling, and leisure time activities.

10. The Right to Choose Freely.

Assure older people a wide range of choices—in jobs, in housing, in family and community life—in a dynamic and improving society.

Recent progress

We can and we must continue the progress that has been made in the past few years to advance the well-being of our senior citizens. During this decade we have begun to take the steps which are necessary to solve some of the problems of the aged and to take advantage of the opportunities that the older population represents. What has been accomplished because of the concern and increased awareness, which your group did so much to highlight, is something unique in our history.

There has been more legislation enacted in the past 4 years to meet the needs of the aged than was enacted in the past 40 years:

The 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act provided the largest social security benefit increase in history.

The 30 year fight for health insurance for the aged was won.

The Older Americans Act is bringing new and expanded services to older people in their own communities.

The Economic Opportunity Act has widened the attack on poverty.

The regional medical program is attacking heart disease, stroke, and cancer—diseases which cause 70 percent of deaths of older people.

The Comprehensive Health Planning Act is coordinating community health facilities and services to meet health needs including those of the elderly.

Amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act provides services to meet the special problems of older workers.

Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act aid in the rehabilitation of physically and mentally handicapped individuals including the aged handicapped.

Legislation expanding library services will bring increased opportunities for meaningful living to older people.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has initiated the "Model Cities," neighborhood facilities, home rehabilitation, and rent supplement programs—all of which will benefit the older person.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 has outlawed age discrimination in employment by employers, employment agencies and labor unions.

Yes, much progress has been made in identifying the needs of the older population and in the development of programs and services to meet them. But the job has just begun.

Social Security

We cannot relax our efforts when 30 percent of our older population—5 million

people—still live in poverty. Their incomes, which are too meager to live on decently, must be raised.

We must continue to improve the social security program—the biggest anti-poverty program in the United States. Social Security benefits right now are keeping 10 million persons out of poverty. By increasing the minimum monthly benefits to \$80 for an individual and to \$120 for a couple, 1 million more persons, including 800,000 persons 65 and over, would be immediately moved out of poverty. We must increase the minimum benefit to \$100 a month over a period of time.

In as prosperous a country as the United States, where the Gross National Product has been increasing at an average annual rate of 5 percent, there is no reason why social security beneficiaries should not share in the expanding prosperity. I think we can and we must steadily improve the social security program to keep pace with the Nation's economic growth.

Public assistance

For most people, additional improvements in the social security program would be sufficient to help them out of poverty. But it must be recognized that there are people who may, for one reason or another, require public assistance. And today their needs are not being met adequately. In addition to inadequate payments, residence and other restrictive eligibility requirements are barriers to meeting their needs.

No one is happy with the present welfare system. The President's Commission on Income Maintenance is studying ways to overhaul the system and to deal with the gaps which exist. We do not know yet what the recommendations of the Commission will be. But while we are waiting for a longer-run solution we must make some radical changes in the scope of coverage, in the adequacy of payments, in the way welfare payments are administered and in building incentives to independence.

One way to accomplish this is to establish a Federal system of income payments with eligibility, the amount of payments and appeals determined on a national basis. This would overcome many of the problems of inequity and State variations and fiscal inadequacy which plague the present welfare system. I suggest this proposal for further consideration.

Adequate income

Our goal must be to enable all retired people to command a purchasing power related to their needs. We must assure them a basic income which permits them to participate fully in family and community life without being required to work and without the stigma of charity. But those who are able and wish to supplement their basic retirement incomes through earnings must be helped to do so. Society needs their continued services.

Health insurance

Another area that demands our attention is the health needs of the aged. While Medicare has reduced the financial barriers to medical care that previously existed for many older persons, serious health problems still confront the aged. We must continue our pursuit of the American goal of a later life free from illness, disability and suffering. The extension of health insurance protection to cover preventive services such as periodic health examinations and disease detection services might be one means of reducing the incidence of serious disabling diseases in old age.

But certainly we must find ways of combatting the rising cost of medical care, including the mounting costs of drugs that drain the budgets of many elderly people.

*Presented at Douglas Gardens, Miami, Florida.

Currently elderly people spend 5 times as much on medicines as do younger persons.

Two proposals would help us eventually combat this problem: the Medicare-Medicaid Drug Cost Determination bill, which would establish a reasonable cost range for drugs supplied under the Medicare-Medicaid and child health programs; and the United States Drug Compendium Bill, which would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to publish a complete and up-to-date compendium of lawfully available drugs together with all pertinent prescribing information for use by physicians, pharmacists, and the general public.

Housing

The aged also must have adequate housing at prices they can afford and a wide variety of alternative living arrangements.

Too many of them today live in one room walkups, shabby hotels, old lodging houses, or isolated farmhouses. Much of this housing is unsafe, unhealthy, and rat infested. Rents take about one-third of the income of the aged. Much more must be done to improve the housing situation of the aged.

One step that could be taken, would be to require States, as a condition for the Federal approval of a State old-age assistance plan, to establish and designate a State agency to be responsible for maintaining standards of health and safety in housing rented to old-age assistance recipients. Such a requirement would provide an essential safeguard for the living arrangements of a highly vulnerable group—the needy aged.

But the aged, no matter what their income, need more housing options. Their needs and desires are as varied as any other age group and no single type of housing can be expected to satisfy all the aged. Some may wish to stay in their own homes, others may wish to move into high rise apartments. Some may want to enter a church home, others to live in a retirement village. All these options must be available.

Work and retirement

Alternative and new combinations must also be available with respect to work and retirement. Some people want to retire at 60, others never. Some want to work full-time, others part-time. For those who retire, meaningful retirement activities must be available to them.

Social services

The development of appropriate social services would greatly increase the freedom of choice in living arrangements. Homemaking services, home health services and protective services for the aged in sufficient supply would give many older persons who must now live in institutions a chance to remain in their homes if they so desire.

The expansion of senior centers, the development of adult education programs and increasing opportunities for volunteer services would also give older people greater freedom of choice.

CONCLUSION

Bold new imaginative approaches are needed if we are to meet our obligation to the generations who have contributed so much to this nation's progress. And just as important is that they continue their contributions to the fabric of the economy they helped so much to shape.

Working together we can continue to keep the spotlight on the urgent needs of the Older American. We must continue to urge programs that will meet their needs. Based on our past experience, I am confident that great strides can be made in 1969, 1970, and the years ahead. I intend to give all I have—my energy, my mind, and my heart—to putting into action the ten-point program I have outlined today.

I ask your help and your dedication in this great effort.

PESTICIDES—LET US SPRAY?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last month WCBS-TV, New York, presented an alarming and courageous documentary showing the effect that DDT and related pesticides are having on Atlantic coastal fisheries. The program entitled "DDT/SOS" was produced by Osborne Segerberg, Jr. and narrated by CBS-TV science editor, Earl Ubell. It was presented as a part of the award-winning public service series, "Eye on New York."

I was privileged to be able to arrange to have this important program viewed by a distinguished conservationist, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, and by such congressional conservation leaders as Senators PHILIP A. HART and GAYLORD NELSON and Congressmen JOHN D. DINGELL and WILLIAM F. RYAN. CBS-TV was so impressed by the reaction of these leaders that it broadcasts their comments in separate programs.

The dangers that DDT and related nonbiodegradable pesticides pose for our environment are very grave. I am pleased to be able to reprint in the RECORD at this time the entire CBS program and the comments of Justice Douglas and my colleagues dealing with one very important facet of this problem:

"DDT/SOS" A SPECIAL REPORT BY WCBS-TV NEWS

UBELL. By 10 o'clock in the morning, most of the work is done here at the Fulton Fish Market. The stalls are empty. The fish have been sold and carted away.

But one day this market and these stalls might be empty for another reason. There might be no fish to sell. The mackerel, the tuna, the bass, the snapper might be reduced to such small numbers that fishing might not pay.

Why? Well, we are pouring new chemicals into the oceans, chemicals that reduce the fertility of fish to such a low level that they could indeed disappear.

The Challenger out of Sandy Hook, New Jersey. A research vessel of the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife . . . hunting down the threats to sea life—combinations of acids, DDT and sewage sludge that drive fish away. Already, fishermen report that fluke, porgy, weakfish and seabass have all but disappeared from New York waters.

The Challenger's divers have discovered a dead sea 20 miles from New York. It is a wide area where the city dumps its sewage. Nothing lives here. But DDT reaches beyond local waters, and millions of pounds of it wash down from farms to the sea each year. And it stays for ten years or more near the mouths of rivers—the estuaries—where fish are born. Diver-biologist Bob Wicklund:

WICKLUND. DDT, of course, is being introduced into our environment, especially in the estuarine areas where it's very important to young fish—is a nursery grounds for young fish—these fish are taking up this DDT and the bigger predators are feeding on the smaller fish and they are actually taking in DDT in small quantities and it's actually building up in these species.

The combination of all these chemicals and dumping of chemicals and sewage and so on certainly will build up into a problem

eventually. I think it's a problem right now, as a matter of fact.

UBELL. Dr. Charles Wurster, biochemist at the State University at Stony Brook, told correspondent Jim Kincaid of his investigation of the impact of DDT on the sea and its life.

KINCAID. Doctor, we ordinarily think of DDT as being a purely agricultural product, something that is dropped on crops or is spread in various ways to control insects. How does it get here?

WURSTER. Well, unfortunately, it doesn't stay on a farm where we put it. It moves from the farm by a number of mechanisms. It can either get into the air as a gas or as a particle and fly around the world in the normal circulation patterns of the atmosphere and come down in the precipitation or it can move downstream in the watershed and by river systems drain into the ocean.

So by these mechanisms, most of the DDT that is applied to the land areas of the world are eventually going to be transferred into the ocean.

KINCAID. How does it hurt the ocean?

WURSTER. Well, it hurts it in a number of ways. It affects it—it affects the food chains at various levels. It can affect the phytoplankton at the base. It can affect birds and fish at the top.

The phyto-plankton replace the carbon dioxide that the world's animals exhale with oxygen and they also generate nutrients that become the food supply in the ocean. So this is an essential part of life on earth.

KINCAID. Without the phyto-plankton, we're nowhere.

WURSTER. Uh, yes. Absolutely. We've had it.

KINCAID. Okay, what happens—what happens on up the line? You're talking about food chains. Something eats the phytoplankton and it moves up. How does this affect us?

WURSTER. Well, the DDT has a tendency to concentrate as it works up the food chain, so that at each level in the food chain it becomes more concentrated than it was at a lower level.

Now this means that the carnivorous birds and fish at the tops of these food chains are often the hardest hit.

KINCAID. How would some of these birds and fish be . . . primarily . . .

WURSTER. Well, fish like . . .

KINCAID. Since we're talking about pollution now.

WURSTER. Tuna, swordfish, mackerel, the various important fish of the world's marine fisheries.

KINCAID. And would they be dwindling in numbers already?

WURSTER. We don't know. We can't really tell. We don't have the data to tell. But we do know that the DDT that they carry endangers them, because DDT accumulates in the yolk sack of the eggs, and when the eggs hatch this DDT often kills the fry. And so we're . . .

KINCAID. I see.

WURSTER. The DDT in the ocean directly threatens the marine fisheries of the world.

UBELL. Dr. Wurster now wants to know how DDT affects pigeons . . . how it cuts down the young bird. The lethal biology may be similar to that of fish. Many birds lose their reproductive power after contact with DDT. Dr. Wurster is sure of one thing: DDT has wiped out the peregrine falcon east of the Rockies. It did its work by interfering with calcium metabolism so that the falcon's eggs were too fragile to survive. Biologists know that if a chemical can wipe out one species, it can wipe out another.

That other species may be fish which are born in marshes like this one at Brookhaven on Long Island's south shore. A decade of DDT spraying for mosquitoes has all but wiped out animal life here. Dr. George Woodwell, chief ecologist at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, has convinced local

authorities to stop spraying, and life is coming back. Dr. Woodwell points out that DDT's action may not be obvious:

WOODWELL. In some instances when DDT is applied in large quantities, it kills birds and fish by acute exposure, killing them outright at that moment. More often, however, it reduces their reproductive potential, reduces their rate of reproduction and so over a period of years they simply disappear. The loss is not a spectacular loss, such as we have when we have a kill of fish following an application of pesticide.

UBELL. Well, the amount of DDT needed to reduce reproductive potential as you call it, or rather have the animals have fewer babies each generation. How much is needed to do that?

WOODWELL. Well, this can be a very small quantity as long as it's present on a continuing basis. In the case of oysters, for instance, some hundreds of a part per million of DDT residues is sufficient to reduce the reproductive potential of oysters to zero.

UBELL. Well, would you say that there exists now because of the persistence of DDT in the environment a real danger to the food fisheries of the world?

WOODWELL. Oh that is certainly true. This is one of the greatest hazards of DDT—that we will swap our oceanic fisheries for the use of DDT in the production of food on land for the convenience of its use in other applications. Certainly the persistence of DDT residues for ten years, perhaps even much longer than that, is sufficient to produce a very serious threat to oceanic fisheries.

UBELL. Every expert I talked to told me the same thing: we don't know how much DDT will make a species of fish vanish. In short, a multi-billion dollar industry is in danger, a danger born of ignorance.

At the Coney Island Aquarium, Dr. Ross Nigrelli, the director, agrees that there is a danger:

NIGRELLI. My personal feeling, Earl, is that it is a real threat. And particularly in fisheries that are within the continental shelf where most fisheries occur. The pollution, I think, is increasing every year. There's more DDT coming into the environment.

UBELL. Well, aren't you concerned about the levels, though?

NIGRELLI. I am. I am concerned. Not only from the health point of view, but from a conservation point of view. I think that some of our important food fishes may actually become depleted in time. It may be beyond our time, but I'm certain that if this continues indefinitely, without some regulation as to the use and the amounts that are put into the sea and the ocean, we're going to be into trouble in the future.

UBELL. In 1962, Rachel Carson warned in her book, *Silent Spring*, that the insecticides could make the fish disappear from the oceans. At the time, many pooh-poohed her speculations as reckless. But now many fish scientists believe that her prediction may come true.

DDT, alone or in combinations with the other depletions that man is wreaking on the oceans, could make the fish disappear.

It is ironic that it comes at a time when many look toward the oceans as a new resource to feed an ever-expanding population. And the loss of that fish could be a major catastrophe.

And for those of us who eat fish for health or for pleasure, that loss could be tragic.

INTERVIEW WITH HON. WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

INTERVIEWER. Mr. Douglas, constructing this broadcast on the impact of DDT on fish, what is your impression now?

Justice WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS. Well, that's a terrific film. It should upset any rational person and make him want to do something about it. It's a terrifying thing. The unseen subtle way in which DDT used on the farm

works its way down through irrigation ditches into a river and, eventually, into the ocean. And how one billionth part of DDT per unit of water can sensitize an oyster—and oysters have a capacity to accumulate a tremendous amount of this.

Other fish do, too. What's happening off New York is a great disclosure, a great eye-opener on the Atlantic. We're greatly concerned out West. I wish you could do one on the Pacific. We have a tremendous problem there in the Pacific off my coast—that's the coast of Washington—it's very, very rich in plankton and we're beginning to realize now that plankton is getting highly infected with DDT.

And plankton is, of course, the anchor food for all the chain of things that are dependent on . . .

INTERVIEWER. The wheat of the sea . . . Justice DOUGLAS. Yes, the wheat of the sea. And we're beginning to realize that the tremendous output of DDT endangers many foods, with the best of intentions we have financed DDT plants and they are extensive and are ruining the Pacific. I don't mean just overnight. I'm speaking now in terms of decades.

We may be wiping out many different species of fish at the present time very important in food for human beings.

INTERVIEWER. Tell me, what do you think should be done right away?

Justice DOUGLAS. Well, I would think that this should be on every television station in the United States. I would think that, after television gets through showing it, there should be reruns. I think they should show it at schools. I think this should go to the conservation societies. This should be shown everywhere—wherever there's adult education.

INTERVIEWER. Do you think it's time we banned DDT completely—what's your impression?

Justice DOUGLAS. Well, I think—I was much interested in what Sweden did and much interested in what Michigan did. I've been proposing this—I'm not a scientist but everything I've read indicates that we're dealing here with a killer. I came at it largely through my interest in the birds and through the work with the Audubon Society and with the World Wild Life group.

I have been watching the disappearance, the gradual disappearance of the bald eagle and the shocking effect on the reproduction of the Bermuda Petrel due to the taking in of large quantities of DDT. I hadn't realized until I saw this film of the tremendous impact upon fish.

And also, eventually, there is man. We eat fish, we get DDT from the fish and we store it. How much DDT can a man store? A woman? A child? What effect will it have on health? These are unanswered questions, perhaps unanswerable. But it's this kind of film that will pose the questions and set people to thinking. Eventually, the thing will be banned, should be banned everywhere.

INTERVIEWER. Up till now, we've had to wait for legislation in order to accomplish some control over noxious chemicals in the—in our society. Isn't there some right which I would have as an individual to get manufacturers to demonstrate safety conclusively before there is a nuisance . . .

Justice DOUGLAS. Well, we're on the periphery of the development of new laws. That is very involved and there are a lot of aspects to it. Perhaps, the most constructive thing that's happening at the present time here on the Hill in Washington, D.C. are some bills being drafted by Congressmen and Senators that would set up some kind of scientific control, some kind of a clearinghouse where nothing can be shipped in interstate commerce unless it's cleared by this scientific committee and that can be cleared only by proof of no harm or very remote chances of harm.

The chemical companies are turning these things out at I don't know how many dozens a year and no tests made. The federal agencies in their spraying programs use herbicides without having control patches to learn what a particular poison will actually do. I know the forest services use sprays. I don't know precisely what is in the sprays but they're herbicides and the service doesn't know beforehand what it will do eventually to the species that they're spraying. Come with me to Wyoming and I can show you stuff that they sprayed ten years ago and it's still pretty much of a desert.

INTERVIEWER. What I'm asking, really, is there something in our current law which could make it incumbent, upon the manufacturer before he even distributes it, to demonstrate that there would be no long-term effects upon individuals and upon the environment?

Justice DOUGLAS. No, there's nothing—nothing has as yet developed. Letting it develop just by individual litigation is a slow process. We couldn't afford to wait. We have to have some overall dramatic scientific controls and there have been more and more people thinking that way and I think it'll come. I think it should come very fast.

Not only with respect to DDT but all these other pesticides and poisons that are being used to control all sorts of things that grow. These things must be controlled. We must know—you know, just like doctors before they start operating know and we must know before we ruin the earth any more than we have done now and the waters and the air.

INTERVIEWER. Thank you.

INTERVIEW WITH HON. PHILIP A. HART

INTERVIEWER. Senator, you've just seen our broadcast on DDT and its impact on the fish. What's your impression?

Senator PHILIP A. HART. I profess that coming from the Great Lakes basin, I didn't realize that the sea water—the oceans—were under the gun. We know perfectly well in Michigan that DDT can raise hods. But I didn't realize that it reached out into the oceans of the world. Maybe that will generate the kind of interest that will be required if we're going to do anything about it.

And the first thing to do is find out presently what damage does occur. A very disturbing study of the Cancer Institute shows that eleven of the popularly used pesticides have caused a very shocking number of cancerous tumors in laboratory mice.

Well, I want to know whether pesticides will do that to me, too. And in the case of the fresh water fish, the Great Lakes basin is entitled to hear Congress say "wait a minute, let's find out just what does happen here." And let's find out how to control this damage. And that's the kind of hearings that we're going to have.

INTERVIEWER. Are you planning hearings on that?

Senator HART. Yes, on May 19th we're going to take a look at the specific situation that occurred in Michigan. We're going to ask the Secretary of H.E.W. and others on what basis they made the decision that this was dangerous. To what extent can it be controlled? What should we do?

Now this is something, of course, that we should have been doing ten or fifteen years ago. I remember when DDT first was unveiled. It was the greatest thing since we invented the wheel. Well, apparently it's got some squeaks in it, if not, some very real hazards.

And that's exactly what this hearing will try to identify.

INTERVIEWER. The hearings that you're planning, do you plan to extend them to questions of ocean life as well?

Senator HART. If we're needed to. I'm going to suggest that the institute of health attempt to identify not just the damage to

marine life, but humans as well. Because we're the end of that food chain that you were talking about on that film that was so interesting. We're the animal life that I'm most concerned about. You and me.

INTERVIEWER. Well, could you tell me exactly what you're going to do in these hearings, aside from having the Secretary and . . . ?

Senator HART. Secretary and experts? What can you do? I'm a Greek and history fellow. I wouldn't know a chemical composition if you stuck it in my eye, but I want to find from the fellows who are supposed to know, precisely what it is that we should do.

INTERVIEWER. Well, what sorts of legislation would you be looking toward?

Senator HART. Well, in the case of fresh water fisheries, what are the cost factors? What substitutes? Clearly, agricultural interests are benefitted by the use of some of these pesticides. But what are the costs? And if the damage that DDT does exceeds the benefits, what substitute, what alternative may there be?

When we begin a hearing like this, you don't know what the answer is. And even if you think you do, you shouldn't say so because it will make somebody mad.

INTERVIEW WITH HON. GAYLORD NELSON

INTERVIEWER. Senator, you've just seen our broadcast on DDT and its impact on the fish. What's your impression?

Senator GAYLORD NELSON. I thought it was very well done. It points up something that ecologists, biologists, botanists, scientists have been warning us about for more than a quarter of a century. The indiscriminate introduction into the atmosphere of slow degrading pesticides can and will create an environmental disaster, and that's what's happening—disaster that threatens all living creatures, from insects and worms to fish and birds and human beings themselves.

INTERVIEWER. What do you think ought to be done about this?

Senator NELSON. Well I've been trying for several years to make it illegal to use DDT in this country without success. In fact I haven't been able to get a hearing on the bill. I think the long term approach has to be that we create a National Pesticide Commission of distinguished scientists, to evaluate all the pesticides, recommend those that ought to be removed from the market place entirely and recommend the limitations on the use of these pesticides. My own view is that all slow degrading pesticides ought to be eliminated from the market place entirely.

We ought to establish a procedure for qualifying the use of these pesticides in the same way that a drug manufacturer has to qualify the use of his drug—come in with proof as to what its effect is. If we don't we're going to destroy a fair share of all the living creatures on earth.

INTERVIEWER. Does this report that we've given incline you to make a greater effort at this point, do you think?

Senator NELSON. No it doesn't, simply because I have been alarmed about the catastrophic situation that's been developing for a good many years, and have spoken on this issue in about twenty-six states across the nation in the last six or seven years. I'm very pleased to see this kind of a report being made to the public. I hope it gets nationwide recognition and notice because until the public becomes aroused to the situation that's developing, we won't be able to get any legislation passed. And if we don't, I assure you that there's no question we'll destroy a major portion of the living creatures on the face of the earth in a handful of years.

INTERVIEWER. Michigan and Arizona have banned DDT. What about some other states? Do you know of any others? Say, your own?

Senator NELSON. Well, there are some hearings going on in Wisconsin to consider a state ban on DDT. Conservationists have advocated for several years that we entirely stop the use of DDT in our state, and, of course, this ought to be applied to a whole series of other hard pesticides that are being indiscriminately used. And I hope there will be a large number of states that will follow. I would wish that we would have the leadership of the national level to stop the use right now and to establish standards and protect our environment before it's too late. And I don't think that time is very far away.

INTERVIEW WITH HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

INTERVIEWER. Now that you've seen our broadcast, Congressman Dingell, what's your reaction to the accusation that the DDT may make the fish disappear from our waters?

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL. Well, I think this is the first time that I've seen a radio or a television station that had the courage and wisdom to put on this kind of a program. I personally think that this is but a small part of the total problem we have with hard pesticides being applied by the thousands and thousands of tons, these different kinds of pollutions emanating from air and water sources of different kinds, and the many other kinds of destructive impacts that we're imposing on our ecology.

INTERVIEWER. Well, what sort of action do you think should be taken right now with respect to DDT in the ocean?

Congressman DINGELL. I have every reason to believe that we probably will have to either rigorously curtail or actually prohibit the use of DDT and certain other hard pesticides for many, many purposes; to limit the times of applications; to reduce the amounts; and to take other steps necessary to control the almost runaway pace of pesticide pollution of our environment.

INTERVIEWER. Well, do you anticipate some sort of legislation?

Congressman DINGELL. I will shortly be conducting hearings in my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation on this very matter. We must do something about the problem of understanding, first of all, what our resources are; what we are doing to them; the practical effect of pollution from pesticides from industrial-municipal sources into the water and the air; the problem of herbicides and reach out at fertilizers and all the other things that are going into the destruction of our environment which is now taking place. We must begin to establish a program for orderly use of resources—not overuse—wise use, and not prohibitionary use.

Action must be taken so that we can minimize the hazards and provide the greatest benefit to the largest number of people through the wise use of our resources.

INTERVIEWER. Would you agree that DDT ought to be banned as it's been banned in Michigan and Arizona?

Congressman DINGELL. I think that there are many areas where DDT will probably have to be banned. I'm not prepared at this particular moment to make a flat statement it should be banned in all instances but it certainly should become subject to the most rigorous controls. We prohibit the use of DDT in foods, yet, we allow persons to assimilate such pesticides in even greater amounts through spraying, through leeching the substance into municipal water supplies, and things of this kind. As a result it is getting into foods such as meat and fish where—although there may be a prohibition against its use—there is actually no way of effectively preventing it under these circumstances.

INTERVIEW WITH HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

INTERVIEWER. Congressman Ottinger, what is your reaction to the program we presented, particularly with reference to DDT?

Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER. Well, this was a real public service in my view because people generally don't appreciate what a tremendous danger these non-degradable pesticides present to human life.

You know, we talk about endangered species and we are even having hearings in Washington on them. It's ironic: the most endangered species of all is likely to be the fellows that are holding the hearings—man.

INTERVIEWER. Now what happens if something isn't done about DDT and quite soon?

Congressman OTTINGER. Well, these pesticides are dumped into the ocean—I believe I've seen a figure of a hundred and thirty-three million tons a year around the globe and they keep destroying the life of the ocean, particularly the plant life of the ocean which feeds the fish we eat and creates the oxygen that we breathe. DDT kills them and, since it doesn't break down, it keeps on killing. That's the real long-range danger.

There are pesticides that you can get that will break down, will dissolve and disappear and their effect will disappear but these particular pesticides keep destroying.

INTERVIEWER. Do you contemplate introducing any legislation?

Congressman OTTINGER. Yes. I feel very strongly that these pesticides ought to be outlawed altogether, the non-degradable pesticides. We'll have to act at the Federal level, but we could start right here in New York State, several other states have.

There are hearings going on now in Wisconsin and Minnesota and a couple of other states have acted already. I think it's not only a national problem but a matter of international survival. We shouldn't be contributing this very dangerous substance to our environment. The danger is, of course, that one day, without knowing it, we may just tip the balance of nature and there just won't be enough oxygen produced out of the ocean to outbalance the number of people and animals and plants that are absorbing oxygen and we'll find ourselves on an irreversible path to destruction.

INTERVIEWER. Congressman Ottinger, getting to the general fact that we are polluting our environment every day—we're polluting it not only with non-degradable pesticides but with plastic products, for example, that will not go back to the soil. We're polluting it with smoke into the air and all sorts of pollution is going into our water.

Do you think this is something that is going to have to be handled on a federal level, that is to say, the cooperation between the states and between individual regions just doesn't seem to work?

Congressman OTTINGER. Certainly, we're going to have to have federal standards. The states may be permitted to handle this to the extent that they do so adequately. But, as in many other fields in which we've been working of late, I think the federal government is going to have to set down minimal standards and it will have to step in where the states fail to act. We better do it soon, because we're running out of time. For instance, the Water Resources Council says that by the year 2010 our total available supply of water will be matched by our consumption. To meet our needs we'll have to practice sound conservation.

Within a much lesser time, we're going to have these inversions of air pollution being precipitated out over our metropolitan areas and we are going to strangle thousands of people. Unfortunately, in our society, too frequently, we wait for catastrophes to strike until we act.

In Santa Barbara we've already seen what happens when we fail to protect resources. But with the kind of situation that we are dealing with now, the results of failure may be too terrible. It's incumbent upon us to act before catastrophe strikes.

INTERVIEW WITH HON. WILLIAM FITZ RYAN

INTERVIEWER. Well, Congressman Ryan, now that you've seen our broadcast on the impact of DDT on the ocean fisheries, what's your reaction?

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM FITZ RYAN. The CBS documentary, "DDT—SOS" vividly illustrates the problem which must confront everyone concerned with preserving our environment. You have done an excellent job of bringing to public attention the effect of DDT and other pesticides and particularly the effect and impact on the world fish supply.

As the world population continues to expand despite whatever efforts there are at population control, we know that we must look in future years to the sea for food to feed our population, and what you have done is to starkly point out that there may be no food for feeding the future generations of mankind unless steps are taken to overcome the effects of pesticides and DDT on the reproduction of fish.

INTERVIEWER. What would you say about the banning of DDT?

CONGRESSMAN RYAN. In some states, I understand this has already been done, and it should be done wherever possible in conjunction with other regulations.

In other words, we don't want to ban DDT and then have some other similar pesticide substituted for it. It seems to me there should be strict regulation of all pesticides. This should be done not only at the state level, but also through federal regulations, setting standards for states such as we are now moving toward in air pollution control and water pollution control. There really ought to be thought given to setting up an Environmental Control Commission in the United States which would have overall jurisdiction over all pollution including the effect of DDT and pesticides upon our environment.

INTERVIEWER. Well, what action would you like to see taken right now?

CONGRESSMAN RYAN. I would like to see the Congress move towards establishing an environmental control commission with broad regulatory authority. I say move toward it because I recognize how difficult it is to bring legislators to regulate vested interests and industries which have the power that the pesticide industry obviously has.

There should be legislative hearings to look into this question; there should be preliminary legislation adopted; and there should be as much possible public attention focused on this problem as possible. And that's why CBS is entitled to great credit and you yourself, Earl Ubell, for having brought this to public attention and having focused on a very serious problem, particularly one which affects New Yorkers.

Because, as you point out, the flow of pesticides and sludge and all of the conditions which are created by this in the New York Harbor area really affect New York as a port into which comes seafood which is part of the livelihood of many, many thousands of New Yorkers.

ROCKEFELLER: OIL DIPLOMAT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the decision to send Nelson Rockefeller to Peru

as this country's representative was ill-advised and insensitive. His international reputation as the Standard Oil multimillionaire could only have fueled the fires of hate and provided credence to the anti-American propagandists.

What was Mr. Rockefeller's mission to Peru that he wanted the cover of protection afforded as an official of the U.S. Government? If his presence in Peru as a private citizen was regarded as dangerous to him personally, how could our administration have believed that he would be acceptable to Peru as an envoy?

The properties seized are the investment of private citizens. The U.S. Government does not own fishing boats or oil wells. Just who did own the oil wells of International Petroleum Co.—a subsidiary of Standard of New Jersey—seized in Peru?

Under unanimous consent I submit an AP release and the Latin America Report for February 1969 for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, May 25, 1969]

UNITED STATES TO WITHDRAW MISSIONS IN PERU

Bowing to Peruvian demands, the United States announced with "profound regrets" yesterday a planned pullout of U.S. military missions from Lima and cancellation of a scheduled visit there by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York.

"The Department of State profoundly regrets the decision of the Peruvian government confirming that it will not receive the visit of Governor Rockefeller and that it would require the withdrawal of the U.S. military missions in Peru," the department said in a statement issued by press officer Carl Barch.

But despite continuing serious difficulties with Peru, Barch added, the U.S. Government "intends for its part to continue . . . the search for practical solutions to existing problems . . . in good faith and with good will."

Barch also said he does not foresee at this time any prospective break in diplomatic relations between Washington and Lima.

The department's statement climaxed a new surge in the difficulties between the United States and Peru which have ranged from arguments over Peruvian seizures of U.S. fishing boats to Lima's takeover of large U.S. oil holdings.

Rockefeller, on a series of fact-finding trips to Latin America for President Nixon had intended to visit Peru the last couple days in May.

However, the military-controlled Peruvian regime indicated last week that a Rockefeller visit would be unwelcome and that the U.S. military missions ought to leave. It contended that the United States had cut off arms sales to Peru in violation of an arms agreement between the two countries.

[From the Latin America Report, February 1969]

PERU FACES HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT

On October 3, last year, Peruvian troops overthrew the liberal administration of President Fernando Belaunde Terry. In announcing the coup, the military cited it as "transcendental, historic, marking the start of the definitive emancipation of our country." Since then, leader of the military junta, General Juan Velasco Alvarado, has proved that his is no ordinary right-wing military government. He voided the oil rights of the International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, and has opened diplomatic and trade relations

with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

The immediate cause given for deposing President Belaunde was his agreement with the IPC to drop a \$140 million "debt" which the government alleged was owed by the oil company.

In return, IPC gave up its oil fields, but received permission to expand its refinery at Talara. It received no additional properties or land concessions. Upon taking power, the junta voided the agreement made with President Belaunde. General Velasco insisted that the company owed the \$140 million, and spoke of "powerful economic forces, national and foreign, that frustrated popular basic reforms," but overlooked the fact that IPC paid its taxes (a phenomenon in Latin America) and contributed about \$26 million a year to Peru's economy.

The trouble started in 1963, when Peru declared that the 1911, 1922 and 1924 treaties and titles to the La Brea y Parinas oil fields to be null *ipso jure*, in other words that they never existed. This meant that the fields had to be turned over to the nation. But the Belaunde administration compounded the problem by saying that profits accruing to IPC were illicit and illegal and demanded that the \$140 million accrued during this period be refunded to Peru. It was this club that forced IPC to give up its fields in return for the Peruvian government's waiver of claims to the \$140 million.

MILITARY CONFISCATES PROPERTY

The military junta waived nothing. Indeed, it claims that it will accept only clear property, and charged IPC with "indebtedness." On October 9, the oil fields were occupied by troops and the legal-diplomatic fight was on. Some observers believe that the growing internal fight between the military and President Belaunde finally forced the former to use the IPC matter as a pretext for taking over, but that the whole matter got out of hand. And beneath the generals are operating a large group of young, ambitious colonels whose precise ideological orientation is far from clear. It was they, observers believe, who got General Velasco and the junta to open trade and diplomatic relations with a large chunk of the Communist block of nations. It is assumed that the Soviet Union will offer to supply "technicians" to operate the nationalized oil fields.

Finance Minister, General Angel Valdivia Morriberon, next accused the United States of "exerting futile pressures on Peru, and all of Latin America is watching." Latin America is indeed watching, and if the United States does nothing to secure payment for the confiscated oil equipment and other properties, the shimmering idea that the United States is a "paper tiger" (witness Castro's expropriation of nearly \$2 billion in U.S. properties) may become a concrete conviction.

There is a definite tendency in Latin America to compare Peru's present situation with that of Cuba in 1960, when Fidel Castro established diplomatic relations with the Soviet bloc and stepped-up systematic seizure of U.S.-owned properties. And there is a fear in the United States that Venezuela's and Colombia's oil may slip away from the free world if something is not done by the United States to protect its investments overseas—a fear heightened when, on February 6, Peru upped IPC's "indebtedness" to \$690.5 million.

THE HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT

It was precisely this fear that led ex-Senator Bourke Hickenlooper to amend foreign aid laws. The amendment holds that all U.S. aid to a foreign country will automatically cease within six months if that country has not paid for the expropriated properties or started "meaningful negotia-

tions" within that period of time. The military junta has jingoized the Hickenlooper Amendment and whipped up a considerable amount of popular support against what it terms "an inadmissible imperialistic menace which would injure Peru's sovereignty."

The United States is likely to move carefully. As of 1967, other U.S. business interests in Peru totalled around \$605 million, and a strong stand taken on the IPC issue, many fear, will automatically trigger confiscation of those investments. Yet, there are those who believe that unless the United States does take a stand, it will only be a matter of time before not only the \$605 million will be seized but other U.S. holdings in Latin America as well.

Perhaps some lessons have been learned from failing to protect U.S. investments in Cuba back in 1960. Perhaps not. In any event, the Hickenlooper Amendment is law and unless something breaks must be applied. Meanwhile, the Soviets exacerbate the situation. On January 8, Moscow Radio's "Peace and Progress" program, beamed in Spanish to Latin America, said that "the CIA is increasing its activities in Peru to discredit those members of the Peruvian military junta who consistently defend their national sovereignty." So we have the spectacle of the United States being backed into a corner by a military junta which is receiving the support of the Soviet Union.

FREE CAPITOL TOURS OPPOSED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Ray Tschimperle of the Weekly Valley Herald, Chaska, Minn., has come out strongly against legislation that would eliminate the nominal fee that is charged for a tour of the U.S. Capitol building. I include his commentary at this point in my remarks:

GUIDED TOURS

If you should go to Washington, D.C., this year, you may be in for quite a treat. Several legislators have introduced bills to eliminate the nominal fee for a tour of the U.S. Capitol building. The last time we heard, the fee for a guided tour of the building was a quarter per person.

The guides currently derive their salary from the fee charged for the tour service. It's a pleasant experience to visit the chambers of the two legislative branches of our government. The guides are courteous and well informed. They point out the statues of favorite sons sponsored by the various states. They demonstrate the unusual acoustics in what was once the old House meeting room. Here it is possible to hear a whispered conversation across the room if you stand in a certain spot.

Indeed, the tour is a real bargain at the present cost, or even double that. The intent of the Congressional proposals is to place the guides on the Federal payroll, thus granting them certain fringe benefits to which they are not currently entitled, such as sick leave and hospitalization. They would also be eligible for retirement benefits, instead of social security, as at present. We see no reason for the guides to remain in the ranks of the forgotten. They are entitled to a day's pay in return for a day's work. We wonder, though, if the elimination of the fee is the best answer. It might be better to up the rate slightly. Why should those who cannot af-

ford a trip to the Nation's Capital be forced to pay, through their taxes, for those who can afford to make the trip and therefore at least theoretically, enjoy these "free" tours? Here is another case in which Congress is being asked to subsidize the more fortunate.

This may seem petty, but we are both weary and leery of anything the government moves into where our money is concerned. These things always have a way of getting out of hand.

INHUMANE TREATMENT OF U.S. PRISONERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last week, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird brought up a most important subject concerning the Vietnam war. That is the subject of the inhumane treatment of U.S. prisoners of war by North Vietnam. Mr. Laird made an unusual and most commendable public plea to North Vietnam. He asked for a list of all U.S. prisoners and for the release of those who were sick and wounded. He also urged North Vietnam to permit impartial inspection of POW facilities and regular flow of mail to prisoners. I know we all share the Secretary's shock and disappointment over North Vietnam's negative response to this humanitarian request.

North Vietnam's persistent refusal to reveal the names of U.S. prisoners causes needless heartbreak and anxiety for thousands of American families. There are approximately 1,300 American servicemen who are listed as prisoners of war or missing in action—more than 200 have been in this status for more than 3½ years. This is longer than any U.S. serviceman was held prisoner during World War II.

As one who represents a district that is the Navy's largest homeport, I have had occasion to meet with the wives of these prisoners of war. Many of them have not heard from their husbands for months because North Vietnam and the Vietcong have refused to allow a free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families. Their anxieties are further aggravated by reports and pictures of U.S. prisoners who have been released that revealed poor diets and the lack of medical care in the North Vietnamese and Vietcong prison camps.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to Secretary Laird's efforts to win the release of our American servicemen who are now held captive by North Vietnam and the Vietcong. This is a subject that has been overlooked too long. We must not permit the American POW's and their families to become the forgotten people of this war.

So that my colleagues can share with me Mr. Laird's statements on this matter, I include them in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
MELVIN R. LAIRD

On numerous occasions I have expressed my deep concern for the welfare of our American servicemen who are prisoners of war or missing in action. In this regard, I

have directed Assistant Secretary of Defense (ISA) Warren G. Nutter, who has been named chairman of the Department of Defense Prisoner of War Policy Committee, to insure that the families of these servicemen are receiving all assistance to which they are entitled.

The North Vietnamese have claimed that they are treating our men humanely. I am distressed by the fact that there is clear evidence that this is not the case.

The United States Government has urged that the enemy respect the requirements of the Geneva Convention. This they have refused to do.

The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have never identified the names of all the U.S. prisoners whom they hold. For the most part, information on some of these Americans has come in the form of scattered, and often distorted, propaganda films and photographs which the North Vietnamese have chosen to sell or release.

We know that at least several U.S. prisoners were injured at the time of their capture and we are concerned about the medical care they are receiving.

The Geneva Convention requires a free exchange of mail between the prisoners and their families and yet very little mail has been received from only a few prisoners in the past five years.

As of next month, more than 200 American servicemen will have been listed either as prisoners of war or as missing in action for more than three and one-half years. This period of time is longer than any U.S. serviceman was held prisoner during World War II.

The Department of Defense continues to hope for meaningful progress on the matter of prisoner release in the Paris discussions. In the meantime, we appeal to North Vietnam and the Viet Cong to respect the humane rights of those whom they hold prisoners of war.

Specifically, we call for adherence to the Geneva Convention which requires:

1. Release of names of prisoners held.
2. Immediate release of sick and wounded prisoners.
3. Impartial inspections of prisoner of war facilities.
4. Proper treatment of all prisoners.
5. Regular flow of mail.

Most importantly, we seek the prompt release of all American prisoners.

BRIEFING ON U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION PERSONNEL

The U.S. Government and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam have placed great emphasis on proper treatment of enemy prisoners of war held in South Vietnam. We have recognized the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

At the same time we repeatedly have expressed our desire that the enemy honor its obligations under the Convention and that it properly treat U.S. personnel captured by them.

North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces captured in South Vietnam are detained by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in PW camps which are inspected regularly by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

In accordance with the Geneva Convention, sick and wounded prisoners have been released and repatriated to North Vietnam. We have provided such treatment not only because it is required by the Convention but also because it is the humane thing to do.

We have hoped that our adversaries would reciprocate. Regrettably, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have not followed our example. There is clear evidence that the enemy is treating the U.S. prisoners it holds inhumanely.

On numerous occasions, the United States

has appealed to the enemy to respect the requirements of the Geneva Convention which North Vietnam endorsed in 1957.

The purpose of this briefing is to express Secretary Laird's continuing and deep concern regarding treatment of U.S. servicemen listed as prisoners or missing in action in Southeast Asia.

Today, there are more than 1300 U.S. servicemen classified by the Services as either prisoners of war or missing in action.

Of the more than 1300, nearly 800 were downed over North Vietnam. Most are pilots and we believe a substantial percentage of the missing may be prisoners.

The families of these hundreds of servicemen have lived for months and years under the continuing anxiety and pressure of uncertainty as to the status and well-being of their loved ones.

Despite repeated attempts by the U.S. Government and neutral organizations, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have consistently refused to release the names of those U.S. prisoners whom they hold.

Secretary Laird is deeply concerned by Hanoi's continued refusal to identify the U.S. prisoners whom it holds. On several occasions, he has expressed his respect for the magnificent patience and courage shown by the hundreds of wives, children and parents who for so long have hoped to learn about the status of their loved ones.

The magnitude of this unnecessary inhumanity has increased with each passing month. There now are more than 200 U.S. servicemen listed as prisoners or missing in action in Southeast Asia who have been in those categories for more than three and one-half years. This is longer than any U.S. serviceman was held a prisoner during World War II.

We now have more than 500 American servicemen who have been listed as PWs or missing for more than two years. The first U.S. pilot, whom we believe is still a prisoner, was captured in August 1964.

The North Vietnamese authorities have made statements, both publicly and privately, to the effect that American prisoners of war were being treated humanely. However, it has been impossible to verify such claims because North Vietnam adamantly has refused neutral inspections of the places of detention.

Hanoi's claims of proper treatment and its controlled visits with a handful of selected news people are not adequate substitutes for complete and impartial inspections.

Most information regarding the status of American prisoners has come in the form of propaganda films and photographs which the North Vietnamese have sold or made available to various news sources throughout the world. It is regrettable that we must rely on such often distorted information to determine the status of U.S. prisoners.

Many of these films and photographs have implied that our prisoners were being well treated, that they were permitted to communicate freely with each other, that they were allowed to correspond freely with their families, and that they were receiving proper medical treatment. Examination of this information, however, raises serious questions as to whether such has been the case. In fact, our analysis indicates that this is not the case, and that the provisions of the Geneva Convention are being disregarded.

In some instances, North Vietnamese propaganda has generated false hopes among American families because the identity of the prisoners shown could not be clearly determined. In one case, 20 different wives believed that a prisoner shown in a propaganda photo was her husband. The prisoner remains unidentified.

It now has been more than six months since the bombing of North Vietnam was halted. During that time we have had no releases and almost no information on Ameri-

can prisoners. In the past five years, North Vietnam has chosen to release only six pilots. All six had been held for relatively short periods of time, ranging from three to seven and one-half months.

Three of the six returned had been listed as missing in action and, thus, the announcement by Hanoi of their prospective release was the first indication that they were even alive.

Some of the propaganda photos made available have shown U.S. pilots alive on the ground after capture by the enemy. Regrettably, no information has been received since their initial captivity, again causing severe and unnecessary anguish to the families involved. Commander A. C. Brady and Major W. S. Gideon are two such cases.

Another example is Major J. H. Kasler who was shown as injured when captured but has not been heard from since.

One propaganda film showed a display of 18 ID cards of pilots. This is an unacceptable substitute for determining the status of U.S. prisoners.

There have been indications that American prisoners in North Vietnam have been mistreated physically. In 1965 and 1966, captured U.S. prisoners were paraded through the streets of Hanoi. Some were seriously injured, as in the case of Lt. D. G. Rehmann, who suffered serious burns when downed in December 1966.

In addition, we believe that the great majority of American prisoners have been isolated from contact with the outside world.

Several propaganda photographs released have shown U.S. prisoners in such solitary confinement. All six pilots released by North Vietnam in 1968 confirmed that they had been held in isolation for varying periods of time.

Such isolation can have serious adverse effects on the long-term welfare of those detained under such circumstances.

North Vietnam released films also raise serious questions as to whether the prisoners are receiving proper medical care. Recent photographs show that some prisoners are continuing to suffer from injuries incurred at the time they were downed.

For example, several prisoners have been shown still using crutches after many months of captivity. Lcdr H. A. Stafford injured his left arm and shoulder when shot down in August 1967. Today, his left arm appears to be noticeably smaller raising questions as to what medical treatment was offered.

One photo shows Lcdr J. S. McCain, III, shortly after capture in October 1967. He was pictured in extensive casts because of both arms and his right leg were broken. Hanoi has not indicated what his present condition is, and thus we are concerned about what treatment Commander McCain has received in the past 18 months.

One recent film included an elaborate spread of food which only two prisoners are shown carrying. Neither is shown actually eating the suspiciously large portions.

Recently, an Italian journalist met Lt. Robert Frishman, who was captured in October 1967. In the interview, published in L'Europeo a few weeks ago, Frishman stated that his right arm is significantly shorter than his left. He also stated that he had lost a substantial amount of weight since his capture. He, too, confirmed that he had been held in isolation by indicating that the reporter was the first person he had spoken to in almost a year and a half.

Weight loss by other prisoners has also been confirmed in propaganda films. One such case is Seaman D. B. Hegdahl who weighed over 200 pounds at the time of capture and obviously has lost considerable weight in the past 18 months. We observe similar indications in photographs of Lt. J. Crecca, Jr., and Colonel R. Risner.

In viewing the propaganda information which the North Vietnamese have chosen to release from time to time, the same few prisoners appear in the pictures. This raises the obvious question as to the status of the vast majority who are not paraded before the cameras.

We welcome any information concerning U.S. prisoners regardless of the source. However, we want to reiterate that these propaganda films are no substitute for the information and impartial inspections required by the Geneva Convention.

Propaganda films and photographs are misleading. One example was the distorted information released by North Korea during the captivity of the Pueblo crew. North Korean propaganda stated that the Pueblo crew was well fed, that they were permitted to exercise regularly, and that they could communicate frequently with each other and with their families.

We now know that these photos were staged and that, for the most part, the portrayed benefits occurred only when the photographs were actually taken.

We have seen similar "staged" photographs such as this scene of a purported capture of a U.S. pilot in North Vietnam. Other photographs have implied that our prisoners were permitted to attend religious services. However, recent photographs show only a handful of prisoners actually present for such services. And, it is noted that they are carefully separated which suggests either that Hanoi wants the room to appear full or that the men are kept apart so that they cannot communicate.

Another film attempted to indicate that the prisoners were enjoying recreational activities by playing table tennis, but the facial expressions and lack of animation are positive indications that it is a staged event.

Regular exchange of mail between prisoners and their families is a guaranteed provision of the Geneva Convention. Such a flow of mail simply has not been permitted by the North Vietnamese.

In the past five years, less than 100 prisoners have been allowed to write to their families. Even at that, the frequency of writing for this limited number of prisoners averaged less than two letters per year.

If these few writers had been allowed to write the number of letters and cards as permitted under the Geneva Convention, their next of kin would have received 18,000 letters and cards. Thus far, they have received less than 600.

We have no indication that any letters were received by families from September 1968 until late April 1969. Since then, some dated in late 1968 were received by families.

A recent North Vietnamese propaganda film suggested that U.S. prisoners had received Christmas mail and were permitted to celebrate the Christmas season. In the first place, the film shows only a handful of prisoners.

Secondly, the film purports to show prisoners opening Christmas mail when, in fact, they are reading letters dated in March, April and July of 1968. In two cases, the film indicated that the prisoners were opening Christmas cards when, in fact, the mail shown were Easter cards sent months before.

In December 1968, U.S. next of kin forwarded more than 714 Christmas packages. We have no confirmation of whether any were actually received by the American prisoners.

As part of the Secretary of Defense's concern for these men, he has directed a thorough review of the benefits available to the families involved. It is his intention that the military services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense must do all that is possible for the next of kin.

On several occasions, Defense Department

officials have met with groups of wives and parents whose husbands and sons are listed as prisoners or missing in action. We can attest to the bravery and personal courage of these dedicated American families.

Secretary Laird and the Department of Defense continue to hope for meaningful progress in the Paris discussions and progress leading to the release of all American prisoners.

In the meantime, however, we appeal to North Vietnam and to the Viet Cong to respect the rights of prisoners of war and to comply with the Geneva Convention.

Specifically, we urge them to take the following humanitarian actions:

1. Release all U.S. prisoners whom they hold. The seriously sick and wounded should be returned immediately.
2. Assure that all prisoners receive proper medical care and adequate food.
3. Permit regular impartial inspections of prisoner of war facilities.
4. Allow a free flow of mail between the prisoners and their families.

OUR CURRENT INTERNATIONAL TRADE POSITION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently the president of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, Mr. Thomas P. Turchan, addressed the Dry Color Manufacturers Association in New York City. His remarks concerning our current international trade position and recommendations for the future are timely and warrant, I believe, serious attention at this time.

I include Mr. Turchan's speech as follows:

SPEECH BY THOMAS P. TURCHAN,
APRIL 18, 1969

I am extremely happy to have been invited to be here today, not just because the trade problems of SOCOMA and DCMA are so similar, but also because I believe there are some things which have gone too long unsaid with respect to the international trade policies of this nation.

SOCMA is undoubtedly well known to all of you for its defense of the American Selling Price system, but I do not intend to spend much time today on the merits of ASP or the reasons our industry believes it must be maintained. The problems facing the nation and the American chemical industry at this critical point in our history are far broader than ASP. They involve issues which affect the economic strength of our country, our relations with other free world nations and the entire international monetary system.

Ever since the end of World War II, the United States has mainly followed an uncoordinated and day-to-day policy whereby decisions in the trade area have been strongly influenced—in some cases even determined—by political or humanitarian considerations. This was acceptable, and even necessary, immediately following the war when our objective was to pump dollars into the devastated economies of Western Europe and the Far East. We gave more than we received and it helped rebuild the free world. Unfortunately, there are many today who cannot or will not recognize that the world of 1969 is far different than the world of 1946, and who appear unable to accept the obvious fact that this country is in serious trouble if it does not develop and carry out a realistic

long range trade policy for the decade of the 1970's. This policy must encompass the entire U.S. economy and must have as its central objective the attainment and maintenance of competitive equality in the world marketplace for the United States vis-a-vis its trading partners.

It is more than a bit disheartening to view our present international trade situation—or what I should more properly call our present international trade dilemma. Last year, our government reported the nation had its worst trade performance since the depression year of 1937. Official Commerce Department statistics showed a reported trade surplus of only about \$700 million. Actually, if one excludes from these figures all of the military assistance programs, purchases made with A.I.D. funds and agricultural commodities given away under P.L. 480, our commercial trade showed a deficit of about \$2½ billion. Indeed, if we computed our balance of trade as most other countries do—on a c.i.f. basis—our deficit was about \$5 billion. Just four years ago, we had a commercial trade surplus by our method of reckoning of more than \$3½ billion—a surplus that has gone downhill ever since that point in 1964.

The most immediate result of the deterioration in our trade account has been a dangerous weakening of this country's international balance of payments position. I am sure you will remember the serious dollar crisis we had a year ago. This was caused primarily by our \$3½-billion payments deficit of 1967, which followed years of previous deficits. On the surface, things were a little better last year with the nation showing a slight payments surplus. But there remains a considerable amount of "dry rot" if one probes a little beneath these surface figures.

There were two principal factors which bailed out our balance of payments last year and kept the dollar afloat and neither is anything on which a nation can safely base the future stability of its currency. One was the billion dollars of Treasury bonds our government was able to sell to Canada and West Germany and the other was the unprecedented billions which poured into the United States stock market during 1968. To the extent that this record is not matched in 1969, our balance of payments situation will show a sharp deterioration. Even more threatening, if economic conditions should change so that the foreign money now in the market is withdrawn in any significant amounts, we will have a payments crisis of serious proportions. I believe these factors are what Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans had in mind recently when he predicted a balance of payments deficit this year "in the billions of dollars." It is clear the long term problems of the dollar are not only still with us but, if anything, have actually worsened since the crisis a year ago. These problems cannot be solved until and unless we find some way of restoring our once healthy international trade balance.

Our industry—the American chemical industry—has a vital stake in the policies our government adopts in an effort to reverse this trade deterioration. We had exports in 1968 of over three billion dollars, yet our share of world markets has been steadily declining for the past few years and even the record-breaking export performance last year barely got us back to the share we had in early 1966. In order to effectively compete in foreign markets, our industry makes direct capital investments abroad of some half billion dollars a year and we already have well over seven billion dollars invested in foreign facilities. The repatriated earnings from these investments have made a dependable and ever increasing contribution to our balance of payments position. The curb placed on these investments in the last few years is, in our opinion, a good example of treating the symptoms rather than the basic disease. It is heartening to see the present Administration

at least make a start toward the complete removal of this clearly self-defeating policy.

On the domestic side, chemical imports have continued their annual growth of more than 14%. They passed the billion dollar mark for the first time last year and their presence is beginning to be felt in many segments of the industry which have never before faced serious competitive pressures from abroad. What is done—or is not done—with respect to trade policy will have an important effect on exports, imports, capital investment plans, employment and earnings—on virtually all aspects of our industry.

We are already faced with some hard decisions as a result of the unreciprocal Kennedy Round Agreement signed two years ago. It is important to keep in mind that we are scheduled to get no further tariff reductions from the United Kingdom and the Common Market nations. They have made their full 20% cuts. Meanwhile, this country has reduced its tariffs so far by less than half of the scheduled 50% agreed to by our negotiators. Even worse, our tariffs will continue to go down over the next three years although many of our major trading partners abroad have already taken back, through increased border taxes, even more than the small tariff concessions they made in the Kennedy Round. Is it any wonder then that SOCOMA has opposed and will continue to oppose with all its resources the unreciprocal separate package agreement which calls for the removal of the American Selling Price system of valuation in return for some further slight-of-hand tariff reductions. Is it any wonder that the necessary implementing legislation is so strongly opposed by the industry and workers which it claims to benefit and by leading members of Congress from both sides of the aisle.

I believe it unfortunate that many mistakenly consider our Association to be "protectionist" when what we are really seeking is fair trade—the same access to foreign markets that we have given our trading partners, and the same general ground rules for this competition. We have a strong, efficient industry and we are willing to take on anyone, but it is made extremely difficult when we must compete with the government-sponsored cartels of Japan, the tax rebates given by European governments to encourage exports, the ever higher border taxes and the increased use of quota systems and import deposit and licensing schemes which have proliferated abroad in recent years. I find it difficult to understand how our government has permitted so many foreign nations to preach free trade, while practicing the protectionist policy of making sure, in each instance, that their national interest always comes first. The time is long past when our country can afford any more of this.

Border taxes are probably the best single example of the way many foreign governments use non-tariff barriers to support domestic industry. What has happened in the two years since the Kennedy Round in this one area alone underlines the seriousness of the problem. Germany, embarrassed by its massive accumulation of foreign currencies, attempted to slow its mounting trade surplus—almost \$5-billion last year—by dropping its border tax from 11% to 7% in December. Yet this remaining 7% is still almost double the 4% rate in effect just 12 months earlier. We are not even back to the pre-Kennedy Round competitive conditions of 1967—and the German situation is not unique. The Netherlands hiked its border tax to 10% last year and then to 12% in January. Norway's import tax is expected to go from about 13% now to 20% at the end of the year. Belgium also plans to raise its border taxes next January, and Mexico expects to adopt such a system in October. Brazil's border tax is up to 30% and Denmark is applying its tax to many new categories, including pharmaceuticals. I could

go on for some time just listing the countries making increased use of border taxes and export rebates. Even the British are studying the possibility of adopting an internal TVA tax system with matching border taxes and export rebates.

It was well before the Kennedy Round bargaining first began that representatives of the chemical industry saw the handwriting on the wall and called the attention of the government officials to the growing danger to our trade posed by the border tax situation. At that time, and for several years thereafter, U.S. trade officials refused to even admit there was a problem—much less attempt to do anything about it. Now that the Kennedy Round is over and the situation has gone from bad to worse, their attitude has changed dramatically—if a little too late. Treasury Department officials in the past year have suggested that the United States establish a border tax system based on our present level of indirect taxes. One Assistant Secretary proposed that border taxes and export rebates be used to improve our nation's balance of payments situation as, I might add, other nations have done. The President's Export Expansion Council has called for tax incentives to spur exports and for a study to investigate the advantage of a TVA tax system in the United States. The Tax Foundation has proposed that the GATT rules with respect to border taxes be revised. Even the former U.S. Special Trade Representative has come out for a major change in the U.S. tax system in order to take advantage of the corresponding border taxes and export rebates—an advantage he denied even existed while he had the power to do something about it.

Our trading partners have been quite willing to discuss the border tax problem. In fact, they have been discussing it with us in GATT and the OECD since 1963 and I am sure they would be happy to continue discussing it this year and next year and the year after. They would like nothing better than to talk it to death. Unfortunately, the disadvantage to this country's trade caused by border taxes and export rebates had become so serious that we *must* find a solution during 1969. I am happy to report that the United States appears to be taking a harder line in recent months with respect to this issue. There is growing recognition by many in this country that unless Europe agrees to action this year, to let us play under the same rules they do, our government must and will take whatever steps are necessary to provide practical equivalence.

The inherent problems caused by the increasing use of border taxes and export rebates go beyond just the effect on United States trade with the countries involved. Certainly, they cut down our foreign sales by raising the price of American exports and they give foreign producers a significant edge in the United States market through rebates. But just as important is the competitive advantage they provide in third country markets throughout the world. As exports rebates go up, this competitive advantage increases even further, thus weakening America's entire trade picture. The effects are too far-reaching for us to ignore any longer.

The situation facing the American chemical industry during the next few years is a difficult one. We have opened our market wide to producers in both Europe and the Far East, and we have little doubt they will take advantage of this new opportunity. They are already doing so. By contrast, we find little, if any, meaningful new access to their markets as a result of the Kennedy Round. If you have any real doubts as to who gained and who lost in that historic bargaining, let me assure you that it was those nations who utilized their professional business talent and single-mindedly adhered to their goal of taking care of their national interest first and foremost while concurrently calling upon our delegation to make further concessions in

the interests of "free trade." They had a plan, they did their homework well and, not surprisingly, they came out better in the negotiations.

The effects of this unreciprocal deal are already being felt in many product lines where import competition was not a major factor in past years. Many small companies whose principal sales are in these areas will be in real trouble in the years ahead and even the large U.S. producers will find that the changing trade patterns will show up in a significant way on their profit and loss statements.

We find it hard to believe that this result is in the best interests of either the chemical industry or the United States and we can only hope that the effect of the Kennedy Round on this nation's balance of trade and payments will be mitigated by intelligent, forceful actions in the very near future.

Some people look at our industry's present \$2-billion trade surplus and find it hard to believe that we are seriously worried. I can only point to the example of the American steel industry, which had a more than two-to-one trade surplus as recently as 1961. Seven years later, imports had more than tripled while exports had declined precipitously. That two-to-one surplus had turned into a three-to-one trade deficit with foreign producers last year capturing about 17% of the American market. The cost to the nation's balance of trade is about \$2-billion a year.

These are serious problems and they will not be solved by adopting the pet phrases of either the free traders or the protectionists. They require this country to take a more realistic attitude towards trade bargaining to insure we get at least as much as we give. In addition, we must demand—not ask—that the ground rules of international competition be made the same for all. A good example of the way there is one rule for the United States and a different one for virtually every other country is provided by the textile industry's present efforts to achieve an international agreement covering wool and man-made fibers. Foreign governments have threatened retaliation and accused us of harboring all types of dastardly "protectionist" sentiments because the new Administration has come out in favor of such an agreement. Yet, as Assistant Secretary of Commerce Stanley Nehmer recently noted, the United Kingdom has restrictions on wool and man-made fiber products from Japan, Italy has similar quotas on Japanese imports and France restricts imports from not only Japan but Hong Kong as well. West Germany has restrictions against Japan, Hong Kong, India and Pakistan and the Benelux countries have a bi-lateral agreement setting quotas on Japanese textiles and apparel. Canada has similar agreements with Japan, Korea, and Hong Kong and Denmark uses licenses to regulate textile imports from Japan, Korea and Taiwan. In fact, even Japan itself sets quotas on imports of woolen fabrics from France, Italy and the United Kingdom. Yet when an American industry finds itself in trouble and proposes that this country consider reciprocal action, the noise and threats from abroad are awesome.

While I am on the subject of retaliation, I must admit some difficulty in understanding why so many in this country allow themselves to be frightened into inaction by foreign threats of retaliation. The very countries making these threats have much more to lose than do we. Our exports are only about 4% of our gross national product—their are two or three times as much. Furthermore, world production costs are such that the U.S. generally is the largest and most profitable single market for foreign exporters, while our sales to them are frequently the least profitable portion of our business. I simply cannot see them starting a trade war which would risk their partici-

pation in the American market. It would not be in their best interests.

Some of you may have heard the remarks by Senator Herman Talmadge at last month's SOCMA luncheon meeting. I would like to conclude by quoting a few of his comments. The Senator, who is an influential member of both the Senate Finance Committee and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress and served as a Congressional delegate to the Kennedy Round negotiations, pointed out it is time for this country to "become more hard-headed in its commercial relations with other countries. The Uncle Sugar attitude of the past has resulted in a severe balance of payments problem . . . We must look beyond tariffs to the real barriers which interfere with the exchange of goods and services and reciprocity must be the keystone of our commercial relations . . . Out of economic necessity our policy must become more hard-headed and realistic. We can no longer afford to accept adverse economic repercussions for the sake of vague political objectives. European unity should not be purchased at the cost of draining U.S. farmers' income, U.S. gold or U.S. jobs."

MINNESOTA EDITORS SPEAK OUT ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are increasingly alarmed by campus disorders that not only threaten the loss of lives and property, but are undermining academic freedom and destroying individual rights. I include at this point a variety of editorials from the press in the Second Congressional District which indicate rather general attitudes about this serious problem:

[From the Montgomery (Minn.) Messenger]

JUSTICE BLACK MAKES SENSE

The experience of history indicates that those who condone or support the violence on American campuses and the disruption of educational routine on the grounds of preserving a necessary atmosphere of freedom in institutions of higher learning may be off on the wrong foot. Anarchy on the campus has virtually destroyed higher education in Latin America. The decline began in 1918 when students in Argentina were given a voice in running the universities.

The governments of Latin American countries have been trying to reverse the trend, but, in the meantime, standards have sunk so low that a Mexican professor was compelled to admit, "We produce bad doctors, but they displace witch doctors. We produce bad lawyers, but they are going to be clerks anyway, with some legal training. Our brilliant students we send abroad."

In the U.S., before the meaning of education dissolves in chaos, it might be well to heed the words of Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black who recently said, "I have always had the idea that the schools were to educate the children and not children to educate teachers."

[From the Pipestone County (Minn.) Star]

WHAT CAN WE EXPECT FROM THEM?

This week a majority of 800 delegates attending a convention of professors criticized President Nixon's get tough statement with campus rioters. They claim his remarks are a threat to academic freedom.

What they are really telling the world is many professors are way off base and have

caused much of the unrest on the campus. Anyone that has attended a university can look back on some of the nutty professors—most of them are tops but there are plenty professors that have been misnamed. They have had too much freedom.

We agree with President Nixon. It is time the university officials let the students know who is running the campus and especially who is paying the bills—the tax payer. They should kick out all students that participate in rioting or taking over public property. Jail them if they have to but call a halt to campus disorder.

Students should be reminded that they are there to learn, not to teach.

[From the Murray County (Minn.) Herald]
BIGGER, BETTER POLICE FORCES

If disruptive students at universities and colleges throughout the nation achieve nothing else, they may well bring about bigger, better and more adequately trained and equipped campus police forces.

Over the weekend, black students took over a student center at Cornell University. At the same time, trustees of Atlanta University Center in Georgia were held behind chained doors for nearly 29 hours by predominantly Negro students.

We don't much care whether the students involved were white or black. The point is that they will never achieve their ends by utilizing means such as this. The American people, and we mean those of all races and creeds, will eventually themselves rebel and the result will be a return of order to educational institutions.

Dissent and protest are now generally recognized as the rights of students. But when they hold respectable and well-meaning private citizens as prisoners in public buildings, and when they destroy thousands of dollars worth of public property, they have gone beyond the limits of tolerance.

Let the student, white or black, carry his signs. Let him march, demonstrate and protest. All of this is fine. But when, in so doing, he infringes upon the rights of others who may or may not think differently he is only hurting his cause.

[From the Jordan (Minn.) Independent]
PRICE OF ANARCHY

Campus dissenters whose chief aim is disruption of university operation may be succeeding in a way they had not foreseen. In the last election, many bond issues and tax proposals having to do with education went down to defeat. In California, \$250 million in bonds for construction in the State's troubled universities and colleges were turned down by the voters. Campus riots at Berkeley were given as one reason for the rejection. Tax increases to meet school needs were also defeated in many areas over the nation.

Evidently voters resent the use of tax-supported educational institutions as a breeding ground for riots and violence. The slowing down of the flow of tax funds to education is part of the price that everyone must pay when permissiveness becomes anarchy. And outright anarchy is what some of the recent action has been and it should be dealt with as such.

[From the Windom (Minn.) Citizen]
CHAOS ON THE CAMPUS

Two learned Negroes have spoken out in the last few days against the militant blacks who, along with militant whites, are making a shambles of the nation's colleges and universities.

Justice Thurgood Marshall, first Negro member of the Supreme Court, put it bluntly when he said, "Anarchy is anarchy and it makes no difference who practices it. Nothing will be settled with guns, fire bombs or rocks."

Bayard H. Rustin, a Negro civil rights leader, said that educators should stop capitulating to demands of black students.

"What are soul courses worth in the real world?" Ruskin asks. "In the real world they want to know if you can do mathematics and write a correct sentence."

It is encouraging to hear responsible Negroes taking a stand for law and order. Too little is being said these days of the need to respect and abide by our laws.

Unless a firm stand is taken soon, we will be graduating from our colleges and universities a brand of students similar to the German youth gangs who terrorized much of Germany during Hitler's rise to power.

We think a majority of the American people are getting fed up with the campus militants who have created a minority tyranny that threatens not only our colleges, but the life of our nation.

It is time to prosecute the violent-prone militants to the fullest extent of the very laws they refuse to recognize.

American citizens are running out of patience and our nation is running out of time.

IDENTO-TAG IS MORE THAN CHARITY

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in this age of "gimmickry" in fundraising, I was delighted to learn of a useful, effective item employed by the Disabled American Veterans. The following article by Sally Latham in the April 7 issue of the *Chatanooga Post* provides some useful information on the idento-tag program which affords employment for many disabled veterans and widows of servicemen. I include it in the RECORD:

VETS RETURN LOST KEYS

(By Sally Latham)

It might not have happened to anyone without her direct pipeline to the source, but Gladycy Branton is convinced she's been blessed with a minor miracle, with the Disabled American Veterans as the intermediary.

Gladycy, secretary to Father William Morgan at St. Stephen's Catholic Church, is a key keeper of the keys for the religious establishment. On her key ring are those to the church, the office, the storeroom, along with her own car and house keys.

During the Christmas-New Year holiday, she tells me, she made a flying trip to Minneapolis, Minn. And when you're on a vacation, you don't pay much attention to the tools of your trade back home.

It was only after she arrived back in Chattanooga that she discovered to her horror her whole collection of keys was missing.

And anyone who has ever lost his keys knows what complications the loss leads to. Everything becomes inconvenient if not downright impossible. Too, there's always the naggingly uncomfortable feeling that someone else is in possession of ready access to all you own.

Gladycy's loss happened somewhere, sometime, on Dec. 31.

"They had to be either on the Northwest or Delta Airlines or at the hotel where I stayed," Gladycy said. "I dropped them all notes, but I didn't hear from them. They must find thousands of keys, so they probably pitch them out."

The key ring was that of a gasoline company, so she wrote them too—with no success.

But she had something else on that ring—something she had given very little thought to—which proved to be the magic amulet.

It was the little Ident-o-tag she's received in the mail from the DAV.

"I'd been getting them for years," Gladycy told me, "but I thought they were just a gimmick to make money."

She'd put them on the chain with her keys, anyway, without any idea of their significance.

She had given up all hope of ever getting her key ring back when a couple of weeks ago, she received a bulky letter in the mail. It was her long-lost keys.

Accompanying her valued possession was a lengthy letter from a DAV official, explaining that whoever found them had mailed them to the DAV's Cincinnati address on the tag. In turn, the veterans' organization had sent inquiries to the Tennessee license department and had found out through that channel to whom the keys belonged.

"They said they return over two million sets of keys every year," Gladycy reported. "The Ident-o-tag is sort of like insurance—you never know what it means to you until something happens."

The little tag gives up to 15 months of protection, Gladycy was informed, even though you get a new license. The DAV will trace as long as records are available.

And donations made in return for the little gimmicks go to help some 240,000 disabled American veterans.

My eyes are now properly opened. Next time I get Ident-o-tags through the mail, they'll go on my keyring post haste. And with proper remuneration to say thanks in advance for the service.

TAKE CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, many States are under great pressure of maintaining and paying the high costs of State governments, and most of them are not in any position to substitute State funds for Federal funds to take care of some 800,000 AFDC recipients, who, unless the freeze is lifted, will have to be taken care of without Federal matching funds.

It is estimated that under the freeze the States will lose something like \$300 million in Federal grants and this large sum may even be higher.

As a result, very many new State revenues would have to be devised, in the event aid to dependent children were to be indefinitely frozen or substantially decreased.

Some have advocated postponement of the freeze, but this is not a satisfactory answer. It avoids the real issue of providing adequate grants.

The States have a right to know what they may expect, by way of matching funds from the U.S. Government for the very important programs that involve care of and assistance for helpless, dependent children, and I believe that our Ways and Means Committee should take prompt action to repeal the statutory provision limiting Federal grants for dependent children programs which are to become effective on July 1 of this year.

I strongly urge the Ways and Means Committee to take this action and urgently hope that it will do so because this country cannot leave itself in a position of rejecting adequate help and support of young children, who may be in dire need of food, sustenance, and the elementary needs of life.

The Ways and Means Committee has a great responsibility in the social areas which deal with the urgent needs of deprived, indigent, and needy human beings as well as in other profoundly critical, fiscal, financial, tax, and economic matters and I trust it will demonstrate a vital forward-looking role in enlightened social action, as well as assert an independent, realistic policy toward taxes and fiscal matters that is oriented toward the real interests of the rank and file of the American people as it moves to cope with budgetary deficits and balance the national budget.

BY THEIR COMPANY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while there has been extensive press coverage of the turmoil that SDS and other radical left groups have brought to college campuses, we must not overlook the similar problems that have developed at some high schools.

Lyons Township High School in La Grange, Ill., has been the scene of small-scale activities by a handful of students who have come under the influence of the radical conspiracy and I was pleased to note the Suburban Life, a publication serving the communities of West Cook County, in its issue Thursday, May 22, directed attention to this matter in a very effective fashion:

BY THEIR COMPANY

When are we going to realize that the Students for a Democratic Society is nothing but a rabble-rousing organization bent on destruction, violence and the break-up of this nation?

"On Tuesday, May 13, we will march to demand that state's attorney Hanrahan jail this pig and indict him for murder." That's a boxed in indictment on the facing page of a leaflet circulated at a meeting of the student forum at Lyons Township High School last week.

The leaflet further urges that a gathering be held at the corner of Halsted and Armitage in Chicago to rally with speakers from the Young Lords, Young Patriots, Black Panthers Party and SDS. It was.

It inflames the youngsters with the statement, "On Sunday, May 4, our brother Manuel Ramos, a member of the Young Lords Organization, was murdered by an 'off duty' pig."

On the second page of the leaflet is a paragraph carrying the head, "People Demand Justice." It reads, "On May 13 the people will march to the 18th District pig station to demand that state's attorney Hanrahan uphold the American justice that he and his pig friends claim exists. The people will demand that the killer of Manuel Ramos, pig Robert Lamb, be indicted for murder in the

first degree. If Hanrahan refuses to do this he will also be indicted as an accomplice to the murder. Come to the rally, bring the real criminals to justice."

So the SDS seeks justice. Yet the organization overlooks that the accused is entitled to due process of law, just as its leaders scream and protest that they are being denied, which in itself is a fallacy and a smokescreen.

The SDS laces its inflammatory publicity with words like "pig" and "pig power" which are designed to create hate and bigotry, the very things it claims to be opposing.

The SDS writers know no more about what happened in the killing of the Ramos boy than anyone else, but they are quick to assume and pass on to whatever readers they have that the "pig," a police officer, was wrong. And they proceed to convict him in print before the man has had his day in court.

Supposing the shoe were on the other foot? Would they be as quick to accuse and convict?

Do the dissenters call attention to their tactics? Does the SDS mention that members of the organization take over college campuses and deprive other students of the right to attend classes? Do the righteous writers mention that property has been destroyed, files demolished?

Do they mention that state and federal troopers, plus local police, called to the scene cost the taxpayers a lot of hard earned cash? The answer to the foregoing is, No.

The answers given are that the police, troopers, officials and college and high school administrators are "pigs." In fact, everyone who disagrees with them is a "pig."

The SDS is nothing but a national conspiracy. Its leaders know and plan when the next disturbance will take place. It's high time that the leaders of this organization be brought before the courts of law, and if found guilty of disturbing the public peace, be given the full measure of punishment the law provides.

Giving them the rights of the courts is mandatory; they're entitled to it under the Constitution. It may be a mistake to grant them their rights because they don't recognize the rights of others. Nevertheless, right is right and regardless of how we may feel they are entitled to their rights.

And when justice prevails we'll see just who the "pigs" are.

RESOLUTIONS BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I hereby include for the RECORD the following resolutions by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The first resolution concerns the seaward boundary of Massachusetts and requests congressional recognition of a 100-mile limit.

The second resolution supports the concept of revenue-sharing as one way to aid State and local governments.

The third resolution urges the President to nominate Dr. John H. Knowles as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Senate to confirm such appointment.

I include the resolutions as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to recognize the 100-mile seaward boundary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Whereas, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts was granted a seaward boundary to one hundred (100) miles offshore by the First Virginia Charter in the year 1606 and by the Council Charter in the year 1620; and

Whereas, The Federal Submerged Lands Act of 1953, Subchapter I, expresses federal recognition of state seaward boundaries claimed prior to their entering the Union, "(A)nd to the boundary line of each such state where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such state became a member of the Union . . ."; and

Whereas, The First Virginia Charter of 1606 and the Council Charter of 1620 grant a seaward boundary of one-hundred miles to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts prior to its entering the Union in 1789; and

Whereas, The Federal Submerged Lands Act presently favors only two Gulf of Mexico states and confines all other coastal states to a three-mile seaward limit; and

Whereas, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts appears to have a strong historic claim to a seaward jurisdiction beyond three miles, which has not been considered by Congress or adjudicated by the courts; and

Whereas, There is no evidence of Massachusetts surrendering this extensive seaward jurisdiction upon entering the Union; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to recognize and to honor, the one-hundred mile seaward boundary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Interior, to the presiding officers of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION 2

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for general aid to state and local governments through the sharing of Federal income taxes

Whereas, There is legislation pending before the Congress of the United States which provides for the sharing of a fixed percentage of revenues from the individual federal income tax with state and local governments for purposes determined by them; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation providing for the sharing of a fixed percentage of revenues from the individual federal income tax with state and local governments; and be it further

Resolved; That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION 3

Memorializing the President of the United States to nominate Dr. John H. Knowles as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and the United States Senate to confirm said appointment

Whereas, Dr. John H. Knowles, the distinguished and able General Director of the Massachusetts General Hospital is being mentioned as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; and

Whereas, Dr. Knowles as General Director of the Massachusetts General Hospital, which in 1967 was rated number one in a list of ten of America's best hospitals, is a recognized expert in hospital supervision, medical affairs, health planning and scientific research, all fields which come under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the President of the United States to nominate Dr. John H. Knowles as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Senate of the United States to confirm said appointment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

REALTOR WEEK

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. John J. Reed delivered a great and timely speech at the annual civic luncheon of Realtor Week in the Tidewater area in Norfolk, Va.

He was introduced by our friend and former colleague Porter Hardy, Jr. Many of you will remember Mr. Reed as the former Deputy Assistant Secretary, Family Housing, Department of Defense.

It was a timely speech, because everything we hear these days seems to be highly critical of our Military Establishment. It was a great speech, because the speaker was knowledgeable—with no axes to grind—and he brought some people's blurred vision on this subject back into clearer focus. He told his audience, "In view of all this criticism about what is bad about the military, maybe we need to start talking about what's good about the military." He does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I include this speech in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY JOHN J. REED AT THE ANNUAL CIVIC LUNCHEON OF REALTOR WEEK IN THE TIDEWATER AREA, NORFOLK, VA., MAY 21, 1969

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to be back in Tidewater country. This part of our State holds many pleasant memories for an old VPI boy, who spent many summer-student days on nearby Virginia Beach. Those days are remembered both with pleasure and a bit of nostalgia.

Your courtesy in inviting me to meet with you today and to share a few thoughts, is very much appreciated. First, I wish to congratulate your industry; you realtors have done a great deal in the area of community service and establishing professional standards and ethics and you are to be commended. Groups such as these epitomize the local civic spirit which exists throughout our Country and which makes such significant contributions to improving our way of life. You are the community leaders and I believe

your active participation is the key to the continuation of our valued traditions.

I'm very grateful for the kind introduction by my friend, the Honorable Porter Hardy, Jr. I know that it's difficult to get Porter to come away from his retirement activities for public events, so I particularly appreciate his taking the time to be here today. I'd like to say that his departure from the Congress was a loss to Virginia and to the Nation. I'd like to suggest to this group that in special appreciation for his 22 years of dedicated service in the United States Congress, we give him an extra ovation now.

Speaking of Porter, I'd like to share with you one anecdote from his congressional days. You are, I know, aware of his reputation and talents as an interrogator. Let me tell you, when a witness appeared it was always with a cold, clammy sense of apprehension. One day, I happened to be in the witness chair and I was being ripped up one side and down the other by the famous Hardy question technique, and I apparently wasn't doing a very good job of being responsive in my answers. When the session ended, Porter came down to the witness table, and we were chatting while I figuratively bled from my wounds, then his committee colleague, Eddie Hébert from New Orleans, came by, put a hand on each of our shoulders and said, "John, it's a dam good thing he's a friend of yours, otherwise he would have killed you." So friend, or foe alike, we always approached that committee with profound respect and a large measure of apprehension.

Today, I would like to discuss with you, two subjects which I feel are perhaps an appropriate reflection of the facts that this meeting is known as the Civic Luncheon—the highlight of Realtor's Week here in the Tidewater area—and that the theme of Realtor's Week this year is Home Ownership. With regard to these two subjects, one is something I know a great about because of my prior Pentagon assignment—that is the military family housing program. The other, is one I'd like to discuss because I feel very strongly about it—that is the increasing anti-military attitude which seems to be sweeping through the Country.

Your theme for Realtor's Week 1969, "Home Ownership—Foundation of the Nation"—is a great one, and I think we might reflect and say, "How could this be applied to military families? Could this concept become an attainable objective for most military families?" Here, in the Tidewater area, you have a unique situation regarding your military neighbors in your communities. As an example, there are some 92,000 military here, assigned to bases and ships. Of these, about 39,000 are married personnel, representing all the Services. Of the married personnel, about 17,000 are renting homes and apartments throughout your area. In addition, and I found this to be of particular interest, almost 10,000 of these military families own their own homes here in Tidewater Virginia. This, I think, proves that there is a strong desire on the part of many of the military to own their own property. Contrasted with these statistics is the fact that there are some 4,100 Government-owned units which are made available for use by military families. From these statistics, you can see that the Tidewater areas as to military housing represents a balanced picture of private ownership, Government-owned units, and rental units. The policy of the Defense Department regarding the housing of its military families has been that it prefers that they live in the communities surrounding the military installations, where this can be achieved without personal or financial hardship. The Department's position on military ownership of private homes has been that it would neither be discouraged nor encouraged. The reason for the latter view is that with the frequent

transfer of personnel, from one duty assignment to another on an average of something less than 3 years, home ownership can become a significant problem in certain parts of the Country. Our studies, when I was with Defense, showed that in many areas of the Country, sales of properties presented no problems of any consequence and that it was often to the financial advantage of the military man to purchase a home during his tour of duty. Yet, in other parts of the Country, service men were often unable to sell their houses quickly and reasonably when they were transferred, or in some cases where military bases were significantly reduced or even closed there was no market and the properties had to be foreclosed.

Because of these types of problems, the Defense Department decided that it would primarily depend upon the available rental units in the communities surrounding these bases to meet the needs of the families of military personnel. But, also, that it would not prohibit or restrict service men from exercising their free choice in acquiring their own homes, and they were financially able to do so. My challenge to you in this group this afternoon would be this: Are there steps which your industry, the Realtors of America, could take, perhaps in conjunction with the financial institutions, to find ways to assist even more military personnel to come into home ownership and yet not run a great risk of financial catastrophe upon their transfer because of inability to resell their property? How could these people be helped to do this? How could your theme of Home Ownership be implemented on an even greater degree with the military families involved? These are difficult questions, I realize, but I challenge you to use the talents, which are represented collectively here today by the fine people who are members of this profession—are there ways—can you devise systems—if there are practical ways which could be worked out, then I submit that you would be doing the military families a great favor and you of course would be helping your own industry to grow and to prosper. Right here in the Tidewater area, the military represent a significant potential market for home ownership if these problems could be resolved. Certainly, a solution might even conceivably involve legislation which the Congress might enact to help achieve this objective. They've enacted laws in the past to assist other members of our citizenry to achieve home ownership. Again, fair and equitable proposals which could be advanced towards achieving this objective would, I am sure, receive careful consideration by those in the military and those in the Congress. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to think that on this point, the ball is back in your court.

Next, with your indulgence, I would like to share with you some thoughts and observations of a strictly personal nature now that I am a private citizen again. I would like to talk about public service and I would like to speak out against the current wave of anti-militarism that appears to be sweeping this Country.

At the outset, let me make it clear: Military men do make mistakes, realtors make mistakes, even lawyers make mistakes; however, this does not go to the motivation and integrity of these people. This thought was well stated recently by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird in a speech to a group of newspaper editors when he said, Quote:

"Another type of criticism that gives me concern is that directed at the military profession and at the character of the career military man. Some of the critics seem to be in search of a scapegoat. The frequently expressed concerns about the military-industrial complex raise some valid issues, but it is utter nonsense to question the motivation of our military leaders. Our military leaders

are dedicated men of the highest competence whose purpose is peace." Unquote.

We sitting in this room today would not have to go very far to be reminded of great personal military leadership in the cause of peace. Certainly, General Douglas MacArthur, by his forceful personal leadership and integrity, established a strong economy and a democratic society in Japan following World War II and in this way made a staunch ally out of a former enemy.

Also, we Virginians proudly claim our son, George Catlett Marshall, as we should, and, certainly, the strong leadership which he exhibited as a Statesman, and which emanated from a background of many years of military service, was of vital help to our Country. His leadership revitalized the economy of continental Europe and assured that those countries would continue as democratic societies, and remain in the Western camp of nations. It occurs to me that, perhaps, some contemporary critics are a little short on a sense of history.

Every day it appears, we see headlines in our papers about protest against ROTC on college campuses; we read of military recruiters being abused and physically detained by small groups of students and others; we hear and read of students, and of some faculty members, protesting accomplishment of military research and development work on campus; we read of some members of the clergy breaking into and vandalizing the administrative offices of a corporation which produces a product needed by the military; and we read newspaper articles implying that high Pentagon officials—men whom I knew personally and knew to have the highest integrity—were dupes of certain private corporations. I, like many others, am sick of it. I think we all need to begin to speak out against this kind of philosophical nonsense and to recognize our need for a strong, competent military organization in today's world. In view of all of this criticism about what is bad about the military, maybe we need to start talking about what's good about the military. In the words of the old Johnny Mercer hit song, "Let's accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative."

First, let's talk about the ROTC program. It would be my opinion that if the military is going to retain its democratic roots, then it seems vital that we continue to have the quality level and the broad base of career officers which the ROTC helps to provide. Certainly, by inputting into our officer corps qualified individuals from many diverse backgrounds and colleges we are assuring the continuation of the proper relationship of the military within our democratic society.

Let's go on to research and development on defense problems by universities. I would say this is very important to the defense effort and to stimulating the growth of basic knowledge. Where does such R&D effort leads us? Certainly, it helps to provide the weapons that we may need at future times. But, what else does it provide? Let's explore the computer field. Our entire economy has prospered because of this area of technology. Where did it begin? With Naval gun requirements for ballistic tables. Years back, 1944, Dr. Howard Aiken of Harvard designed and built a new computer on a "go-no go" electric relay basis in order to help calculate ballistic tables. This machine filled a whole building up at Dahlgren, Virginia, and was the beginning of modern computer technology. Later came the NORC—the Naval Ordnance Research Calculator. This was about 1955. It was an early electronic computer produced under a Navy contract with the IBM Corporation as a follow-on to research at universities. This effort, on the NORC, and the parallel military-sponsored effort on transistors, pushed us over the threshold in the com-

puter field and has led us into the current technological era. Are we to believe that this is an undesirable by-product of inherently evil research? I think not. If by short-sightedness, or perhaps for even more devious motives, we are asked to class research and develop effort sponsored by the taxpayers throughout the Defense Department as a bad thing, then are we not stopping the progress of the technical side of our Defense effort and deferring the advance of basic knowledge? If in the frustration over the Vietnam war and other problems in our society, we take such action to damage the basic fabric of our National makeup, then I think we all need to do some serious thinking as to what the objectives of this American society truly are. And most disturbing to this observer is the lack of leadership on the part of some university administrators and faculty members in not retaining a true perspective of what is good for this Country, and of giving in to a current screaming mob rather than preaching out in terms of ultimate objectives and desires.

Last Saturday was Armed Forces Day, and, perhaps that is an appropriate milestone date that we can each use to start turning this thing around. I don't know how "military" got to be a dirty word, but, I for one, and I am sure I also speak for the majority of the people present today, believe that there is much good in our current Defense establishment. I don't fear a military-industrial complex will take over our Government. As a matter of fact, I think it provides strength for our Nation. It needs to be monitored, yes; and there are those in the Congress and in the Executive Branch who do monitor it with a sense of integrity and a sense of duty. A strong military establishment has kept the peace—such as it is—since the end of World War II. What really is the power of the United States as a Nation? Is it our gross national product, our mineral wealth, our productive capability? To our adversaries, I submit, it is that B-52 crew that's now aloft; it's the men submerged in a Polaris submarine somewhere off the European continent; it's the kids down in a silo in one of our western states monitoring their dials and electronic equipment; it's the GI along the 38th parallel over in Korea; and, above all, it's the men in Vietnam.

This is the point of the dagger as they say and this is the power of the United States that is respected in today's world. Perhaps, what I am trying to say is best summed up by the motto of our elite SAC forces—"Peace is our Profession."

Thank you.

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my very able friend from Delaware, Congressman BILL ROTH. I was disappointed to learn that he will be creating a great void in the House by leaving for the other body, but happy to find that he will continue his dedicated and tireless service in the Congress of the United States.

Ever since he entered these Chambers, BILL ROTH has shown not only a rare aptitude for his job, but a rare concern for the people who sent him here. He has combined an outstanding academic, military, and legal background with a natu-

ral involvement in community and world problems to establish himself as an outstanding leader in the State of Delaware, and as an outstanding Congressman here in Washington.

It is this record of accomplishment that he has been writing since joining us here that deserves a special tribute by his colleagues. Amidst the talk and worry about our growing bureaucracy and the potential dangers and inadequacies of big Government, BILL ROTH struck out on his own to do something. He attacked the complexities head on, pointed up the need for and then gave direction to a design that will help make at least one area of government more comprehensible and more workable. Responding to inquiries by his constituents on just what our Federal Government was capable of doing and what, in fact, it did do with its Federal-aid programs, he set out to let them—and us—know.

By first uncovering, through his extensive inquiries and tabulations, the many inadequacies and areas of duplication and waste which exist, and then proposing two original major pieces of legislation to alter those inadequacies during his first year in Congress, he has displayed the kind of leadership and initiative that we can expect from him.

It seems appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about the seat which our eminent colleague will be seeking. It is the seat of the very distinguished Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, who this year announced to the disappointment of all concerned citizens and officials everywhere that he would not seek reelection at the end of his term in 1970. Although his decision is regrettable from the standpoint that his services will not be continued here in Washington, we can find comfort in his assertion that he looks upon it as an announcement of his candidacy for the highest honor that can be conferred upon any man, which he maintains is to be "a constructive and useful private citizen of the State and country to which I owe so much."

There has been some question as to whether or not Senator WILLIAMS can be replaced, and whether the public interests will ever again be protected as they have been since he took office.

It is my feeling, and the feeling of many others in this body, that BILL ROTH has already displayed the same kind of concern for the people he represents, and the same dedication to the removal of waste and inefficiency in Government. I am confident that if he is given the opportunity, he will bring to the Senate the same honor, energy, integrity, and brilliance which he has shown us here in the House.

We wish him well.

THE PRICE IS RIGHT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the New York City

Department of Consumer Affairs on a proposal to require unit pricing to the nearest 10th of a cent on certain commodities. The purpose of the proposal is to enable shoppers to make successful price comparisons, now an impossible task.

Senator NELSON of Wisconsin and I have introduced legislation which would amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act by requiring the price per unit to be placed on consumer commodities. The New York City proposal and the legislation we have introduced are parallel measures to eliminate the price and packaging confusion that is so pervasive in the marketplace. With their passage, consumers would finally be able to determine what really is a good buy.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

Three years ago the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, designed to promote informed choice in the marketplace, was enacted into law. But the housewife in 1969 as in 1966, still stands bewildered in the supermarket aisles.

Faced with endless varieties of packages, labels, and prices for a multiplicity of brands of the same product, the housewife hardly resembles the sophisticated consumer on which our free enterprise economy is based—one equipped with sufficient information about products and prices to make rational choices. The result is that American consumers are shopping blindfolded, with the scales of marketplace justice rarely balanced in their favor.

The Fair Packaging and Labeling Act has failed to give consumers parity with producers in the free enterprise arena. It was neither intended to, nor did it in fact, resolve all the informational needs and problems confronting consumers. Even if the Act were being vigorously enforced, which is not the case, consumers would still be left in the dark when it comes to identifying the "best buy".

Admittedly the Act, has in some cases, reversed the wild proliferation of package sizes. The National Bureau of Standards, pursuant to the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, is presently involved in resolving package proliferation problems. To date, 27 product categories (such as crackers, coffee, detergents, toothpaste) have had weight standards established, thus reducing the variety of package sizes. 39 additional consumer commodities are currently under study.

But reducing package proliferation, in itself, will not provide consumers with the most elementary information necessary to make economically wise purchases: how much does a standard unit, an ounce, for example, cost for the various brands and sizes available within a given product category?

It is clear to me that consumers need three basic kinds of information about packaged products:

- (1) a true statement of net weight and the percentage of ingredients;
- (2) the quality or grade of ingredients;
- (3) the unit price for competing sizes and brands.

The first type of information is dependent upon a labeling system that indicates the actual net contents. For example, declarations of net weight for fruit and vegetables packed in syrups, brines or other liquids which do not differentiate between the product and the liquid, hardly are valid indications of contents.

The second type of information is dependent upon a comprehensive and accurate quality grading program—a vast improvement over the limited and ineffective grading pro-

gram the Department of Agriculture now administers.

Finally, there is no existing system for identifying the unit costs of packaged products; this information gap would be closed by the adoption of your proposal at the local level and bills to achieve the same purpose pending at the federal level.

What kind of anti-consumer practices would enactment of your proposal remedy? First and most obviously, it would give consumers the basic kind of economic information necessary to make cost-value comparisons. Secondly, it would negate the widespread practice, now engaged in by food and toilet goods manufacturers, of subtly shrinking package contents without reducing prices.

Hearings to be held next week by my Special Consumer Inquiry will show that hundreds and probably thousands of packaged food and toiletry products have experienced such subtle weight decreases, thus causing "hidden" price increases to consumers: did you know, for example, that the package of Betty Crocker Country Corn Flakes that contained 11 ounces in 1965 now contains 10 ounces; that the Franco-American spaghetti that used to be 27 ounces is now 26½ ounces; that the 8 ounce can of Libby's chili is now 7½ ounces? Prices go up and contents go down.

Are you aware that the Jergens Lotion that was 12½ ounces is now 10½ ounces; that the 8 ounce can of Breck Hair Set Mist is now 7 ounces; that the 12½ ounce family size Halo Shampoo has shrunk by one ounce; that the 21 ounce package of Serutan is now only 18 ounces?

Obviously, if the price per unit were recorded on packages, manufacturers would not be able to conceal price increases by shrinking the contents of their packaged products.

Your proposal requiring unit pricing to the nearest tenth of a cent on certain commodities which cause the greatest confusion is a sound approach to refocusing attention on the absence of fair packaging and labeling. The example set by New York City will, hopefully, provide the model for other cities to follow. And it could provide the impetus for the enactment of similar federal legislation.

Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin and I have introduced legislation which would amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act by requiring the price per unit to be placed on consumer commodities, including food, household goods, drugs, and cosmetics. The retail outlet would be responsible for posting the actual price per unit of contents based on the actual sales price.

I think we should not be intimidated by manufacturers and sellers who claim that the cost of unit marking would result in higher prices. It is obvious that unit pricing charts could be made available to retailers and that they can stamp the unit cost and total cost on each package or container as easily as they now stamp the price on these items.

I want to commend you for taking the initiative in this matter and thank you for providing me with an opportunity to appear before you today to discuss this important proposal.

APOLLO 10

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Astronauts Eugene A. Cernan, Thomas P. Stafford, and John Young have circled the moon, a feat accomplished only once before, and took a new gigantic step toward a lunar landing when they de-

scended to within 50,000 feet of the lunar surface. As Americans, we are proud of their achievement and the achievement of the many people who, throughout the country, have worked on the development of the Apollo equipment. As Americans we are proud of three fine young men who have taken another step in challenging the unknown. By their efforts we are learning more about the world we live in.

As we mark this achievement as the prelude to a lunar landing we should remember that this is a beginning. It is a beginning not only of an exploration but the beginning of the opening of a new era of utilization of space. The road along this route of exploration will be long and difficult. Success will not always come easily and at times the sacrifices will be large. However, I believe that with the leadership of such men as Astronauts Cernan, Stafford, and Young we will be prepared to continue to challenge the unknown for new knowledge and the benefit of all mankind.

We welcome the astronauts back to earth and wish them a speedy reunion with their families and friends. They truly are pioneers of their times.

HOUSING HOAX

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1949, Members of Congress passed the National Housing Act which committed this Government to the construction of 810,000 public housing units for low- and moderate-income citizens to be completed in the ensuing 6 years. Today, 20 years later, we still fall 10,000 units short of that goal. It has, indeed, been a "housing hoax" particularly in view of the current conservative estimate of a need for low-income housing by 7.8 million persons who presently cannot afford to compete for housing on the open market.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues this portrayal of the situation by Michael Harrington whose column was carried in the May 20 edition of the Washington Evening Star:

THE GREAT AMERICAN HOUSING HOAX

Our longest running official lie, approved by five Presidents and ten sessions of Congress, has just opened the new season under George Romney. It is the Great American Housing Hoax.

Romney's announcement of his Model Cities policy was designed with all the art of a cigarette commercial. For anyone who believes a brand can be so low in tar and nicotine that it is almost pure air and simultaneously is the most flavorful smoke around, will also be persuaded that, by cutting the Model Cities funds by \$75 million and extending the program to more neighborhoods, it is being made more effective.

After this optimistic contradiction, the secretary of housing and urban development went on to reveal his "breakthrough" plan. In this scheme, there is to be such innovation in construction techniques that the one-half of American families now unable to bid for decent housing on the private

market will suddenly become effective consumers.

This is a marvelously painless solution to a crisis for it would not cost much federal money and it would make big private profits. The only problem is—and Romney could check it out by reading the analysis of Paul Douglas' National Commission on Urban Problems of a few months back—that it will not work. But even making the outlandish assumption that such an approach is going to produce six million units of low cost housing in ten years, there is no hint of the aesthetic, racial and social design of all these homes.

Will they take the form of suburban sprawl, of gilded ghettos—or of new towns and refurbished old cities? It should be obvious by now that such momentous questions are not going to be solved by the invisible hand of Adam Smith acting through the private market but will require creative government planning—and spending—at every level of the society.

But then it is unfair to single out George Romney for blame since he is simply, and probably sincerely, acting in the tradition of institutionalized hypocrisy which has characterized housing policy for a generation.

The Great American Housing Hoax began in 1949 with a Republican conservative, Robert A. Taft, on the side of the angels. Taft, who knew then what Romney has yet to learn, declared that the private market obviously could not satisfy the housing needs of poor people.

On the basis of free enterprise principle, he declared this was an area in which the government had to intervene. And as he helped pass the 1949 Housing Act, he said that Washington had to finance 135,000 units of low-cost housing a year for six years.

It is now 20 years since the nation solemnly accepted this housing goal—and we have yet to fulfill four years of Taft's target. Moreover, in the intervening period urban renewal and federal highway programs were actually destroying more low-income housing than Washington was building and cheap interest and handsome tax deductions were helping to construct more than 10 million units of middle income and wealthy housing.

So it is that one comes to the magnificent irony that the stated purpose of the 1968 housing legislation was to fulfill the stated purpose of the 1949 act.

But no one should fear that the 1968 oath to the poor will be honored. This year, when we were supposed to be taking the first giant stride toward creating six million units of low-cost housing in ten years, we are doing practically nothing. Because of inflation, even the normal rate of private construction will be down; and with a conservative Congress and a passive President, there is no real chance that Washington will broaden the public sector.

But even though one cannot thus charge Secretary Romney for a unique dereliction, the particular way he evades the issue is worthy of some comment. For it is becoming clearer every day that the domestic social thinking of the Nixon administration is dominated by a central myth: that Lyndon Johnson tried to do too much. The policy conclusion is that what is therefore needed is not new programs or, God help us, new money, but a more efficient administration of the old structures and a greater reliance upon voluntary groups and the private sector.

But, as the Great American Housing Hoax demonstrates, the poor in the slums have suffered for a generation from too little, not from too much. In all probability, Romney's cigarette commercials for the new, cut back and improved, Model Cities program is just one more of those retreats from social commitment caused by Vietnam and inflation, one more instance of burdening the poor to stabilize the dollars of the affluent. But the

idyll about the painless, almost moneyless creation of a private low-income housing market is a serious, reactionary attempt to ignore one of the nation's most desperate needs.

STUDENT'S LETTER ON VIETNAM INTRODUCED BY MR. MOORHEAD

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman's office is literally bombarded with thousands of pieces of mail every week—as you gentlemen well know.

The correspondence range from the congratulatory to the vituperative and all the stages in between.

Occasionally one receives a personal letter which so clearly demonstrates the writer's sincerity and concern that one must give it special treatment.

I received the following letter from Miss Elizabeth Morrison, a student at the University of Pittsburgh.

Like so many millions of Americans, myself included, Miss Morrison is disturbed and agitated over the continued fighting in Vietnam and the toll in lives, patience, and morale that this horrible conflict is taking.

So much has been said about the young people in this country who are protesting our Vietnam adventures that we sometimes forget the honesty and depth of their feelings.

I defy anyone to read Miss Morrison's letter and pass off her plea as that of a misdirected youth yelling merely to make herself heard.

I think the words of this young lady represent the best qualities that the young people of America possess and reflect those characteristics that eventually will make this country strong and united once again.

The letter follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA.

April 2, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: Today your newsletter arrived and it couldn't have come at a better time. Vietnam has alienated me in a sense from our political system. This alienation is a rather difficult thing for me to accept because as a political science major at Pitt, I've always felt somehow involved with politics and the government.

The thing that bothers me about Vietnam is that it hurts so much. Having had several courses concerned with our political involvement in SouthEast Asia I can understand the commitment we have there. What I can't understand is how people with family members in the armed services stationed in Vietnam can live for a year with all of the anxieties brought on by guerilla warfare. How can they say good-bye to their sons and husbands, knowing that they may never see them again? I've said that I can understand our commitment there, and I can. I've never actively protested it and I don't admire draft resisters. I just can't tolerate the thought of all those young men dying every day. They're so very young and they have to die, having had no taste of life.

I'm not writing to say that I have a solution to the war because I haven't. I am writing to you because I admire you and I'm certain that I'll receive some kind of letter from your office. Perhaps that will make me feel

a more integral part of our country. Please, please work with your fellow congressmen to urge Nixon (perhaps I should have said President Nixon but having been an active Humphrey supporter it's difficult) to make the end of the war in Vietnam a top priority. It's so unspeakably awful. You're so very fortunate to be in a position to be heard. I'm not. In fact the closest I'll come to being heard is when one of your staff members reads this letter. Please do something active to stop the deaths of American men in Vietnam. I know how very hard I would work towards that end if I were in your position.

Even when the war is over, nothing in the world can fill the void in America created by the deaths of the soldiers fighting in Vietnam. What can compensate for the loss of vision or limbs in those returning home?? Surely not a disability pension. Give every American a chance to a life here, not just widows and children. If something isn't done soon, there may be a tremendous decrease in the number of children in the United States. Wars hurt Rome and this war is killing America.

Congressman Moorhead please do something now before the scars can never heal. As a member of the Pitt Young Democrats I had the opportunity to hear you speak to our club shortly before the election. I was impressed by your sincerity. Please don't let me or any other citizen down. Use your good position to contribute to America's salvation.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH A. MORRISON.

LAW DAY, 1969

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at a recent luncheon meeting in observance of Law Day, members of the Denver Bar Association were privileged to hear an address by Mr. Charles W. Poe, Jr., associated director of Denver Opportunity. Before being appointed to his present position, Mr. Poe served with great distinction and ability as a member of the legal staff of the Idaho operations office at the Atomic Energy Commission at Idaho Falls.

In his Law Day address, Mr. Poe reveals a deep insight into some of the social problems facing America. He points out that the law should serve as an instrument of social change and that the role of lawyers and jurists should be that of actors in this process rather than reactors.

I include Mr. Poe's address as a part of my remarks:

LAW DAY, 1969

(By Charles W. Poe, Jr.)

Governor Love, Judge Finesilver, and other distinguished guests:

During the preparation for my brief presentation, I gave a great deal of consideration to the prospective audience and to its composition. As you are aware, lawyers and those in related fields of endeavor are of a peculiar breed in terms of being somewhat cynical and unswayed by rhetoric, since cynicism and rhetoric are a way of life. As a result, I decided that there was little I could say in the time available which would make a lasting impression upon you.

In my presentation therefore, I shall try to share with you my experience, and my concern. It may depart somewhat from an outline you may have seen. Within the guidelines of our luncheon subject, "What the Framework of American Law Means to Me," it shall focus upon the following areas:

1. A concept of law;
2. The impact of the law upon my life;
3. The need for change and action; and
4. A necessary coalition.

I deplore those, who because of their position in a community, automatically attribute to themselves the accoutrements of leadership, and are so received. What you shall hear are not the opinions of a self-styled leader, but rather, the opinions of one man, a black man.

When one views the present and continuing reassessment of all of our values, our traditions and customs, there is no sound basis for such reassessments to exclude the law itself. Samuel Johnson has defined the law as: "the last resort of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the public good." I would modify that definition to read, "The law should not be the last resort of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the public good."

The law, and you as lawyers and jurists, should be in the vanguard of social change, not as reactors, but rather as actors.

My concept of the law and its impact upon me cannot be segregated from my self-concept as a colored man, a Negro, and now as a black man in a racist society. There is no law without justice, and justice continues to be a commodity which, for the most part, black people and other people of color—the long disenfranchised, disadvantaged, and frequently poor, have not been able to purchase with the same degree of quality and quantity as their white counterparts. Many black people have translated the cry for "Law and Order" into "Keep the niggers in their place." It is not my purpose to turn this into a sociological commentary, but I would be less than candid if I did not voice my concern and my commitment at a time when the nation and the community I love continue to avoid making those hard decisions which must be made if the moralization identified in the Kerner Report is to no longer remain ignored and unchecked.

I say "racist society" not with the condemnatory fervor with which that phrase is ordinarily accompanied. I say "racist society" as one who is aware that the effort, if made, to purge our nation of the debilitating effects of discrimination and prejudice, will be a long and painful one. However, neither the burden of pain nor the burden of time should further delay either the incision or the surgery.

What has been the import of the law upon my life and how is this related to my preceding comments? For the sake of clarity, let us use 1954 as the year for the "before" and "after" considerations which follow. The law before 1954 had established that "separate but equal schools" were bona-fide, state-supported institutions, largely based upon *Plessy v. Ferguson*, an 1896 Supreme Court decision. In that decision 73 years ago, the dissenting voice stated, "The Constitution is color blind." But should it be? We have all heard the cliché, "We are a nation of laws, and not of men." But are we? I believe that we are a nation of men who have the power, and hopefully, the will, to change laws to meet newly identified, mid-20th century needs. Prior to 1954, the law in all of its infinite wisdom, helped to give you, white America, an over-assessment of your true worth, and concomitantly caused a corresponding under-assessment of a black man's value.

As Baratz stated in a recent American Speech and Hearing Association article:

"Even when the abolitionists were most vociferous in their insistence upon eliminat-

ing slavery in the United States (some 200 years after the initial importation of Negro slaves) they were not disputing the thought that the Negro was genetically inferior to the white man, but simply insisting that slavery was an immoral institution, even if those held in bondage were inferior individuals."

American history as it is still taught in many schools conceals the extent of the contribution of black people. Were you aware:

1. That 30 black people were with Balboa when he discovered the Pacific Ocean;
2. That a black man was a navigator and captain of one of the three ships accompanying Columbus;
3. That black men accompanied George Washington when he crossed the Delaware;
4. That a black engineer, Benjamin Banneker, assisted in laying out the design for Washington, D.C.;
5. That the basic blood transfusion techniques were developed by a black man, Dr. Charles Drew, who, by the way, died from loss of blood as the ambulance took him from the white hospital which initially rejected him, to one which would accept him;
6. That a black man, Dr. William Hale, performed the first open heart surgery in America; and
7. That the first American to lose his life in the Revolutionary War, on Boston Commons, was a black man, Crispus Attucks.

How does all of this relate to the law, to today's ceremonies?

During my life, I've gone from the back of the bus to the front; from the balcony seat in the theatre to front row center; from driving all night because we were unable to find accommodations except by the side of the road, to staying at a Holiday Inn. These changes are due to changes in the law. Contrary to popular belief, black people have long been some of the most law-abiding people in this land. For example, the law required segregated housing, and black people did not try to buy outside designated areas. Law-abiding black people for years used their designated drinking fountains and rest rooms. Black people were denied full access to public accommodations, and for years, black people were law-abiding and did not seek to confront this issue openly and directly, until a black domestic with tired feet refused to move to the back of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama in 1955, and in 1962 several black men refused to move from lunch counters in Greensboro, North Carolina.

Such a law-supported system helped to destroy manhood, a sense of worth and dignity, and contributed to the inaccurate assessments mentioned before.

We are all aware of the recent spate of Federal laws which purport to remove the legal effect of such racial distinctions. Many black people, myself included, in view of these new laws, wonder how well white Americans will obey them.

And of black power—black militants or black power advocates have made positive contributions. They have made black people talk less about love and more about power. Power can compel action, where reason fails. As Andrew Hatcher, a black man, elected Mayor of Gary, Indiana, stated:

"Black power advocates have taught us a fundamental lesson; that black people must learn to exercise their power to their own advantage, to demonstrate their unity, use their vote, their numbers to achieve their objectives . . . black power has reminded us that fear can be an important ingredient for change; that fear reaches its zenith where black people choose not to play by the rules of the game—rules they never made and the powerful never obeyed."

I am fearful. I am fearful that the sands in our time clock are running out. I am fearful that those in positions of power in our

community do not and will not see the need for action; I am fearful that the prodding to remove the last anachronism of the applicability of the Bill of Rights to all state action will be either circumvented or subverted. I am fearful that those who tell me that our society does not have the inherent flexibility to incorporate people of color in a meaningful way are correct, that change—lasting change—cannot be done in a peaceful, non-violent manner. I am fearful that the opportunity to make "this nation, under God, indivisible," will pass us by. Moreover, there is a higher law—a law often addressed by Martin Luther King, espoused by Gandhi—the moral law of "rightness." But both Gandhi and King are dead, and the voices you now hear are not the voices of moderation. Without action taken because it is right and just, and not action delayed because it does not neatly fit into a legal pigeonhole, the voices of moderation will not only be muted, but silenced.

Black people are not a monolithic group. They are as diverse and different in attitude and performance as they differ in coloration. Similarly, the reactions to Denver's current school crisis vary significantly. In watching the Denver School Board struggle with an issue that should have been confronted years ago—quality education for all children—and in watching and hearing the protestations, often sincere, of white parents, the real issues become obscured. The real issues, as I view them, are an integrated school system versus a segregated school system. In light of the mass of data accumulated by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, an integrated education in today's social milieu has a better chance to supply a quality education to all children. Integration, to be meaningful, must be based upon the enlightened self-interest of all parties.

Those of you who protest bussing your children to achieve school integration, with what are you concerned—the bus ride, or what is at the end of the ride? If it is the former, almost sixteen million children are bussed to school daily in these United States; if it is the latter, then your concern is well-founded and you should assure yourself that a quality education is available for every child, in every school in Denver.

In other words, if you are not a part of the solution—a quality education—you are part of the problem.

Needed changes in the law, and more importantly, in its application to the non-white, the non-wealthy, and a re-structuring of our national and local priorities can only come from an active coalition of all committed people, black, white, brown, yellow, red—all hues. There are no real alternatives. The time for fence-sitting, for non-involvement, is over for all of us. No lasting change can occur until apathy is replaced by action. Black people are no longer asking, but demanding their just due from a society which long has denied them accommodation, and in so doing, we are proudly crying out for all to hear what Martin Luther King quoted so movingly:

"Free at last;

"Free at last;

"Thank God Almighty, I'm free at last!"

HEARINGS ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT AND GRANT CONSOLIDATION ACT

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee has scheduled

hearings the mornings of June 4 and 5 to take testimony from Members of Congress on H.R. 7366—Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969—and H.R. 10954—Grant Consolidation Act of 1969.

The subcommittee would be pleased to receive the views of all interested Members on either or both of these related bills. Members wishing to testify on June 4 or 5, or to submit statements for inclusion in the hearing record, are requested to contact Dr. D. C. Goldberg at the subcommittee office.

Mr. Speaker, I include the texts of H.R. 7366 and H.R. 10954 at this point in the RECORD for the information of the Members:

H.R. 7366

A bill to improve the financial management of Federal assistance programs, to facilitate the consolidation of such programs, to provide temporary authority to expedite the processing of project applications drawing upon one Federal assistance program to strengthen further congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, and to extend and amend the law relating to intergovernmental cooperation.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited as the "Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969."

TITLE—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. Title I of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1098; Public Law 90-577) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"FEDERAL ASSISTANCE CONSOLIDATION PLAN

"SEC. 111. The term 'Federal assistance consolidation plan' means any plan involving a fusion of two or more Federal assistance programs in the same or closely related functional area(s) and with separate statutory authorizations.

"JOINT PROJECT

"SEC. 112. 'Joint project' means any undertaking which includes components proposed or approved for aid under more than one Federal assistance program or appropriation or one or more Federal assistance programs or appropriations and one or more State programs, if each of those components contributes materially to the accomplishment of a single purpose or closely related purposes."

TITLE II—ACCOUNTING, AUDITING, AND REPORTING OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

SEC. 201. Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE VII—ACCOUNTING, AUDITING, AND REPORTING OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to encourage simplification and standardization of financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs, to promote among Federal agencies administering such programs accounting and auditing policies that rely on State and local financial management control systems meeting certain standards, and to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to prescribe rules and regulations for use of audits of States and political subdivisions in meeting the responsibilities of the General Accounting Office with respect to such programs.

"MORE UNIFORM FINANCIAL REPORTING

"SEC. 702. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall have au-

thority to promulgate rules and regulations simplifying and, to the extent feasible, making uniform the financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs.

"FEDERAL AGENCIES' RELIANCE ON THE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CONTROL SYSTEMS OF STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

"SEC. 703. (a) Federal agencies administering Federal assistance programs shall adopt accounting and auditing policies that rely, to the maximum extent feasible, on internal or independent accounting and audits of such programs performed by or for States and units of local government.

"(b) Heads of such agencies shall determine the adequacy of the internal financial management control systems employed by recipient jurisdictions, including but not restricted to a determination of (i) whether accounting records are maintained, and reports are prepared, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles; (ii) whether audits are carried out in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards; and (iii) whether the auditing function is performed on a timely basis by a qualified staff which is sufficiently independent of program operations to permit a comprehensive and objective auditing performance.

"(c) Where such control systems are found to be acceptable, heads of such agencies shall, in the absence of substantial reasons to the contrary, authorize agency acceptance of audits performed under such systems in lieu of audits which otherwise would be required to be performed by such agencies.

"(d) Periodic sample testing of the standards of such control systems shall be undertaken by such agencies to verify the continuing reliability of the systems for the purposes of section 703(c).

"(e) Each Federal agency administering Federal assistance programs shall foster greater cooperation with the personnel operating the internal financial management control systems of recipient jurisdictions by maintaining continuous liaison with such personnel, including the interchange of audit standards and objectives and collaboration in the development of audit schedules.

"(f) Each such agency administering more than one Federal assistance program shall, to the extent feasible and permitted by law, coordinate and make uniform the auditing requirements of such programs.

"(g) Federal agencies administering one or more Federal assistance programs shall, to the extent feasible, establish cross-serving arrangements under which one such agency would conduct the audits for another.

"(h) The Bureau of the Budget or such other agency as may be designated by the President is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as are deemed appropriate for the effective administration of this section.

"ACCEPTANCE BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE OF AUDITS OF STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

"SEC. 704. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized to prescribe rules and regulations whereby the General Accounting Office may accept for purposes of its auditing of Federal assistance programs the auditing performed by States and political subdivisions receiving Federal assistance, when such auditing is performed under internal financial management control systems whose procedures meet generally accepted auditing standards and whose personnel are qualified and in a position sufficiently independent of program operations to perform a comprehensive and objective audit.

"(b) Periodic sample testing of the standards of such control systems will be undertaken by the General Accounting Office to verify the continuing reliability of the systems for the purposes of section 704(a).

"(c) The Comptroller General shall make a report to Congress on the operations of this section at the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the first full fiscal year following the date of enactment of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969."

TITLE III—CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. Such Act is further amended by adding after title VII, as added by section 201 of this Act, the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. (a) The President shall from time to time examine the various programs of Federal assistance provided by law and shall determine what consolidations are necessary or desirable—

"(1) to promote the better execution and efficient management of individual Federal assistance programs within the same functional areas;

"(2) to provide better coordination among individual assistance programs within the same functional areas; or

"(3) to promote more efficient planning and use by the recipients of Federal assistance under programs within the same functional areas.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes of subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this title, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"PREPARATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF PLAN

"SEC. 802. (a) When the President, after investigation, finds that a consolidation of individual Federal assistance programs within the same functional area is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 801(a), he shall prepare a Federal assistance consolidation plan for the making of such consolidation, and shall transmit such plan (bearing an identification number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that with respect to each individual program consolidated under such plan, he has found that the consolidation is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 801(a). Each such consolidation plan so transmitted—

"(1) shall place responsibility in a single Federal agency for administration of the consolidated program;

"(2) shall specify in detail the matching formula and, where relevant, the apportionment formula for rendering Federal assistance under the consolidated program and such other relevant conditions and requirements for rendering such assistance, including planning and eligibility requirements, as may be indicated by one or more of the statutes establishing the individual programs consolidated under the plan;

"(3) shall set forth the differences between such formulas, conditions, and requirements and the corresponding provisions of the statutes of each of the individual Federal assistance programs consolidated under such plan;

"(4) shall provide for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel of individual Federal assistance programs affected by a consolidation;

"(5) shall provide for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with such programs as are involved in the consolidation, as the President considers necessary by reason of the consolidation for use in connection with the functions of the consolidated program, except that unexpended balances so transferred may be used only for the purposes for which the appropriation was originally made; and

"(6) shall provide for terminating the affairs of an agency or administrative unit whose programs have been transferred as a consequence of the consolidation.

"(b) Each Federal assistance consolidation plan shall provide for only one consolidation of individual assistance programs.

"(c) The President shall have a Federal assistance consolidation plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session.

"CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION

"SEC. 803. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of this section, a Federal assistance consolidation plan shall become effective at the end of the first period of ninety calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the plan is transmitted to it unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the ninety-day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that the House does not favor the Federal assistance consolidation plan.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; and

"(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the ninety-day period.

"(c) Under provisions contained in a Federal assistance consolidation plan, a provision of the plan may be effective at a time later than the date on which the plan otherwise is effective.

"(d) A Federal assistance consolidation plan which is effective shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and (2) in the Federal Register.

"SEC. 804. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House, in the case of a resolution introduced in either House stating in substance that the House does not favor a Federal assistance consolidation plan transmitted by the President in accordance with this title; and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(b) The following provisions shall apply with respect to a Federal assistance consolidation plan:

"(1) A resolution with respect to a Federal assistance consolidation plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"(2) (A) If the committee to which a resolution with respect to a Federal assistance consolidation plan has been referred has not reported it at the end of ten calendar days after its introduction, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the Federal assistance consolidation plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(B) A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, is highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has re-

ported a resolution with respect to the same Federal assistance consolidation plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than one hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(C) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, the motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same Federal assistance consolidation plan.

"(3) (A) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a Federal assistance consolidation plan, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(B) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not more than ten hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. An amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(4) (A) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a Federal assistance consolidation plan, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(B) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a Federal assistance consolidation plan shall be decided without debate.

"EXPIRATION DATE

"SEC. 805. The authority of the President under section 802 to transmit Federal assistance consolidation plans shall expire three years after the date of the enactment of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969."

TITLE IV—JOINT FUNDING SIMPLIFICATION

SEC. 401. Such Act is further amended by adding after title VIII, as added by section 301 of this Act, the following new title:

"TITLE IX—JOINT FUNDING SIMPLIFICATION

"SEC. 901. The purpose of this title is to enable States and their political subdivisions to use Federal assistance programs more effectively and efficiently, to adapt such programs more readily to their particular needs through the wider use of joint projects drawing upon resources available from more than one Federal program, appropriation, or agency and to acquire experience which would lead to the development of legislative proposals respecting the consolidation, simplification, and coordination of Federal assistance programs. It is further the purpose of this title to facilitate the development of joint project and joint funding arrangements at the national level by giving primary emphasis to those arrangements involving intradepartmental actions and by placing interdepartmental joint projects and management funds on an experimental and limited demonstration basis.

"INTRADEPARTMENTAL JOINT PROJECTS

"SEC. 902. (a) The head of every Federal department and agency administering two

or more Federal assistance programs is authorized to approve combined applications for joint projects requiring funding from two or more such programs administered by his department or agency.

"(b) To develop the necessary departmental or agency capability to achieve the purposes of section 901, the head of such department or agency, among other actions, shall—

"(1) identify related programs within his department or agency likely to be particularly suitable or appropriate for providing combined support for specific kinds of joint projects;

"(2) develop and promulgate guidelines, model or illustrative joint projects, common application forms, and other materials of guidance to assist in the planning and development of joint projects drawing support from different Federal assistance programs;

"(3) review program requirements established administratively within his department or agency in order to determine which of those requirements may impede combined support of joint projects and the extent to which these may be appropriately modified, and make modifications accordingly;

"(4) establish common technical or administrative rules among related Federal assistance programs administered by his department or agency to assist in the support of specific joint projects or classes of joint projects;

"(5) create joint or common application processing and project supervision procedures or mechanisms including procedures for designating a lead office or unit to be responsible for processing of applications and supervising joint projects approved by him; and

"(6) develop common accounting, auditing, and financial reporting procedures that will facilitate establishment of fiscal and program accountability with respect to joint projects aided by Federal assistance programs administered by his department or agency.

"(c) Where appropriate to further the purposes of this title, and subject to the conditions prescribed under subsection (f) of this section, the head of every Federal department and agency administering two or more Federal assistance programs may adopt uniform provisions respecting—

"(1) inconsistent or conflicting departmental or agency requirements relating to financial administration, including accounting, auditing, and fiscal reporting, but only to the extent consistent with the provisions of clauses (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (d);

"(2) inconsistent or conflicting departmental or agency requirements relating to the timing of Federal payments where a single or combined schedule is to be established for the joint project as a whole;

"(3) inconsistent or conflicting departmental or agency requirements that assistance be extended in the form of a grant rather than a contract, or a contract rather than a grant;

"(4) inconsistent or conflicting departmental or agency requirements for merit personnel systems, but only to the extent that the joint project contemplated would cause those requirements to be applied to programs or projects administered by recipient agencies not otherwise subject to such requirements;

"(5) inconsistent or conflicting departmental or agency requirements relating to accountability for, or the disposition of, property or structures acquired or constructed with Federal assistance where common rules are to be established for the joint project as a whole; and

"(6) other inconsistent or conflicting departmental or agency requirements of an administrative or technical nature as defined

in regulations authorized by subsection (f) of this section.

"(d) To further carry out the purposes of this title, the head of every Federal department and agency administering two or more Federal assistance programs—

"(1) may provide for review of combined applications for joint projects to his department or agency by a single panel, board, or committee in lieu of review by separate panels, boards, or committees when such review would otherwise be required by law;

"(2) may prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of joint management funds with respect to joint projects approved by him so that the total amount approved by any such project may be accounted for through a joint management fund as if the funds had been derived from a single Federal assistance program or appropriation; and such rules and regulations shall provide that there will be advanced to the joint management fund from each affected appropriation its proportionate share of amounts needed for payment to the grantee and amounts remaining in the hands of the grantee at the completion of the joint project shall be returned to the joint management fund;

"(3) may prescribe rules and regulations governing the financial reporting of joint projects financed through joint management funds established pursuant to this section; and such reports shall, as a minimum, fully disclose the amount and disposition of Federal assistance received by recipient States and local governments, the total cost of the joint project in connection with which such Federal assistance was given or used, the amount of that portion of the cost of the joint project supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective joint project audit;

"(4) shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of recipient State and local governments that are pertinent to the moneys received from joint management funds authorized by him; and

"(5) may establish a single non-Federal share for any joint project, authorized by him and covered in a joint management fund, according to the Federal share ratios applicable to the several Federal assistance programs involved and the proportion of funds transferred to the joint project account from each of those programs.

"(e) Subject to such regulations as may be established pursuant to subsection (f) of this section, the head of every Federal department or agency administering two or more Federal assistance programs may enter into agreements with States or appropriate State agencies to extend the benefits of this title to joint projects involving assistance from his department or agency and one or more State agencies. These agreements may include arrangements for the processing of requests for, or the administration of, assistance to such projects on a joint basis. They may also include provisions involving the establishment of uniform technical or administrative requirements, as authorized by this section. Such agreements ordinarily will focus on those program areas wherein Federal assistance is normally channeled through the States.

"(f) In order to provide for the more effective administration of funds drawn from more than one Federal assistance program or authorization in support of intradepartmental joint projects authorized under this section and to assure energetic and more uniform departmental and agency administration of the functions authorized by this section, the President may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to achieve these purposes.

"(g) This section shall become effective one hundred and twenty days following the date of enactment of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969.

"INTERDEPARTMENTAL DEMONSTRATION JOINT PROJECTS

"Sec. 903. (a) In order to extend selectively the benefits of joint projects and joint management funding on a Government-wide basis and in recognition of the administrative difficulties involved in this undertaking, the President is authorized to approve on a demonstration basis combined applications for joint projects requiring funding from two or more Federal assistance programs administered by more than one Federal department or agency.

"(b) In order to develop the necessary capability in the Executive Office of the President for achieving the purposes of this section, the President shall have authority to exercise with reference to interdepartmental demonstration joint projects the same responsibilities and authorities assigned to heads of Federal departments and agencies with reference to intradepartmental joint projects under subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 902.

"(c) To facilitate the expeditious processing of applications for interdepartmental demonstration joint projects or their effective administration, the President is authorized to establish rules and regulations requiring the delegation by heads of Federal departments and agencies to other such departments and agencies of any powers relating to approval, under this section, of programs or classes of programs under an interdepartmental demonstration joint project, if such delegation will promote the purposes of such project. Such rules and regulations may also provide for the delegation to other Federal departments and agencies of powers relating to the supervision of administration of Federal assistance, or stipulate other arrangements for other departments or agencies to perform such activities, with respect to programs or classes of programs subject to this section. Delegations authorized by such rules and regulations shall be made only on such conditions as may be appropriate to assure that the powers and functions delegated are exercised in full conformity with applicable statutory provisions or policies.

"(d) To facilitate the establishment of joint management funds on an interdepartmental basis, any account in a joint management fund involving money derived from two or more Federal assistance programs administered by more than one Federal department or agency shall be subject to such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with other applicable law, as the President may establish with respect to the discharge of the responsibilities of affected departments and agencies. Such rules and regulations shall assure the availability of necessary information, including requisite accounting and auditing information, to those departments and agencies, to the Congress, and to the Executive Office of the President. They shall also provide that the department or agency administering a joint management fund shall be responsible and accountable for the total amount provided for the purposes of each account established in the fund, and shall adhere to accounting and auditing policies consistent with title VII of this Act. They may include procedures for determining, from time to time, whether amounts in the account are in excess of the amounts required, for returning that excess to participating Federal departments and agencies in accordance with a formula providing an equitable distribution, and for effecting returns accordingly to the applicable appropriations, subject to fiscal year limitations. Excess amounts applicable to expired appropriations will be lapsed from that fund.

"(e) During the seventh month after the end of each fiscal year, starting with the first full fiscal year after the effective date of this section, the President shall submit to the Congress an evaluation of progress in accomplishing the purposes of this title.

"(f) Demonstration joint projects initiated under the authority conferred by this section shall not exceed one hundred in any one fiscal year, and shall not exceed two hundred and fifty during the period of three years during which this section is effective.

"(g) This section shall become effective one hundred and twenty days following the date of enactment of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 and shall expire three years after it becomes effective, but its expiration shall not affect the administration of joint projects previously approved.

"AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

"Sec. 904. (a) Appropriations available to any Federal assistance program for technical assistance or the training of personnel may be made available for the provision of technical assistance and training in connection with projects approved for joint or common funding involving that program and any other Federal assistance program.

"(b) Personnel of any Federal agency may be detailed from time to time to other agencies as necessary or appropriate to facilitate the processing of applications under this title or the administration of approved projects.

"AUTHORITY OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"Sec. 905. For the purpose of audit and examination, the Comptroller General of the United States shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of recipients of interdepartmental and intradepartmental joint projects that are pertinent to the moneys received from joint management funds established for such projects."

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL AND EXECUTIVE OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 501. Section 601 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) If any Act of Congress enacted on or after January 3, 1971, authorizes the making of grants-in-aid over a period of three or more years, then during the period beginning not later than the twelve months immediately preceding the date on which such authority is to expire, the committees of the House and Senate to which legislation extending such authority would be referred shall, separately or jointly, conduct studies of the program under which such grants-in-aid are made and advise their respective Houses of the results of their findings with special reference to the considerations cited in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 601(a). Each such committee shall report the results of its investigation and study to its respective House not later than one hundred and twenty days before such authority is due to expire."

SEC. 502. Title VI of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 604 as section 606; and

(2) by inserting immediately after section 603 the following new sections:

"CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW SPECIALISTS

"Sec. 604. Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives which is responsible for the review and study on a continuing basis, of the application, operation, administration, and execution of two or more grant-in-aid programs is entitled to employ a review specialist as a member of the professional staff of such committee in addition to the number of such professional staff to which such committee otherwise is entitled. Such specialist shall be selected and appointed by the chairman of such committee, with the prior approval of the ranking minority member, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position. Such specialist shall, under the joint direction and supervision of the chairman and the ranking minority

member, assist the committee in the performance of its review functions under this title.

"REPORTS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

"Sec. 605. (a) Heads of Federal agencies administering one or more Federal assistance programs shall make a report to the President and the Congress on the operations of such programs at the end of each fiscal year beginning with the first full fiscal year following the date of enactment of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969. Such reports shall, among other things, describe—

"(1) the overall progress and effectiveness of administrative efforts to carry out each program's statutory goals;

"(2) the consultative procedures employed under each program to afford recipient jurisdictions an opportunity to review and comment on proposed new administrative regulations, and basic program changes;

"(3) intradepartmental and interdepartmental arrangements to assure proper coordination at headquarters and in the field with other related Federal assistance programs;

"(4) efforts to simplify and make more uniform (i) application forms and procedures and (ii) financial reporting and auditing requirements and procedures;

"(5) the feasibility of consolidating individual Federal assistance programs with others in the same functional areas, where such exist;

"(6) the practicability of delegating more administrative discretion, including application approval authority, to field offices;

"(7) whether changes in the purpose, direction, or administration of such Federal assistance programs, or in procedures and requirements applicable thereto, should be made; and

"(8) the extent to which such programs are adequate to meet the growing and changing needs which they were designed to support.

"(b) The President shall transmit a summary report on Federal assistance activities to Congress not later than January 31 of each year subsequent to the first fiscal year following the date of enactment of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969. Such a report, among other things, shall (1) summarize and analyze the findings of department and agency reports provided in section 605(a); and (2) set forth such recommendations as he may deem appropriate to convert the existing system of Federal assistance programs into a more effective vehicle for intergovernmental cooperation."

H.R. 10954

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize consolidation of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Grant Consolidation Act of 1969".

Sec. 2. Title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following immediately after chapter 9 of said title 5:

"CHAPTER 10.—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION

"Sec.
 "1001. Purpose.
 "1002. Definitions.
 "1003. Federal assistance program consolidation plans.
 "1004. Limitations on powers.
 "1005. Effective date and publication of consolidation plans.
 "1006. Effect on other laws and regulations.
 "1007. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on consolidation plans.

"§ 1001. PURPOSE

"(a) The President shall from time to time examine the various Federal assistance programs provided by law and shall determine

what consolidations of such programs are necessary or desirable to accomplish the following purposes: (1) any of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of this title, or (2) the purpose of making the programs or aspects thereof more consistent.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes of subsection (a) of this section and that the purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this chapter, and can be accomplished more rapidly thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"§ 1002. DEFINITIONS

"For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) 'agency' means—

"(A) an Executive agency or part thereof; and

"(B) an office or officer in the executive branch;

"(2) 'officer' is not limited by section 2104 of this title;

"(3) 'Federal assistance' or 'Federal assistance program' means any assistance provided by an agency in the form of grants, loans, loan guarantees, property, shared revenues, repayable advances, contracts, or technical assistance, whether the recipients are a State or local government, their agencies, including school or other special districts created by or pursuant to State law, or public, quasi-public or private institutions, associations, corporations, individuals, or other persons; and

"(4) 'consolidation' means any action described in section 1003(b) of this title.

"§ 1003. FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION PLANS

"(a) When the President, after investigation, finds that a consolidation of Federal assistance programs is necessary or desirable to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1001(a) of this title, he shall prepare a Federal assistance program consolidation plan (hereafter in this chapter referred to as 'consolidation plan') for the making of the consolidations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit the plan (bearing an identification number) to Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each consolidation included in the consolidation plan, he has found that the consolidation is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 1001(a) of this title, and a declaration as to how each program included in the plan is functionally related.

"(b) Each consolidation plan so transmitted—

"(1) may include, with respect to the Federal assistance programs included in the consolidation plan and with respect to the affected agency or agencies, any reorganization or measure incidental thereto as provided in chapter 9 of this title;

"(2) may alter the terms and conditions provided by law under which the Federal assistance programs included in the consolidation plan shall be administered, including, but not limited to matching, apportionment and other formulas, interest rates, and planning, eligibility, and other requirements: *Provided, however,* That any changes in such terms and conditions shall be limited to those necessary to achieve the purposes of the plan: *Provided further,* That the President shall, in selecting applicable terms and conditions, be limited by the range of terms and conditions for the provision of Federal assistance already included in the Federal assistance programs included in the plan: *And provided further,* That the President shall set forth in his message transmitting the consolidation plan to the Congress his reasons for selecting the said terms and conditions; and

"(3) may abolish any one or more of the terms and conditions of any Federal assistance program.

"(c) The President shall have a consolidation plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session.

"§ 1004. LIMITATIONS ON POWERS

"(a) A consolidation plan may not provide for, and may not have the effect of: (1) continuing any Federal assistance program or part thereof beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the consolidation plan did not take effect; (2) consolidating any Federal assistance programs which are not in the same functional area or closely related functional areas; (3) providing any type of Federal assistance included in such a consolidation plan to any recipient who was not eligible for Federal assistance under any of the programs included in the consolidation plan; or (4) vesting responsibility for the administration of the program or programs contained in a consolidation plan in any agency, office, or officer who was not responsible for the administration of one or more such programs prior to the taking effect of the consolidation plan.

"(b) A provision contained in a consolidation plan may take effect only if the plan is transmitted to Congress before April 1, 1971. Section 905(b) of this title shall not operate to limit any consolidation plan prepared under this chapter.

"§ 1005. EFFECTIVE DATE AND PUBLICATION OF CONSOLIDATION PLANS

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c), a grant consolidation plan shall become effective at the end of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the plan is transmitted to it unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the sixty-day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that the House does not favor the consolidation plan.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and

"(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the sixty-day period.

"(c) Under provisions contained in a grant consolidation plan, a provision of the plan may become effective at a time later than the date on which such plan otherwise is effective.

"(d) A consolidation plan which becomes effective shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and (2) in the Federal Register.

"§ 1006. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

"(a) To the extent that any provision of a consolidation plan which becomes effective under this chapter is inconsistent with any provision of any statute enacted prior to the taking effect of the consolidation plan, the provision of the consolidation plan shall control.

"(b) Any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of any matter affected by a consolidated plan which becomes effective under this chapter shall be deemed to be modified to the extent of any inconsistency thereof with the consolidation plan but shall otherwise continue in effect.

"(c) A suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, does not abate by reason of the taking effect of a consolidation plan under this chapter. On motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after the consolidation plan takes effect, showing a neces-

sity for a survival of the suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, the court may allow the suit, action, or other proceeding to be maintained by or against the successor of the head or officer under the consolidation plan or, if there is no successor, against such agency or officer as the President designates.

"(d) The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this chapter may not be used for any purpose, but shall revert to the Treasury.

"§ 1007. RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON CONSOLIDATION PLANS

"(a) This section is enacted by the Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described in subsection (b); and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(b) The provisions of sections 910 through 913 of title 5 of the United States Code shall apply with respect to a consolidation plan and, for such purposes—

"(1) all references in such sections to a 'reorganization plan' shall be treated as referring to a 'Federal assistance program consolidation plan', and

"(2) all references in such sections to 'resolution' shall be treated as referring to a resolution of either House of the Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the ----- does not favor the Federal assistance program consolidation plan numbered ----- transmitted to the Congress by the President on -----, 19--", the first blank therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled."

PRIDE FOR OUR FLAG

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading daily newspapers in my district, the Menominee Herald-Leader, of Menominee, Mich., has begun a campaign to rekindle a sense of pride and patriotism in the Nation and in our flag. Efforts to promote flag flying on Memorial Day have resulted in a rash of responses from area citizens. Residents have been purchasing flags at a record pace, and this Memorial Day promises to be a special one for Menominee.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing and inspiring to see such an overwhelming response and to know that among shrill voices of dissension and cynicism, plain old-fashioned patriotism is still prevalent. Old Glory can still evoke a sense of pride and national purpose. Those of us in Congress and in the Government who must deal daily with the monumental problems facing the Nation should be reminded that there are millions and

millions of Americans who believe that the Nation and its leaders will prevail in the face of all adversity.

I would like to commend the Menominee Herald-Leader and its fine editor, Mr. Roger Williams. What better way to honor those who have fallen in defense of the Nation than to help regenerate a sense of national purpose and pride, and to promote the use of the Stars and Stripes.

OBJECTIVITY IN DEFENSES

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, current discussions of the ABM Safeguard system should center on the critical issue: Does the proposed ABM system offer the best possible defense system for the expenditure involved?

Too often, the current attacks on the ABM Safeguard system are overly concerned about provoking Russia into nuclear attack. And too often the fact that the Russians already have a limited ABM defense system is conveniently disregarded. The Post-Advocate, of Alhambra, Calif., includes a thoughtful discussion of the ABM question in its May 13 editorial, "Objectivity in Defenses."

Because of its contribution to the ABM discussion, I am inserting the entire editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OBJECTIVITY IN DEFENSES

Everyone who follows international affairs with reasonable regularity is aware that there are complex issues which demand rational settlement.

Unfortunately, the atmosphere in which reasonable conclusions might be drawn is rare, and evidently becoming rarer by the day.

Those in public life who seem to worry excessively about "provoking" Russia are almost wailing in their attacks on the President's ABM Safeguard plan. This is true despite the obvious fact that Soviet Russia seems less concerned than the dovish elements in our own country.

Most of the shrill clamor against the ABM seems based on fear, distrust and even hatred of the American military. Add to this the favorite whipping boy called the "military-industrial complex" and the emotional binge seems unlimited.

It would seem that thoughtful, rational debate would be centered on the issue, which is: Does the proposed ABM system offer the best possible defense system for the expenditure involved?

Hand-wringing about provocation of Russia and "touching off" a nuclear conflict is illogical and scarcely fits the circumstances with which the Russians are confronted.

They have, in the first place, no reason to be apprehensive of our constructing a limited ABM defense system. They have one of their own and presumably are aware of their own relative position. Beyond passing along the usual party line propaganda, which is to be taken for granted, the Russians have not gone into a frenzy of fear and anxiety over the American proposal.

The reason could be that they take a more practical approach to these international problems than the emotional "doves" of Congress and elsewhere. The Soviets, for one thing, can hardly ignore the brewing fracas with their comrades under the skin, the Red

Chinese. They also have stubborn Czechs to contend with in Eastern Europe.

Could it be that the men in the Kremlin recognize the importance under such circumstances of relaxing tensions between East and West? Present indications are that they do, as evidenced by their concern, also, over ominous developments in the Middle East.

They aren't likely to mind the uproar created by the anti-military, anti-establishment forces who are so consistently vocal in the United States of America. But neither are they rushing at full speed into frenzied preparations for war, simply because the President proposed a modified defense plan in our country.

We suspect that the Soviets would be pleased if the ABM plan is defeated. Again, they are pragmatists and any advantage they gain will be welcomed in Moscow.

Primarily, though, it is in the United States that a strange coalition has been assembled for the fear-laden all out attack on our vitally needed defense boost. And defense of the nation, it should be observed, is one of the policy duties with which the President of the United States is charged.

Much of the anti-ABM lobby resorts to emotional appeals that have no bearing on the merit of the President's recommendation.

Recently, for example, meetings were held in Washington, D.C., to oppose ABM. The conclusion of civil rights organizations, peace groups, students, Hippies and others who attended was that it would be "wrong" to set up a missile defense system around the nation's capital because it would interfere with construction of a planned subway system and some school improvements.

It happens that Washington is the only city designated for such protection. The capital is the center of our government and its command post in the event of disaster.

Even Washington is not included in immediate plans for the missile defense system. And it is ridiculous to bring such unfounded and irrelevant charges into the discussion of this important defense matter.

Unless this kind of frenetic and false argument is put to rest, it is possible that the well meaning, the ill-informed or the deliberately misled opponents will make it impossible for the Commander-in-Chief to provide the people with even the most elementary defenses to prevent a nuclear war.

A REAFFIRMATION OF FAITH

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, during the solemn ceremonies accompanying General Eisenhower's funeral, I was struck by the great outpouring of religious feeling. A national mood of reaffirmed faith could be sensed as thousands of respectful citizens turned out to pay their last respects to a great American whose life had embodied our religious and moral ideals.

Writing in the April 4, 1969, issue of the Chattanooga Times, James Reston recaptured this mood, and, in a moving article, described our heritage of faith—a heritage that is still very much alive. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS, LIVING STILL?

(By James Reston)

NEW YORK.—It is hard to believe after the reverent public response to the Eisenhower

funeral services that America is quite as indifferent to religion as the modern prophets and publicists say.

You can hardly pick up a paper these days without being told by somebody that God is dead. In fact, the Pentagon has just told its chaplains in Vietnam to banish him from their lectures, which is scarcely surprising, considering the Pentagon's expansionist tendencies in all other fields.

Still, the substitute gods of the modern age don't seem to be very satisfactory. The trend toward a secular society in America is clear, but when the television demonstrates on a great occasion that it has the capacity to bring the whole nation into a common experience—almost to make us all part of a single congregation—then we find that at least the remnants of a common faith still exists.

The choir at the National Cathedral in Washington sang the old hymn. The opening line is: "Faith of our fathers, living, still," and despite all the modern denials of the point, it is probably still true. The first line of the chorus, however, is different: "Faith of our fathers, holy faith, we will be true to thee till death"—and that is clearly not true for most Americans.

Nevertheless, for believers and unbelievers alike, some facts are plain. The political life and spirit of this country were based on religious convictions. America's view of the individual was grounded on the principle, clearly expressed by the Founding Fathers, that man was a symbol of his creator, and therefore possessed certain inalienable rights which no temporal authority had the right to violate.

That this conviction helped shape our laws and sustained American men and women in their struggle to discipline themselves and conquer a continent even the most atheistic historian would defend. And this raises a question which cannot be avoided: If religion was so important in the building of the Republic, how could it be irrelevant to the maintenance of the Republic? And if it is irrelevant for the unbelievers, what will they put in its place?

"The liberties we talk about defending today," Walter Lippmann wrote in 1938, "were established by men who took their conception of man from the great central religious tradition of Western civilization, and the liberties we inherit can almost certainly not survive the abandonment of that tradition. . . ."

"The decay of decency in the modern age, the rebellion against law and good faith, the treatment of human beings as things, as mere instruments of power and ambition, is without a doubt the consequence of the decay of the belief in man as something more than an animal animated by highly conditioned reflexes and chemical reactions. For unless man is something more than that, he has no rights that anyone is bound to respect, and there are no limitations upon his conduct which he is bound to obey. This is the forgotten foundation of Democracy. . . ."

What the Eisenhower service suggested, may be ever so vaguely to some and ever so strongly to others, is that the religious foundation of our common life—no matter how much we divide over creeds and sects and their relation to the state—is not "forgotten." It may be ignored or challenged or defied, but it is not lost. We may not believe, but we believe in believing, and the reaction to the Old Soldier's death dramatized the point.

It did something else. It demonstrated how national television can bring before the people the things that touch their noblest instincts, and in the process reminded us of how seldom we use their remarkable power for this purpose.

Eisenhower, and the church, and television were unifying forces of tremendous power for good in America in these last few

tragic days. They touched some old and worthy echo in the American spirit which politics, religion, and television usually reject.

These are very old questions but they are still with us. Plato saw man's problem as that of the charioteer driving a pair of winged horses: One of them is noble and of noble breed and the other is ignoble and of ignoble breed. . . . And "the driving of them of necessity gives a great deal of trouble to the charioteer."

This is as true now as it was in Plato's time, but the Old Soldier gave us a glimpse of nobility, and through this remarkable instrument of television, the people responded to it with a solemnity and sincerity no cynic could deny.

ISSUES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland News of Thursday, May 15, 1969, carried an interesting column entitled "Issues" which in a somewhat humorous manner points up the difficulties and inconveniences being forced upon law-abiding sportsmen who seek to purchase ammunition.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the Maryland News' article, I insert the text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ISSUES

(By Diogenes Sinopi)

Wandering into a gunshop down in Virginia the other day, we heard an interesting tale from the shop owner, a crusty old salt we'll call George.

Recently a trio of U.S. Congressmen stopped in on their way to do a little bird shooting. These distinguished legislators—who shall remain unnamed—wanted to buy a few boxes of shotgun shells.

Well, that should be simple enough—or so they thought. Therefore, they were amazed when George asked to see their driver's licenses.

Why, that's silly—all we want is a few boxes of shells, they explained, and we're kind of in a hurry.

"Sorry," said George, "the new Federal law requires it for my records."

"Aw, now, all three of us are U.S. Congressmen," they soothed, smiling.

"Yeah, and I'm Teddy Roosevelt," said George, without a smile. "No licenses, no shells."

Grumbling, the lawmakers fished through their wallets for licenses. To make what started out to be a short story long, our resolute dealer took extra special pains to ensure that all the necessary information was recorded correctly and in proper form, as required by the new law.

While the Congressmen champed at the bit, George wrote in his ledger the date, the quantity of ammunition, its manufacturer, the gauge, the first congressman's name, address, date of birth, and his 14-digit driver's license identification number. With due deliberation, he checked it all over to make sure it was right. Then he started on the second Congressman's.

"Oh, for Pete's sake," rasped the Congressman impatiently.

The dealer pointed his pencil at his irate customer. "Mister, this isn't my idea—it's yours. You guys are perfectly happy to pass all sorts of nonsensical regulation so long as you personally don't have to live with them. Now you're getting a taste of your own recipe.

"I can go to prison for five years and pay a \$5000 fine for not keeping these records properly," he continued. "Even if I make an honest mistake, I may have a lot of unpleasant explaining to do, so I'm not going to give anybody any excuse even to question." He resumed writing.

At this point, the third Congressman directed George to include his purchase on the second Congressman's entry.

George cocked an eyebrow. "Why? You prohibited from buying ammunition?" George's face darkened and he glared at the Congressman. "You're not a drug addict, are you?"

The congressman, taken aback, stammered, but George pressed: "Well, what is it—convicted of a felony? Or a mental defective?"

"That's ridiculous!" the Congressman blurted out.

"Prove you're not!" George retorted. "We just wanted to save time," he replied indignantly. "Here's my license, now please finish so we can get out of here."

"Well, I gotta be careful, you know," said George, somewhat mollified. "It's against the law for me to sell ammunition to anybody I have reasonable cause to believe is prohibited from buying it, and if you want somebody else to buy it for you . . . well, that looks mighty suspicious."

Plaintively: "Look, we're not bank robbers. All we want is to go bird hunting."

"That's all a lot of honest people want to do," the dealer replied. "What good is all this, anyway?" He waved the ledger. "Billions of rounds are sold every year; even with these records, there's no way to trace factory ammunition back to the purchaser. And thousands of shooters handload their own. What do we gain except paperwork?"

The Congressman confessed they hadn't realized how much red tape they'd created, and now they were beginning to wonder whether it served any useful purpose. They finally left with their shells, a little chastened, perhaps, but a little wiser, too.

Now we're telling this story as we heard it, and we're not at all certain that George didn't embellish it a bit. But the moral of the story needs no apology: If a few more Congressmen were similarly educated on the practical consequences of their own legislation, some welcome changes might be forthcoming.

AH FAT LEE OF HAWAII NAMED WINNER OF A 1969 AMERICAN MOTORS CONSERVATION AWARD

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 the Hawaii State bird, the Hawaiian Goose or Nene, was on the brink of extinction. Only a few of these magnificent creatures could then be found anywhere in the islands, but through the remarkable dedication, diligence and perseverance of an employee of Hawaii's Division of Fish and Game, Mr. Ah Fat Lee, this threat today has virtually been eliminated.

In addition to his 40-hour-a-week schedule with the State's Division of Fish and Game, Mr. Lee was able to raise successfully eight goslings during 1955 to 1956. Last season, he increased the production to 123 goslings.

For his outstanding work in saving the Nene from almost certain extinction, Mr. Lee was honored last week by being named one of ten national recipients of

the coveted American Motors Conservation Award. In announcing the award to Mr. Lee, Roy Chapin, Jr., chairman of the board, American Motors Corporation, said:

Like all business and industrial enterprises, we are indebted to the professional and citizen conservationists who work to preserve America's renewable natural resources. It is with this thought that American Motors honors those who have made outstanding contributions to conservation and who, by virtue of their achievements, have inspired others.

With what I trust will be viewed by others as understandable pride, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the citation that was presented to Mr. Lee at the American Motors awards banquet on May 21, 1969:

CITATION

Because he may be, in the words of S. Dillon Ripley and in the opinion of many others, "the single most important factor in the restoration to Hawaii of the Hawaiian Goose or Nene" . . .

Because, as an employee of Hawaii's Division of Fish and Game, he applied his knowledge of poultry farming to the propagation of the Nene, then on the verge of extinction, and through remarkable personal dedication, diligence and perseverance was able to develop a combination of techniques which resulted in an increase of production from eight goslings during the 1955-56 season to 123 goslings last season . . .

Because, although a state employee under civil service, he consistently ignores his 40-hours-a-week status, once working six months without a day off at the Pohakuloa Breeding Station, and has spent untold hours of his own time in studying available literature and in searching for wild plants essential as food supplements for young birds . . .

Because his work has resulted in the release of hundreds of pen-raised geese to the wild flock, and has virtually eliminated the threat of disappearance of Hawaii's state bird . . .

Because in these and other ways he has enhanced the finest traditions of the professional conservationist in America . . .

Therefore, it is the privilege and pleasure of American Motors Corporation to present one of ten Professional Awards for 1969 to Ah Fat Lee of Kamuela, Hawaii.

ABM—WEAPON FOR PEACE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the ABM Safeguard system could become a weapon for peace by deterring Russia and Red China from initiating a nuclear showdown with the United States.

As noted in a May 8 editorial in the San Marino Tribune, the function of the ABM Safeguard system is strictly aimed at defending our Nation and is not an offensive weapon designed for starting nuclear warfare. The editorial concludes that by protecting our capacity to retaliate and thereby deterring nuclear attack, the ABM Safeguard system can serve as a "weapon for peace."

The entire San Marino Tribune's editorial entitled "ABM—Weapon For Peace" follows:

ABM—WEAPON FOR PEACE

A recent issue of "Washington Report," a weekly newsletter of the American Security Council, brings the raging battle over the proposed ABM "Safeguard" system into the range of understanding of the average citizen.

Many of us have the notion that the ABM "Safeguard" program is another escalation of the arms race. After close reading of the Report it becomes apparent that it is not. In fact, the Safeguard system is strictly aimed at defending our nation and could not under any circumstances be used as a weapon of offense.

According to the ASC, what Secretary of Defense Laird is suggesting in the Safeguard plan is protection of our strategic nuclear weapons sites. This would serve to warn the Russians and the Red Chinese that if they launch an attack on these sites we would have the capacity to retaliate.

The Report states: "The very fact that the Russians have installed the first phase of their own ABM, while pushing for the first-strike capability, should give some critics reason to pause since the U.S. merely wants an ABM to protect its ability to retaliate—not to initiate."

"In this same context, we must consider the psychological aspects of ABM deployment. If we provide no such defense, while the Russians develop a reportedly sophisticated one, it is quite possible Moscow would be led toward over-confidence, triggering a Kremlin decision to risk a nuclear showdown with the West."

It would appear to be logical to assume, considering the history of the Russians, that they will be reluctant to launch any kind of an attack on us or our allies so long as they believe us to be strong enough to repel them and take counter measures. If we have no program for defense we would be sitting ducks and likely to face an ultimatum backed by nuclear blackmail. The Safeguard system is our indication that we will not take the part of the aggressor, but neither will we assume the posture of the ostrich. In this respect, the ABM could become a weapon for peace.

DR. J. D. HEACOCK CELEBRATES 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, more than 70 years ago, Dr. J. D. Heacock hung out his shingle and began practicing medicine in the Jefferson County, Ala., area.

Although he is no longer a practicing physician, having retired in 1962 at age 93, Dr. Heacock is still active and today celebrates his 100th birthday.

The doctor has often said he was born in the candlelight era, progressed through the gas light and electric light stages and now is witnessing the space age—and witnessing it literally.

For space is one of Dr. Heacock's interests. As he observes his 100th birthday today he is, I understand, also observing the progress of Apollo 10 in its flight around the moon.

He began practicing medicine in the East Lake section of Birmingham in 1896, later moving to the nearby Woodlawn area.

In 1900 he moved into Birmingham

where he was named Jefferson County physician.

In 1904, Dr. Heacock moved into another era, turning in his horse for a horseless model and becoming one of the first doctors to own an automobile.

A graduate of Howard College, now Samford University, and Tulane University Medical College, the doctor has served as a trustee of Samford since 1908. In 1931 he received an honorary LL.D. degree from that school.

Last year, Samford cited him for 60 years' loyalty and service and presented him a Samford University Chair.

Dr. Heacock is the only living founder of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association of which he served as president for 2 years.

In recognition of his services to the association, that organization established "The Heacock Medal"—a gold merit award to be given laymen for outstanding work in respiratory diseases. And, although he is not a layman in the medical field, Dr. Heacock was one recipient of this award.

A past president of the Jefferson County and the State Medical Associations, Dr. Heacock has also been a member of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Heacock is the distinguished patriarch of a very fine family, which has contributed much to Birmingham and Alabama. The doctor will be celebrating his birthday today with his daughters, Mrs. James Alto Ward and Mrs. E. H. Wrenn, his son Joseph Davis Heacock, Jr., six grandchildren and 12 great grandchildren.

For all the people it is my privilege to represent, it is a pleasure to express our warmest best wishes for a happy 100th birthday to Dr. Heacock and his family, gratitude for his life and work and our hope that his second century shall be filled even more with the rich happiness he has surely earned in a century of service and of inspiration to his fellow men.

RED WATCHES IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, few Americans would buy a Russian-made watch—knowingly, that is.

A report from Southwestern Watchmaker and Jeweler, a trade magazine, indicates that Russia is the world's second largest supplier of watch movements—and in 1967 exploited the U.S. watch market with a gold drain of \$30,000,000—while some U.S. companies have gone broke. And if this is not alarming enough, many jewelers are selling Russian-made watches unknowingly, because the movements are unmarked as to country of origin. The report indicates that if your watch movement does not show the country of origin, chances are it was made in Russia.

How possible? By legislation in 1967

establishing a "free port" facility in the Virgin Islands which permits entry of Russian watches "duty free" as well.

Carried to a logical conclusion, the question then follows: If watch movements—what else? If so-called free ports are to be the rage of the age, then legislation is needed to notify the innocent U.S. consumer as to the country of origin of his item of purchase. Few Americans would touch a Communist-made watch or item made with slave labor—knowingly.

I am indebted to a great patriot in my district, Kenneth G. DeBessonet of Baton Rouge, who is a jeweler and watchmaker for this account from the Southwestern Watchmaker and Jeweler for April 1968 which follows:

THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING, THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING—SOVIETS ON THE MOVE (MENTS)

(Another low-down story by Pat Eskew)

Ding-a-ling!

Hello, operator? Will you ring Honest John's Jewelry Store for me? I can't seem to get his number.

(Pause). Hello, Honest John's Jewelry? This is Pat Eskew. Let me speak to John.

Hello John? Say, John, when was the last time you sold one of your customers a Russian-made watch?

"No, I'm not being smart-aleck, John. You never did, by—whom did you say? Well, all right, John, I'm proud of you. May I speak with your watchmaker, please?"

Say, buddy, this is old Pat. Did you fix any Russian-made watches last week? Last month? Last year...?

Oh, no. Please don't do that. I need all the subscribers I can get. I just wanted to... Bang!

Honey, he hung up on me. What'da ya suppose I said that made him so mad?

It sez here in *The New York Times*, Section 3, Page 2, of the Sunday, February 18, 1968 edition, that Russia sold 40 million watches last year—most of them into the United States... by way of the Virgin Islands. It says that the Department of Commerce's latest figures show the imports of Soviet movements to the Virgin Islands alone were 111,000 units, valued at \$224,313—just last November!

But you didn't sell any of 'em for Christmas presents, did you? Well, I should hope not, but—but—are you sure?

H. J. Maidenberg, the *New York Times* writer, quotes Milton M. Jacobs, a lawyer representing some disgruntled American watch importers who are trying to keep Soviet watches outside the American market. He said: "There are Americans who wouldn't touch a Russian watch, who are wearing them without knowing it."

"The Soviet timepieces are as good as any in the popular price range," he said. "They are entering this country through St. Croix, in the Virgin Islands, and from Guam, largely duty-free."

Well, you say. I always inspect my stock, and I'd never sell or service a Russian-made watch. Some other low-down skally-wag might, but not me—not Honest John!

Hoo-ray for you, Honest John! That's the spirit, Tiger! But John, the only trouble is, nobody can recognize a Russian movement. They're under popular name dials and there are no markings on them.

The law does not require the marking of movements imported from the Virgin Islands. If the movement isn't marked "Made in Switzerland," "Made in Japan," "Made in Germany," etc., chances are that it WAS "Made in Russia." Perhaps even the strap. Because Russia doesn't mark its watches. So there!

Oh, Pat, you're just an alarmist, you say. Just a damned trouble-maker stirring up

some more fuss to get us to read your rag. Admitted that there just *might* be some Soviet watches scattered around here and there, smuggled into this country by the Lord only knows who, there couldn't possibly be enough of them for us to get alarmed about. So why don't you shut up!

'Preciate your Southern hospitality, John, but would you believe the United States Tariff Commission? Who would you guess is the world's leading supplier of watch movements?

Switzerland? Right! Go to the head of the class.

Now, who is in second place? Japan? Nope. Germany? Nope. France? Nope. Want to guess some more?

The second-place supplier, John, is R-r-r-ussia! Here's the figures:

Swiss output: about 70 million pieces.

The Soviet Union: 40 million.

Japan: 16 million.

And gol-lee, who do you suppose is at the bottom of the list? American domestic output: a mere 15 million! (Which sure does sound fishy because Timex alone claims to have produced 18 million single handed in 1967.)

Well, how in the world do Russian watch movements get into the Good Old U.S.A. undetected?

Through the Virgin Islands. No markings are required, you know—but even if they were required:

"Suppose," the *New York Times* article asks, "that an air shipment arrives from Russia to say, Amsterdam. It is put into a different carton and sent to the Islands, in parts. A local girl making \$1.60 an hour puts a few screws in place and it becomes an American watch."

Now, most all of the American watch companies have installations in the Virgin Islands. They don't like the set-up any more than you do. But they are caught up in an economic vortex caused by a federal law, okayed by President Johnson, January 11, 1967 (see Feb. 1967 issue of SWJ), which permits the Island's governor to arbitrarily rule on allowing shipments to be accepted... watches assembled... and forwarded into the United States duty free! To meet the competition American companies have got to get in on the act—or starve.

"We'd like to see the assembly plants shut down in the islands," the *N.Y. Times* article quotes one American watch company official as saying. "If people should discover that they are wearing watches from Soviet lands, it could damage the industry as well as the stores selling them."

"And many stores don't know it, but they are selling Russian watches."

Out of economic necessity, caused by fierce competition, most all of the American watch companies have subsidiaries in the Virgin Islands, and presumably they are assembling some watches with Russian-made parts. They are:

Atlantic Time Products Corporation—alias Bulova Watch Company.

Standard Time Corporation—Hamilton Watch Company.

Master Time Company, Ltd.—Elgin National Watch Company.

Quality Products, Inc.—Benrus Watch Company.

And wouldn't you know, *Virgo Corporation*—United States Time Company (Timex), the world's largest watch manufacturer which, however, produces most of its home market output right here in the good old U.S. with American labor at Middlebury, Connecticut. Now what'da you think about that! Wouldn't that curl your mustache?

There are others operating from the Islands, too. But according to the article "there appears to be some doubt in the industry as to the parent concern."

Now, let's say something real good about the Swiss, since once upon a time in my

ignorance I must have said something nasty about them—so I'm told, although I can't remember when. The Swiss won't send their parts to the Virgin Islands or any place else. The Swiss only permit the export of *whole movements*, except for parts to be used for repairs. Bless 'em!

This proud and adamant stand of the Swiss has, however, put some kinks in the desires of American watch companies to use Swiss parts and movements, so popular and approved by the American public. Bulova now assembles movements on St. Croix, too. They say, however, that 90 per cent of their parts come from Japan.

Meanwhile, Russian-made watch parts are being assembled to produce "American-made watches." There's no identifying marks placed on them. The companies that assemble them under their own dial names are not telling the jewelers they are using Soviet-made parts—but they're not telling jewelers that they do not, either.

Hundreds of thousands of Soviet watches were sold in this country last year from January to November 1967. All without payment of duties (at a gold drain to us of \$30,000,000), and with no markings as to the country of origin.

But, what the hell, who cares?

What you don't know, Honest John, will never hurt you. Your watchmaker can go right on replacing Russian-made parts into Russian-made movements and be nonethe-less patriotic for having done so. The jewelers can't tell they are Russian made even by looking inside.

But the American watch manufacturers and the wholesalers know. You bet.

WHAT IS YOUNG?

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our media today is keeping student activities on the front pages and has made Americans aware of the young people who are searching for answers and questioning the traditional ways of doing things. Oftentimes the reports demonstrate the deplorable confrontations that have been taking place, with no creative value to anyone.

To its distinct credit, the *Lawrence Eagle Tribune* of Lawrence, Mass., devoted an edition of the paper to "young ideas." I was especially impressed by the thoughts expressed in the poem, "What Is Young?" by Yvonne Ground, a professor of English at Merrimack College. The poem follows:

WHAT IS YOUNG?

You ask me, "What is Young?"
My first response is to repeat what Walt Whitman said to the child who asked,

"What is the grass?"

"How can I answer the child? . . .

I do not know what it is any more than he."
Still, all teachers stand on the magic bank of the river Eternal Present:

The young pass always before them. Since I have stood on that bank for nearly thirty years,

I say that above all, Young is perpetual.

Seen as a mass, the young change. Their attitudes change; their ideals change; Their goals, their dedications, their demands change. In one decade they pursue their

Own pleasure, in another social justice, and in another they seem to pursue nothing at all.

Yet seen in their individual humanity, they are remarkably constant.

For Young is a vision. Whatever world they seek—however simple or complex—Lies beyond. They lay out their valleys, heap their mountains; build their cottages, Their skyscrapers; love their loves or arrange their utopias,

Each in a world uniquely his own. Today is merely the clumsy vehicle in which they ride

Toward tomorrow.

Young is intolerance. The young man looks with sharply critical eyes at all of the flaws

In the world he is entering. He snarls his displeasure across the generation gap

At those who created the mess he inherits. Compromise is insupportable, And moderation is for the faint of heart. His has always been the Now Generation. Cautioned to have patience, to build on the foundations of historic good,

He says like Arkadi Kirsanov, "That is not our affair . . . First, we must make a clean sweep."

Young is fear. The young man faces alone an infinity of choices, again and again

Having "to decide, forever, betwixt two things." Because he has just discovered his strength,

He must use it. He is radical because he does not dare to be conservative;

He is sometimes rude and noisy because he fears the vulnerability of gentleness.

As he embarks on the creation of his new and shining world, he announces that his terms

Are not negotiable. The fear of failure is beautifully and dramatically terrifying.

But his greatest fear is of surrender.

Young is anger. The young man hates very purely. He rages against ponderous institutions.

He battles with his words, and with his fists and feet if need be, against what he currently

Calls "the power structure." He cares so painfully that no one else seems to care at all.

And ultimately, if he feels his convictions slipping, he turns his greatest anger on himself.

Young is the conviction of immortality. Life rolls away toward a horizon

So distant as to be invisible. The young man knows he can rebuild the world because he has

Plenty of time to do the job. He can swim the deep waters, climb the sheer cliffs, Drive the fast cars, or rocket to the moon. The thickness of tissue is safety enough,

While cautious maturity shivers and wonders what the young fool thinks he is doing.

Should one of his number presume too far and be crushed too soon,

His outrage is greater than his grief.

Young is pain and turbulence, but Young is also joy. You ask me, "What is Young?"

I see a memory, a boy, my student a quarter of a century ago. He was a beautiful boy

With grace of movement and proud shoulders. His Mexican ancestors had gifted him

With strong, gentle face, and his eyes were full of dreams.

On an April afternoon when the California sun already threatened summer,

I met him coming toward me along the sidewalk. He held a shallow box of green-stuff

Very carefully.

In a few weeks he would graduate from school to the army and a full grown-up war.

(You see, we were very modern a quarter century ago.)

He walked to the rhythm of music that only he could hear, and he looked away

Into a world that only he could see. I had to know what treasure gave him such joy.

So I said; "Nico, what do you have there?"

He looked at me with faint surprise—that I dared intrude, I suppose—

And without ever stopping, without ever releasing his own wondrous world,

Beholding still his private, beatific vision, he replied in the happiest voice I have ever heard,

"Cabbage plants!"

And I guess that is what Young is. It is the dream and the grace and the distinct horizon.

It is the promise of plenty, the hope of fruition, and the threat of blight.

Young is a boy with cabbage plants.

YVONNE GROUND,
Professor of English.
MERRIMACK COLLEGE.

CONTROLLING RENTS UNDER FHA RULES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in response to an unfortunate misunderstanding in New York City, many residents there believed that the Federal Government prevented our local government from effective action in controlling rents. Mr. KOCH and I released the following statement today to clarify this situation:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMEN EDWARD I. KOCH AND BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL ON THE NEW YORK CITY RENT CONTROL LAW AND THE FHA RENT REGULATIONS, MAY 26, 1969

Fear and consternation have overwhelmed the tenant-residents of New York City since last year when thousands of apartment rents were drastically raised. The proper response by the City Council was the passage of the Rent Stabilization Law. But this remedy has raised a new problem.

Many city residents have been told, in some cases by landlords themselves, that the new city law exempts buildings covered by an FHA mortgage. We are here to say that this is not the case.

The new rent stabilization law lists, under exceptions to its coverage, buildings "aided by government insurance under any provision of the National Housing Act, to the extent this local law or any regulation or order issued thereunder is inconsistent therewith." In our judgment this is a misleading section of the local law and should be clarified or removed entirely.

We have consulted with the Federal Housing Administration both here and in Washington. It is their interpretation of this controversial sentence, and it is ours, that there is no exemption to this local law for FHA-financed buildings.

It is important to understand that FHA regulations set a maximum rental schedule for the entire insured building and not a maximum rental for each apartment. At the

other end of the scale, there is no minimum FHA rental schedule either but the mortgagee must submit financing information in the FHA application which lists his costs and provides for a fair return on his investment.

The local rent stabilization law, on the other hand, sets a maximum increase allowed over the previous rental for each individual apartment.

FHA maintains, and we confirm this interpretation, that even if, in some cases, the New York City law sets lower rents than FHA originally approved, that "this is a consequence with which an owner must deal in accordance with the appeal procedure" in the local law.

The FHA adds, and we emphatically agree, "an owner should not expect the FHA to concern itself with his affairs" except to the extent that they are controlled by the original FHA agreement with the mortgagee.

There are 93,000 FHA-insured residential rental units in New York City; therefore, this confusion on what the New York City law means is very serious. Perpetuation of this confusion by some landlords is unconscionable. This badly needed local law applies to FHA and non-FHA buildings alike.

If there are circumstances in individual cases where owners of FHA-financed buildings believe themselves aggrieved by this local law, they have appeals procedures under that law. If those appeals fail, they may seek relief in the courts. But they are bound by the law like any other landlord.

To express our concern for this problem, we are introducing in Congress today a resolution which makes absolutely clear that there is no intended or real conflict with local rent control laws from the view of the federal government.

We are confident that this will establish once and for all that the citizens of New York, acting through their local government, are able to regulate a pressing local problem without interference by the federal government.

H. CON. RES. 275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that if any State or local law or ordinance which provides for the stabilization or control of rentals charged in multifamily residential housing results in maximum rental rates lower than maximum rental rates deriving from any condition, restriction, or requirement imposed by the Federal Housing Administration (in connection with mortgage insurance for housing to which such law or ordinance applies), such law or ordinance should govern and prevail over such condition, restriction, or requirement; and that the regulations and mortgage insurance contracts of the Federal Housing Administration should be prescribed and written (or modified, in the case of existing regulations and outstanding contracts) so as to ensure that such State or local law or ordinance will be fully effective.

CRISIS POLITICS AND MONETARY REFORM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, back in January, commenting on recent fiscal dilemmas with the pound and the franc, I spoke of the need for monetary reform and updating the Bretton Woods agreement.

Trends in the relative strengths of the different world currencies arising from changes in growth of productivity, divergent attitudes toward inflation and full employment, differences in the composition of exports and imports, all point up the need for greater flexibility in exchange rates. Furthermore, the fact that rates are fixed gives a change of rates far more political significance than it would otherwise have, as we see now in the case of Germany's attitude toward the mark.

It would seem an appropriate time for the United States to take the lead in convening a conference of the leading nations of the free world to discuss the whole area of monetary reform, and to develop a more realistic system to facilitate international transactions, instead of coping with each crisis as it happens, often at the mercy of the internal politics of the particular country involved.

I would like to include several recent articles from the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Business Week magazine and Christian Science Monitor in support of my remarks.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 10, 1969]

VANISHING GOLD—BRETTON WOODS BREAKUP SEEN IN MONETARY CRISIS

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—What we are seeing now, they are saying here in London, is the breakup of Bretton Woods.

The system of fixed exchange rates backed by the use of gold at a fixed price as the main world reserve money, which was hammered out at Bretton Woods in 1944, finally is falling apart.

Money markets in Europe have been in turmoil in advance of the weekend meeting of central bankers at Basel, Switzerland.

Dealers simply have had no doubts at all: The West German mark is bound to be revalued upward, if not now, then very soon.

The possibility of the French franc being devalued by 10 percent is also taken into account. And there is some question whether the pound sterling could stay put where it is in that case.

PRESSURE EXERTED

Pressure has therefore been exerted in all directions, toward Bonn and away from London, Paris, and New York.

Central bankers have been "recycling" the money flows, the United States Federal Reserve, for instance, selling D-marks and buying French francs and pounds sterling. But this "recycling" has in no way affected either the basic causes or the inevitable consequences of the crisis.

Once again much is made of the role of "speculators." But the flows and counterflows are not in fact produced by speculation but by the normal processes of trade and banking.

For bankers, other than central bankers, are not prime sources of flows of money. They are the channels for them. If a currency is likely to become more expensive all external sources using and needing supplies of it will inevitably buy that currency if they can. When a money is likely to be devalued, on the other hand, everybody concerned who can will quite rightly sell.

In the City of London, the longest continuously operating money market in the modern world, it is noted that no central bank in a free country has the power—or, indeed, the right—to require commercial concerns to operate against the interests of their shareholders, their employees, and their own corporate entities.

This they would do if they laid themselves open to serious losses by ignoring changes in currency values.

Bankers as a whole themselves still favor the Bretton Woods-type system of controlled stability.

Says John E. Nash, executive director of merchants bankers Samuel Montagu: "The Bretton Woods system was set up to achieve orderly adjustment of balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses among member countries, without forcing member countries [when in deficit] to adopt painful deflationary policies leading to substantial unemployment, or beggar my neighbor competitive devaluation policies designed to export their unemployment to other countries."

GOLD SHUNTED ASIDE

The international monetary system has in fact worked very well, he remarks. International trade has not ceased to grow. Prosperity in Western countries is, year by year, achieving new records. Full employment has prevailed for longer than ever before.

It is economists and some businessmen who mainly disagree.

To some economists here the current crisis has been produced by a failure to allow the Bretton Woods system to work. Absolute fixity of exchange rates has been attempted, for example, which was never intended. And the golden base has been virtually removed from the world monetary system.

The value of gold to the system, it is said, was first that it provided a nonmonetary backing to all major currencies which had worldwide acceptance as a stable unit. If gold did anything, everyone felt sure, it would increase in value, whereas every single currency in the world was, and is, bound to depreciate.

Second, gold in the past allowed balances of payments a great deal of latitude. They did not have to balance exactly in the round. Any lack of balance could be made up by the introduction into the system of newly mined gold.

SOME DOLLAR PROBLEMS

A substitute for gold which could do the same job, like the "special drawing rights" of the International Monetary Fund, has not yet been introduced. Reducing the role of gold without introducing SDR's has made the dollar less than fully convertible into gold (partly through United States pressure applied to other governments to continue holding dollars, partly through the self-interest of all not to contract international liquidity). At the same time however it has put the world on a dollar standard.

Valuable as it is to the world, the use of the American dollar as the only world money has some other disadvantages besides its inconvertibility. It is a monetary unit in daily use. Its supply is not under international control. It is not expected to maintain a stable value in terms of buying power.

Its availability to the rest of the world also depends on the United States being usually in deficit. But, without new gold coming in, global payments now have to balance. So, if there are fixed exchange rates, somebody else has to be in permanent surplus.

One effect of that is to make some countries' balance-of-payments problems virtually insoluble, certainly without very severe deflation indeed.

Another, in a world where rates of inflation vary between country and country and so currency values also vary, is to make a system of fixed exchange rates wildly impractical.

Prof. Harry G. Johnson of the London School of Economics and the University of Chicago, has a public debate with banker Nash just published here by the Institute of Economic Affairs.

He strongly urges flexible exchange rates. And his main argument is that fixed rates leave a government with an overvalued currency the alternatives only of imposing restriction on imports, or deflating the econ-

omy, or devaluing—which is taken as a political defeat.

But flexibility, he avers, removes the balance-of-payments motive for restrictions on international trade and payments. "It therefore can make an important positive contribution" to the stability of the world economy.

Certainly, it is widely agreed here, a fresh world monetary system of some kind must result from the current crisis, or from the next one, if this one is merely papered over. The old system is visibly falling apart.

The alternative to a fresh system would be not a simple monetary crisis but a world economic crisis.

[From Business Week magazine, May 17, 1969]

MONEY SYSTEM REELS OUT OF ITS SIXTH CRISIS

The world's sixth money crisis in 18 months, this one centering on the German mark, was easing this week. But across Europe—in Germany, Britain, and France—conditions seemed ripe for what could fast become crisis No. 7.

Crisis No. 6 was bad enough. It began when \$3 billion gushed into Germany in 3 days last week in anticipation of a mark revaluation. It eased once Germany made it plain it wasn't going to be pushed into raising the value of its currency.

Instead, Germany at midweek unveiled a series of alternative measures aimed at keeping the mark at its present value (roughly four to the dollar) as long as possible.

GERMAN PLANS

To deal directly with hot money flows into the country, Germany's central bank was given the power to demand that commercial banks hold 100% reserves against all their foreign deposits. Until now, the 100% reserve could be put only on new money coming into Germany.

To deal with Germany's embarrassingly large trade surplus, the border tax adjustments first imposed during last November's currency crisis, when money also poured into the country in anticipation of a mark revaluation, will be continued beyond the March, 1970, expiration date. These measures consist of a 4% penalty on exports and a 4% tax break on imports.

Apart from this, Germany also announced some measures on Wednesday aimed at cooling the country's economic boom (page 115). Some \$500-million in proposed federal expenditures, now frozen, may be killed outright. The Bonn government will put a freeze on \$600-million in boom-produced surplus tax revenues, and try to get the German states to put a comparable freeze on another \$300-million in tax revenues.

The latest monetary flare-up, to be sure, was short-lived as such crises go. Nor did the U.S. dollar, the key currency of the international monetary system, come under attack. But in the longer run, it may turn out to have been the most damaging crisis of all.

THE SYSTEM CREAKS

For instance, it proved again how hard it is for nations to change the value of their currencies, no matter how compelling the need. German Economics Minister Karl Schiller and central bank president Karl Blessing fought for revaluation; Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger and Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss fought against it. In the end Kiesinger and Strauss won what was clearly a political, not a financial, battle. "Everywhere," moans a European official, "the monetary problem has become bogged down by internal political issues."

Similarly, there was widespread concern this week that successive crises would ensnare the world monetary system in still more trade and exchange controls—rigged up by nations to avoid changing their currency values. To one worried Continental banker: "We face a creeping paralysis of the world payments system."

And while cooperation among central bank-

ers has kept the system alive through crisis after crisis, cooperation failed a test this time. The key central bankers, meeting at Basel last weekend, took only a half-step toward agreeing on a firm plan for "recycling" speculative money flows—funneling hot money back to countries that lost it. At most, it appears, Germany has agreed to lend dollars to countries that have lost reserves, using the Bank for International Settlements as intermediary.

What the Basel meeting did produce was plenty of muttering that the Nixon Administration has been slow in assuming the leadership role of the Johnson Administration in world monetary affairs—and equally slow in producing ideas for beefing up the monetary system. "It is important," says a European central banker, "that the President of the United States take the lead in setting new policies."

In short, confidence in the world monetary system—fragile at best in recent months—was under enormous strain this week.

SWARMING SPECULATORS

Germany's May 9 pledge to hold the present value of the mark "for eternity" was greeted with cold skepticism in financial circles the world over. Some of the \$5-billion in hot money that poured into Germany between late April when France's General de Gaulle quit and May 9 was flowing back out of the country this week. A German government official estimated the outflow last Monday at \$600-million, with another \$100-million leaving the country on Tuesday. That, of course, is very modest considering all the money that poured into the country.

But international bankers, nearly to a man, still expect the mark to be revalued once Germany has held its national elections in September. And some European money market watchers still think that speculative pressure will force revaluation before that. Certainly the initial reaction among financial observers to Wednesday's German economic package wasn't very encouraging. Most people saw the proposals as far milder than expected.

Britain, too felt last week's panic, losing \$500-million to \$800-million to speculators. Then, on Tuesday, Britain announced still another trade deficit, for April. It has been 18 months since the pound was devalued, and Prime Minister Harold Wilson counted on a trade surplus this year. Instead, the average deficit in the first four months of 1969 was worse than in the final four months of 1968.

France, which hoped for a mark revaluation, must keep standing guard against speculators betting on a franc devaluation. It's most unlikely until France gets a new president. But election day is only two weeks off. Afterward speculators can be expected to swarm against the franc.

U.S. ROLE

The crisis has even slopped over to affect the U.S. by driving up the cost of Eurodollars (U.S. dollars on deposit overseas). U.S. banks borrow Eurodollars to offset tight money at home; U.S. corporations borrow them to use abroad. Since so much of last week's speculation welled up out of the Eurodollar market, most central banks will now aim to keep Eurodollar rates high, to make speculation more expensive.

The crisis did revive talk about reforming the monetary system. Since nations can't be relied on to change the value of their currencies, more and more people—including some monetary officials—are interested in ideas for making such changes more automatic.

And the Nixon Administration this week reminded world bankers it wasn't ignoring the monetary system—it simply was being deliberate, as it has been on most matters. Highest priority goes to fattening the world's stock of reserve assets by giving nations special drawing rights (SDRs) on a pool of currencies in the International Monetary Fund—

to be used in addition to gold and foreign exchange. Washington wants to get the SDRs put into use as quickly as possible. Once that is done, the Nixon people will pay greater heed to more fundamental changes in the monetary system.

Most observers hope in the short run for some multilateral realigning of currency values. The most frequently mentioned approach would be for France to devalue the franc by around 10% and Germany to revalue the mark by the same amount.

CURRENCIES BEYOND "ETERNITY"

An official Bonn spokesman has characterized West Germany's refusal to raise the value of the mark as "final" and "valid for eternity." But the speculators' odds are still weighted heavily on the side of revaluation. Of the more than \$4 to \$5 billion of foreign funds that recently poured into Germany, only about \$1 billion have thus far flowed out. The turbulence in the foreign exchange markets has abated, but the imbalance caused by the continued undervaluation of the mark remains as a constant source of future trouble.

The forces of disequilibrium in the international monetary system are being repressed by exchange controls, trade restrictions and efforts by central banks to counter currency speculation. But those retrograde devices cannot be relied upon for the long haul.

The latest defense measure is the activation of a system for the "recycling" of speculative funds. It provides that the country receiving the inflow make automatic loans to countries which are losing reserves in efforts to maintain the fixity of their exchange rates. In order to prevent sterling, for example, from falling in relation to the mark, British authorities must be able to sell with the recycling arrangement, they get those marks promptly.

But recycling is a palliative, not a cure. If the speculative switching from sterling to marks were followed by a one-for-one reflux of marks back into sterling, Britain's foreign exchange reserves would not be significantly affected. However, losses are incurred when the speculators switch to Eurodollars or another third currency, as now appears to be the case. Falling reserves, in turn, invite further speculative attacks.

What is immediately needed to set the monetary system on a more even keel is greater exchange rate flexibility. Ideally, a comprehensive monetary conference, comparable to that at Bretton Woods in 1944, ought to be convened to plan for the orderly transition to rate flexibility. But the failure of the most advanced countries to reach agreement on the realignment of a few fixed exchange rates makes the prospects for such a large undertaking dim. As a consequence, the next change in the monetary system hinges on whether "eternity" is, in fact, bounded by Germany's September election.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 20, 1969]

THE UNSYSTEMATIC MONETARY SYSTEM

The international monetary system is proving once again its inability to cope with present economic and political realities. So far, however, there seems to be no movement toward constructive alternatives.

When the current apparatus was devised at Bretton Woods, N.H., in 1944, the apparent assumption was that all countries would zealously guard the worth of their currencies with prudent financial policies. If they actually had done so, the system of fixed exchange rates might make more sense.

For many years, though, the only major nation that had clung, consistently and firmly, to financial responsibility is West Germany, which of course was not represented at Bretton Woods. It isn't surprising, therefore,

that the German mark is the strongest of the world's principal currencies.

Under existing monetary arrangements, it doesn't much matter whether one or more currencies are substantially weaker than others or whether one or more are exceptionally strong. In either case fixed exchange rates do not reflect economic reality and there is strong pressure either for devaluation or upward revaluation—or both.

The latest in the long series of crises came last week, when most countries felt that West Germany should increase the international value of the mark. The Bonn government refused to take any such action, for reasons that it believed were good and sufficient.

Basic to the problem, after all, was not German prudence but imprudence in the U.S., Britain, France and elsewhere. Germany reasoned that other nations should at least acknowledge their culpability by devaluing at the same time the Bonn moved the mark upward—a step they were unwilling to take.

The mere fact that exchange rates are fixed gives them a political significance larger than they would otherwise possess. If the mark had been revalued upward, German businessmen and farmers would have found it somewhat harder to sell their products abroad—and they would have faced increased competition from imports. It's small wonder that the Bonn government, a few months before a national election, was unwilling to make a decision that would have angered many citizens.

What happens now? It looks as though we're going to have more of the frantic improvisation that has preceded and followed every currency crisis in the past.

Some of the speculators, who thought they saw a sure thing in mark revaluation, have given up and pulled their funds out of Germany. As long as the mark remains so exceptionally strong, however, the danger remains that an inflow of money will inflate the German economy. The Bonn government is trying to discourage the inflow by raising reserve requirements on German banks' foreign deposits.

A certain amount of the speculators' interest now has shifted to Britain where the pound, devalued only 18 months ago, looks shaky again. The London government had promised a balance-of-payments surplus for 1969, but a widening trade deficit makes that goal appear almost unattainable. The nation may be forced into yet another huge borrowing from the International Monetary Fund.

In the circumstances, it's a little ironic that British politicians are complaining that the IMF and foreign bankers are "running" British internal economic policy. As long as Britain and other nations cling to the idea of rigidly fixed exchange rates, and then insist on financial profligacy at home, there is no conceivable way to avoid external pressures on internal policies.

What it comes down to is that only two possible ways exist to restore reasonable peace and order to world monetary affairs. First, the world can live with fixed rates if all the major nations pursue wise financial policies. This does not have to mean tight money and austere government budgets all the time; the Monetary Fund's mechanism can cope with short-term imbalance. It emphatically does mean that the imbalances can be no more than short-term, quickly corrected by monetary and fiscal measures.

In the real world, unfortunately, any such development looks highly unlikely. Since some nations appear to have developed an addiction to inflationary stimulants, the best available course probably is to agree on greater flexibility of exchange rates. Inflation would produce day-to-day fluctuations in money markets, but it would pose less risk of international monetary panic.

While such a setup could produce problems of its own, they surely would be of lesser magnitude than those now existing.

There's a real question how long the monetary system can survive if it merely goes on stumbling from crisis to crisis.

PILOT GUNTHER HONORED AFTER TRANSATLANTIC RACE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my heartiest congratulations to William M. Guinther of Kutztown, Pa., for a very thrilling and adventuresome accomplishment. Bill Guinther was recently awarded a \$12,000 prize as the meritorious achievement award for an American citizen in the London Daily Mail Transatlantic Race.

The newspaper-sponsored contest commemorated the 50th anniversary of the first transatlantic flight by Sir John Alcock and Sir Arthur Brown. Flying a borrowed single-engine Beechcraft Bonanza, Bill Guinther flew from London to New York in 22 hours, 13 minutes and from New York to London in 24 hours, 15 minutes. The measure of the task and the man is highlighted by the fact that Bill Guinther, as a Korean war veteran and flyer, had one leg amputated after an Air Force plane collision.

I submit for publication in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, articles from the Reading, Pa., Eagle and Times chronicling the occurrences that transpired as a result of Bill Guinther's participation in the great transatlantic race:

[From the Reading (Pa.) Eagle]

BERKS PILOT TO COLLECT \$12,000

William M. Guinther, Berks pilot-airplane salesman was in Philadelphia this morning with his wife, Ann, after winning an unexpected prize in the international London-New York Transatlantic flight competition.

"He's on Cloud Nine and so is his wife," commented Mrs. Leonard A. Hendrickson of Martha's Vineyard, Mass., his mother-in-law who is babysitting for the Guinthers. The Berks man resides near Grimville, Kutztown R.D. 2.

Actually, Guinther is preparing to leave tonight at 7:30 with his wife by jetliner from Philadelphia to accept a \$12,000 prize as the meritorious achievement award for an American citizen in the contest. It is only \$2,400 less than the two awards for the fastest Atlantic crossing.

It is being presented by the Ziff Davis Publications, New York, based, he said, on "accuracy of flight and preparations."

The trip to Philadelphia today was to obtain a passport for his wife. "She's never been out of the country and is a native of the 'Vineyard,'" her mother said.

Guinther, who had his right leg amputated after an Air Force plane collision, had to fly to the "Vineyard" to get his mother-in-law and his wife's birth certificate. Mrs. Hendrickson commented: "It was more for the birth certificate that he flew there."

The older woman will be the baby sitter for the Guinthers who will be in London up to Sunday. She will be tending her grandchildren, Lisa, 8 and Stuart, 6.

Guinther, a native of Bally, planned extensively for the flight with the aid of several others, checking on alternate routes and exacting fuel consumption, he felt this was probably one of the reasons he took the prize.

There were many questions about his flight by persons connected with the contest in New York.

The Korean War veteran, who downed two MIGs, apparently hit every check point just right and gave the proper answers to "a third degree type of questioning," he related.

Credited with helping him, he reported, were Marion Hart, a veteran Atlantic-crossing pilot; Louis Sacchi, who owns a plane-ferrying firm, and Luther Moyer, a Kutztown glider pilot, who provided an emergency radio.

The time he recorded from London to New York was 22 hours, 13 minutes and 18.31 seconds but this was topped by Stephan Wilkinson of Florida at 20 hours and 23 minutes. Going from New York to London Guinther had a time of 24 hours, 15 minutes. The prize in this category—one of 21 sections in the contest that offered \$144,000 in prizes, was \$2,400.

Guinther will pay for his wife's flight to and from England but he will be happy about it. He appeared that way Monday when he was told he won the meritorious honor. The couple also will meet His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh. "I hope they get to see the queen," Mrs. Hendrickson said.

The contest sponsored by the newspaper commemorates the 50th anniversary of the first transatlantic flight by Sir John Alcock and Sir Arthur Brown. Guinther flew a borrowed Beechcraft Bonanza.

[From the Reading (Pa.) Times,
May 20, 1969]

SMASHING "FAIRYTALE"—GUNTHERS FLY HIGH IN LONDON (By Ray Koehler)

The whole episode still has the gossamer aura of unreality.

A week ago, Mrs. William M. Guinther was taking the kids to the dentist.

Forty-eight hours later, the Kutztown R.D. 2 housewife and her pilot husband, an international celebrity and \$12,000 winner in the London Daily Mail Transatlantic Air Race, were:

Zooming first class in a jet to London . . . shaking hands with Britain's Prince Philip . . . dining on Eggs Benedict at the Savoy . . . viewing the Red Knights (England's answer to the U.S. Navy's Blue Angels) as guest of honor at the Biggin Air Fair . . . visiting Westminster Abbey and the Tower of London. . . .

"It was a fairytale . . . unbelievable," exclaimed Mrs. Guinther, back home Monday and still waiting for the coach to turn into a pumpkin at the last stroke of midnight.

The events were put into motion May 12 when Bill Guinther, the airplane salesman who crossed the Atlantic both ways in a single-engine Beechcraft Bonanza, was awarded the "meritorious" prize for non-winning American entries in the air race.

Later, riding "coach" in a jetliner to the winners' reception in London's Royal Garden Hotel, someone began pulling strings and the couple was escorted to first-class seats.

"I watched a George Segal movie . . . Bill went to sleep and snored," the blonde housewife recalled. Her husband, she said, Monday was enroute home from his office at the Philadelphia International Airport.

London was in the midst of the soccer finals and the Bryanston Court Hotel was caught up in the national sports craze.

It was into the midst of this frenzy that Bill and Ann entered Wednesday morning—a scene that added to the air of make-believe.

"Bill was outfitted in a tux with a pleated shirt front and black tie . . . ooh, and did I ever get a gown . . . a deep blue chiffon with beading on the top and stuff. Then I got my hair done and the stylist said I looked 'smashing.' . . . and Bill looked pretty nice, too!"

The reception was scheduled for 6 p.m.—

and both the prince and the Guinthers were late.

"There was a military band in full regalia playing," said Ann, "and as we walked down this broad, carpeted staircase leading to the reception suite the band struck up 'Those Magnificent Men in Their Flying Machines.'"

"I don't know if they did it for us—but Bill sure got a kick out of it."

"All 21 winners in the London Daily Mail contest had been assembled for the reception and at 7 p.m. Prince Philip entered.

"We were at the very end of the receiving area, but Bill thought he spent more time talking to us than anyone . . . he's interested in small planes, you know."

"Prince Philip is a wonderful man . . . just as nice as he seems with a marvelous deep voice . . . I'll never wash my glove."

During their conversation, Guinther presented Prince Philip a distelfink tie clasp he purchased at Dunkelberger's in Kutztown.

"What is it?" asked the Prince, husband of Elizabeth II.

"It's a tie clip," said the one-legged solo flier. "I'm Pennsylvania Dutch and proud of it."

During the dinner the contest winners were given the same menu served 50 years earlier after the first non-stop Atlantic crossing by Alcock and Brown.

"We had Eggs Benedict . . . and Bill said he wanted me to make them for him every morning," Ann laughed.

Her ex-combat pilot husband, she added proudly, got the biggest reception of the night when he was introduced. He also got the biggest check.

The remainder of the weekend was filled with sightseeing and shopping and dining on steak and kidney pie.

We left London Sunday at noon and arrived in Philadelphia at 3 p.m., our time. Mrs. Guinther said, "We got home about 5 o'clock . . . and what a reception."

"Stuart, our 6 year old, was covered from head to toe with the chicken pox!"

THE NEW LEFT AND STUDENT UNREST

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1969, a balanced appraisal of the issue of student unrest was presented to the House Special Subcommittee on Education by Allan C. Brownfeld, editor of the New Guard, the publication of Young Americans for Freedom. As one who has addressed student groups over the last several years and as a faculty member of St. Stephen's School in Alexandria and the University of Maryland, Mr. Brownfeld is by no means a stranger to the issue of student problems and aspirations. In addition, he has authored a special study on the new left for the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. His articles have appeared in several law reviews including those of Yale, William and Mary, and the Texas Quarterly, as well as Modern Age, Commonweal, North American Review, Human Events, Roll Call, the New Guard, and the Washington Star. Holding a bachelor of laws degree from William and Mary, he is presently a Ph. D. candidate at the University of Maryland.

Although Mr. Brownfeld is well acquainted with the extremist operations

of the radicals on campus, he is nonetheless aware that legitimate student complaints do create contention between the school administration and student bodies. However, students, in their efforts to rectify valid grievances, should not be blinded to the nature of the New Left activists who are attempting to use them, both students and grievances, in pursuing their anarchistic ends.

I include the above-mentioned statement by Allan C. Brownfeld of Young Americans for Freedom in the RECORD at this point:

THE NEW LEFT AND STUDENT UNREST

(Statement of Allan C. Brownfeld, editor of the New Guard, the publication of Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., May 15, 1969)

Madame Chairman and members of the committee, I am Allan C. Brownfeld, editor of "The New Guard," the publication of Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., with offices at 1221 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. I am the author of the study of the New Left for the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and am a Ph. D. candidate at the University of Maryland where I am also a member of the Faculty of the University College.

There are many aspects to the protests and campus activism which we are now witnessing. One of the things we are seeing is a new generation of young Americans seriously questioning the values and standards of their parents, of the university, and of the society itself.

Much of this questioning is good, for many of the existing standards and values do, indeed, need to be challenged. For too long our society has accepted the idea that through government, all of our problems could be solved. Young people did not live through the optimistic days of the New Deal when it was believed by many that if you created enough government agencies, and spent enough federal money, all problems—of poverty, of social inequality, of poor housing or whatever—could be solved. They are beneficiaries only of the results.

As they see it, our government has become bureaucratically inert and unresponsive to the needs of the people. It has, beyond this, become coercive. It compels young men into military service against their will, it compels workers to pay for social security which many might choose not to have, it even compels Americans under penalty of fine and jail to answer what were previously considered to be personal questions on census forms.

Young people see that such coercion has not solved our problems but has, in many respects, compounded them. They also are concerned with the university, which is where most of them are now in the capacity of students. They have seen students become the least important commodity at the University as government and private foundations lure professors into writing and research projects which many prefer as opposed to teaching.

It must be remembered that there are many legitimate grievances with regard to the university and the educational process. Irving Kristol, writing in Fortune magazine for May, 1968, noted that "... in the overwhelming majority of universities liberal education is extinct." In a volume entitled, *The Academic Revolution*, Christopher Jencks and David Riesman point out that this revolution began at the end of the World War II, when the demand for higher education began to grow with explosive speed. The complexity of the mass techno-

logical society required many more university trained specialists. As a result a diploma became an almost indispensable document. The role of the academician rose in prestige, leading to a change in the nature of the university.

Harper's Magazine editor John Fischer has remarked about the nature of this change: "... the professoriat soon began to reshape the university to serve its own desires rather than those of the students or their parents. For one thing teachers today are doing less and less teaching. Jencks and Riesman note that 'until World War II even senior scholars at leading universities did a good deal of what they defined as scut work: teaching small groups of lower level students, reading papers and examinations and the like ... Today, however, few well-known scholars teach more than six hours a week, and in leading universities many bargain for less ... the routine problems of mass higher education have therefore fallen by default to graduate students.' ... Research of course is what he had better be committed to, for that alone pays off in money and reputation. It doesn't have to be significant research. Much of it, at least in the social sciences and humanities tends to resemble finger exercises for the piano. It is not concerned with answering real questions or solving real problems." What many students are disturbed about, therefore, is the fact that their own education has suffered. No longer are students considered the most vital part of a university. Mr. Fischer places much of the student restlessness in this perspective: "I believe it is the beginning of a counter-revolution by students—liberal arts undergraduates in particular—against a quiet, almost unremarked revolution which has changed the whole structure of American higher education within the last two or three decades. The main beneficiaries of that revolution were the faculty. The victims were the liberal-arts undergraduates. Only recently have these students begun to understand how they are victimized—and their protest is likely to swell until at least some of the results of the earlier revolution are reversed."

Young people are also disillusioned about democracy, and its ideology often has a hollow ring. They were careful observers of the 1964 presidential campaign. They heard Lyndon Johnson attack Barry Goldwater as an advocate of war, they heard him say that the war in Vietnam was to be fought by "Asian boys," not by Americans. They remember the television spots picturing a world destroyed by nuclear holocaust were the Republican to win.

Thinking that this was, in fact, the case, many of them supported the Democrats. Once implemented, however, the Democratic program looked much like the Republican. As the oft repeated joke had it: "I was told that if I voted for Barry Goldwater we would be at war in six months. I did. And we were."

How much faith can idealistic young people have in a political system which appears to give its highest honors to those who tell a pleasant untruth? How much faith can they have in leaders who base their appeal to the public not on what they really intend to do, but on what they know the people want them to do? For many, 1964 and the years following have been years of disillusionment with the two party system. What we have more and more is a generational credibility gap.

But we have a generation gap of another sort as well, and it is perhaps the key to understanding today's youthful rebellion. Though all of us, young, middle aged, and old live in the mid-twentieth century, only the young, those who have come of age after the conclusion of World War II, are truly of this period. Those who lived through the depression or through World War II, have been frozen by the dramatic and intense experience of those days.

The Southern writer, Walter Hines Page,

wrote this with regard to the generation which lived during the Civil War in the South: "It (the Civil War) gave everyone of them the intensest experience of his life, and ever afterwards he referred every other experience to this. Thus it stopped the thought of most of them as an earthquake stops a clock. The fierce blow of battle paralyzed the mind. Their speech was the vocabulary of war ... they were dead men, most of them, moving among the living as ghosts; and yet, as ghosts in a play, they held the stage."

Thus, the young are the only ones who are, in a sense, frozen with the dramatic and intense experience of these days. They do not relate the upheavals of today with the past, for they know no past, except through the books most of them do not read, to their great misfortune. They live in the present and wonder what kind of future they may hope for in so transient and unstable a world. If there is a generation gap it is of this nature. The generations need interpreters to understand one another, and these seem few and far between.

A young man growing up in Europe one or two hundred years ago would have faced a life situation in which the major decisions in his life were pre-ordained. More than likely, he would have been born in the same house in which his father had been born, almost surely in the same town. He would pursue the same means of earning a living as did his father. If the father was a tailor or a butcher, the son would also live his life in this manner. His marriage would be arranged. His own range of choice-making was very slight. Life was circumscribed by religious faith and communal custom. The individual was part of the community, of the group. His responsibility was more that of playing out his role than grasping life as a horseman at the reins and riding in whatever direction he willed.

Today's man's situation is far different. Today, young Americans have almost unlimited choices with regard to career, location, marriage partners, and other basic elements of life style. Certainly, there are restrictions. The draft claims two years out of the lives of many young men. Some start life in humbler surroundings than others, thereby limiting upward mobility. Yet, on the whole, the young man or woman coming of age in America at this time has perhaps a greater freedom to choose his pattern living than has any individual at any other time in history.

Freedom to choose, however, becomes a very difficult task when no one provides any knowledge or information about the basis upon which such choices may beneficially be made. At one time the family, the school, and the church spent a good deal of time pointing young people in particular directions which they considered to be valid and time-tested. Today the family is in a state of disarray, the school pursues a "value-free" curriculum, and the church doubts its own message, being swept away in the modern tide of relativism.

Not too long ago, *The New Yorker* featured a cartoon in which one priest said to another: "I would not be so presumptuous as to tell the congregation what was right and what was wrong." In one of the most important volumes advocating the new variety of Protestant theology, *The Secular City*, Professor Harvey Cox of the Harvard Divinity School, notes that man, in the modern world, is no longer concerned with what theologian Paul Tillich called the "ultimate questions," namely those concerning life, death, and meaning. Cox notes that "... they are obviously not questions which occur to everyone, or indeed to the vast majority of the people. They do not trouble the newly emergent urban-secular man very frequently. They arise, in fact, not from the structures of existence at all but from the ero-

sion of inherited world views and cultural meanings . . . We have found technopolitan man to be pragmatic and profane."

Cox urges the modern church to turn away from metaphysical questions, since these are no longer the questions which people are asking. Instead, he argues, they should enter the social and political arena: ". . . in secular society politics does what metaphysics once did. It brings unity and meaning to human life and thought. In today's world, we unify the various scholarly and scientific specialities by focusing them on specific human issues . . . Theology today must be that reflection-in-action by which the church finds out what this politician God is up to and moves in to work along with him. In the epoch of the secular city, politics replaces metaphysics as the language of theology."

Harvey Cox's insights into the nature of the modern world and of modern man should by no means be deprecated. He has, indeed, broken much new ground. But too much of his advice has been taken at face value. Too many churches have turned their backs upon the metaphysical questions which he says that man is no longer asking, and have delved fully into the questions of the world. It is proper to be concerned about open housing, the war in Vietnam, hunger and crime. But man also has a spiritual nature which must be nourished, and this spirituality has been virtually ignored. What many young people are searching for is a perspective about life which is no longer presented by the institutions which once seemed to perform this task. The mood of modern religion was captured by Evelyn Waugh when he wrote the following in *Brideshead Revisited*: "I had no religion. I was taken to church weekly as a child, and at school attended chapel daily, but, as though in compensation, from the time I went to my public school I was excused church on the holidays. The view implicit in my education was that the basic narrative of Christianity had long been exposed as a myth, and that opinion was now divided as to whether its ethical teaching was of present value, a division in which the main weight went against it; religion was a hobby which some people professed and others did not; at best, it was slightly ornamental, at the worst it was the province of 'complexes' and 'inhibitions'—catchwords of the decade—and of the intolerance, hypocrisy, and sheer stupidity attributed to it for centuries. No one ever suggested to me that these quaint observances expressed a coherent, philosophic system and intransigent historical claims . . ."

The New Left is asking the very "ultimate questions" to which Tillich referred and which modern theologians say have disappeared from the world. Where they will find answers to such questions in what they view as a materialistic and de-humanized age, is difficult to say. In searching for values, however, many in the student movement have taken the negative turn toward nihilism, a turn which other youthful movements at other times have also taken, much to their later regret.

There is a serious dichotomy between the leaders of the New Left—the Tom Haydens, the Jerry Rubins, the Rennie Davises—and the young people who form the core of the movement, the ones who attend protests and demonstrations, the ones who, in the privacy of their own contemplation, feel depressed and disillusioned and wonder what the future may hold.

The leaders are, in many instances, at least ten years older than the followers. More important, they are professionals. Leading protests is what they do, and it is all that they do. Many of them have the wild gleam in their eyes which indicates that for them the "revolution" is more of a personal obsession than a public necessity. They hope that, after the revolution, it is they who will be called upon to lead the new and liberated society.

We have, of course, seen this before. Revolutionary leaders have always managed to gather followers not by promising the tyranny they, in fact, had in mind, but by associating themselves with the deepest aspirations of the group they sought to use for their own purposes.

Thus, Lenin promised the Russian people bread, peace, and land, not Communism. Castro promised the Cubans constitutional democracy, not Communism. Mao Tse-tung promised the Chinese agrarian reform, not Communism. Yet, once in power, the promises were forgotten and the revolutionary leaders proceeded with their long-established blue-print. Likewise, New Left leaders promise college students alcohol and girls in their dormitory rooms, an end to the draft, and a "purpose" for life, namely the liberation of the "oppressed." It sounds good and noble, and the requisite support has been forthcoming.

The fact that young people have many valid questions to ask, does not in any way diminish the danger of many of the activities, leaders, and organizations which have, in many instances, been blindly entered into by students who were not aware of the long-run implications of their actions.

Many of the leaders of such militant organizations as Students for a Democratic Society do not hesitate to support the use of violence. A leaflet prepared in Toronto, Canada and distributed to S.D.S. chapters throughout the country contains instructions on how to make Molotov cocktails and incendiary time bombs. Urging sabotage as "the next logical step toward obstruction and disruption of the U.S. war machine," the leaflet says that it is ludicrous to think that demonstrations closing down an induction center for a few hours will really hurt Selective Service.

"On the other hand," the leaflet says, "is there anyone who doubts that a small home-made incendiary device with a timing mechanism planted in a broom closet at the Oakland induction center could result in fire and smoke damage to the entire buildings, thus making it unusable for weeks or months? One person with a fair knowledge of chemistry could build such a device easily and cheaply and could plant it with almost no chance of being detected." Steve Weissman, a student leader at Stanford University, expresses the view that time for rational discourse has ended and the time for violence has arrived: "What the University has done is to get us to think for a number of years that social problems can be solved by rational discussion . . . There's no conversation between us and the C.I.A. We're on different sides. I hope people will now see that force is a part of the world . . ."

A similar view was echoed by Steve Kindred, a member of the S.D.S. at the University of Chicago. He said that, "This university owes quite a lot of reparations. This whole society owes quite a lot of reparations. With what the university's done, and the way it's followed in the footsteps of the other major institutions of this society, it may burn some day. It doesn't deserve not to burn."

The incidents at Columbia University in the Spring of 1968 provide an excellent case in point. There were two alleged demands made by the student rebels: (1) a halt in the construction of a gymnasium in Morningside Park, and (2) termination of contracts with the Institute for Defense Analysis. But the take-over of Columbia had nothing whatever to do with these issues. Two graduate students, Dotson Rader and Craig Anderson, presented this information: "Months before, at an S.D.S. conference in Maryland, the decision had been reached to take physical control of a major American university . . . Columbia was chosen because of its liberal reputation, its situation in New York and the fact that it was an Ivy League school.

S.D.S. felt it was important at this time to disrupt a private, prestige, tactically vulnerable university . . ." The issues which were presented were simply pretexts. According to these observers ". . . the point of the game was power . . . It was revolution, and if it could be shown that a great university could literally be taken over in a matter of days by a well organized group of students then no university was secure . . ." Mark Rudd, the leader of the take-over, later admitted that the issues had, in fact, been mere pretexts.

Another important case in point were the riots precipitated at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. As far back as November 16, 1967, the *Village Voice* reported the leader of the Youth International Party, Jerry Rubin, as saying: "See you next August in Chicago at the Democratic National Convention. Bring pot, fake delegates' cards, smoke bombs, costumes, blood to throw and all kinds of interesting props. Also football helmets."

Early in 1968 the National Mobilization Committee Against the War in Vietnam, headed by David Dellinger, organized a Chicago project committee and placed Rennie Davis in charge with instructions to work closely with Tom Hayden, leader of Students for a Democratic Society, and Jerry Rubin, of the Progressive Labor Party and also of the Youth International Party, more commonly known as Yippies. Dellinger and Hayden held a press conference in New York on June 29 and were quoted by the *National Guardian* as saying: "We are planning tactics of prolonged direct action to put heat on the government and its political party. We realize that it will be no picnic but responsibility for any violence that develops lies with the authorities, not the demonstrators."

Early in August, Rennie Davis appeared before a meeting of the Chicago Peace Council held at the Lawson Y.M.C.A. He displayed two large 3' by 3' maps of the area surrounding the International Amphitheatre, noting locations where police, National Guard, F.B.I., and other security forces would be situated during the proceedings. He stated that if trouble starts at the Convention, among other things, "the Loop will fall," implying demolition of the downtown Chicago area.

The violence which occurred in Chicago was predicted almost precisely by the August 9th Intelligence Division Report of the Chicago Police Department. That report concluded with this statement: "Due to the talk around the office of the National Mobilization Committee and the general attitude of Rennie Davis and Tom Hayden, the reporting investigator feels that the night of 28 August 1968 there will be wide-spread trouble through efforts of Davis and Hayden. It is felt that there will be trouble in the Loop Area and possibly on the South and West sides. This would be done in an effort to draw the Police away from the Amphitheatre." The issue of the police conduct, the fairness of the communications media, and the role of Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley will remain subject to much discussion. That the police force did over-react in many instances is clear. That this is exactly the response which extremist leaders sought to produce is also clear.

Perhaps the most important lesson to emerge from Chicago was the fact that the violence which occurred in that city was long planned by the most militant members of the New Left. It was carried out under the leadership of men such as David Dellinger, Tom Hayden, and Jerry Rubin, the same people who led the march on the Pentagon. This was no idle political demonstration to its leaders, although it was surely viewed in those terms by many of the innocent and idealistic young people who were its participants. Writing in *The New Republic*, James Ridgeway, an eye-witness observer of events in Chicago, stated the fol-

lowing: "The clashes between police and demonstrators began as calculated maneuvers by the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the Youth International Party. The strategy was to confront the police, and thereby demonstrate that America was a police state . . . Following out their scheme to promote a continuing confrontation between growing numbers of people and the police—they figured that the Chicago officials would respond by bringing in more police and troops, and so make clear to all those looking on that Chicago was an armed camp and America was a police state—the radicals talked enthusiastically about little acts of violence, like a stink bomb in the hotel, or dirty words on some walls, to provoke the police and manipulation the liberal McCarthy youths into their own ranks. In effect, the idea was to stimulate a little guerrilla war . . ."

Tom Hayden, a leader of the Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, was not satisfied with the violence he and his group had managed to provoke in Chicago. Addressing a rally in Grant Park, he urged youths to go home and create "One, two, three hundred Chicagos." Hayden cried: "If they want blood to flow from our heads, the blood will flow from a lot of other heads around this city and around this country. We must take to the streets, for the streets belong to the people . . . It may well be that the era of organized, peaceful and orderly demonstrations is coming to an end and that other methods will be needed."

Since Chicago, violence has increased on the nation's campuses. The Institute of Science and Technology at the University of Michigan was rocked by an explosion last October 14. The bombing was the thirteenth to hit the Detroit area since August and came only two weeks after extensive damage forced the closing of a semi-secret C.I.A. recruiting office in a downtown Ann Arbor office building.

Ann Arbor Police Chief Walter Krasny has claimed the series of bombings may be the work of "anti-Establishment militants" at the University of Michigan, while Detroit officials blame "hippies" for the explosions. The far-left National Guardian reported that "Reaction to the bombings in the bombings in the Ann Arbor radical community has ranged from quiet amusement to fantasy to increased discussion regarding the nature and timing of revolutionary chaos and terrorism and their possible relation to politicization of young people and/or mass repression of the radical movement. While some feel that such violence will help increase the consciousness of students, others feel that the level of awareness is now so low that the bombings will do little . . ."

Violence is often proclaimed as the only means by which society can truly be cleansed. The Rev. William Sloane Coffin, convicted this summer of conspiring to violate draft laws, delivered his first sermon of the academic year at Yale University in praise of change, even if change comes in violent ways. He told 300 persons, mostly students, that "life is change, growth, love and readiness to suffer." The Rev. Coffin warned that the current condemnation of violence by political leaders may also be a condemnation of change. He stated: "Jesus, when he threw the money changers out of the temple was no more violent than (Columbia radical student leader) Mark Rudd."

Following this advice, a new publication, *Mayday*, has appeared. Making light of the violence which has shaken a number of campuses it led off its fourth issue with this verse: "Sabotage, This is Number One and The Fun Has Just Begun." Edited by Andrew Hopkind, James Ridgeway, and Robert Sherill, its November 8, 1968 issue included the following: "The war begun last winter on the Western front, in the rainy season. The guns of February were four Molotov

cocktails thrown at the Naval ROTC building on the Berkeley campus of the University of California . . . The first attack on the Berkeley ROTC building was followed by the burning of a similar center at Stanford. At about the same time, electric power cables strung over the Berkeley hills were cut. Then, three giant electric towers in Oakland were blown to the ground leaving 30,000 houses without power and stopping work at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley. A few days after the tower was destroyed, a University of Colorado drop-out student turned himself in to publicize his "crime." "I had to do something to stop their machines—so maybe they would listen, so that this war would be stopped," he said."

The majority of those who advocate violence either to change the system or to improve its shortcomings are unaware of the historical consequences of violent upheavals. George Bernard Shaw wrote that "Revolution never lightens the burden of tyranny, it simply shifts it from one shoulder to another." That violence is the solution to our current difficulties is, observing the historical record, very unlikely.

Crusades which initially seek to throw off the fetters of an old order have, in most instances, simply replaced them with new fetters. The French Revolution led to the Reign of Terror, the Russian Revolution to Stalin, the Chinese revolution to Mao Tse-tung. The tyrannies which follow violent revolutions have been infinitely more brutal than the autocracies they replaced. The New Left's advocacy of violence is not its only danger. Its blindness to totalitarianism and its hostility to the traditional American concept of free speech is of equal significance.

Many of the New Left are intolerant of viewpoints other than their own. In his *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Professor Herbert Marcuse (termed the "foremost literary symbol of the New Left" by the *New York Times*) states that people who are confused about politics really don't know how to use freedom of speech correctly; they turn it into "an instrument for absolving servitude," so that "that which is radically evil now appears as good." Having established this premise, Marcuse recommends "the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, racial and religious discrimination or which oppose the extension of public services." For him the correct political attitude is one of "intolerance against movements from the right and toleration of movements from the left." The practical result of such a philosophy was to be seen when former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara had to enter a police wagon to avoid crowds at Harvard, when General Lewis Hershey was forced off the stage at Howard University, when students charged the podium at Brown University as General Earle Wheeler spoke.

A student strike at the University of California brought a significant statement from Charles Susskind, a professor of electrical engineering and a man who had seen at first hand how the nazis created "political universities" in the Germany of the 1930s. An example of the lack of concern with the totalitarian nature of communism may be found in the proceedings of *Students for a Democratic Society, largest of the New Left organizations*. This group included in its Port Huron Statement of 1962 a denunciation of "colonialism, communism, and anti-communism." In 1965 it eliminated from its constitution clauses barring "advocates and apologists of totalitarianism" and opposing "authoritarianism both of communism and of the domestic right"; such provisions, they explained, were "negative and exclusionary" and "smacked of red baiting." As a result many communists have flocked into the ranks of S.D.S. Commenting on the group's 1968 convention, the *New Republic* observed

that the Progressive Labor party—the Peking-oriented communist organization—"is heavily represented within S.D.S. because the party sees S.D.S. as a recruiting ground for new members." It noted that at the convention P.L. delegates "continually pushed the idea that students should ally with the traditional working class in a common 'struggle' against the ruling class."

The unrest on the part of students is, therefore, a difficult and complex phenomenon to adequately understand. On the one hand, there are many honest young people with valid grievances, asking important questions. On the other hand, there are false leaders, attempting to use this idealism for their own ends, many of which are totalitarian and dedicated to the destruction of the American society.

It is essential that young people be made aware of the real nature of the New Left activists who are attempting to use them. It is also essential that society show some concern for the valid grievances they have. This generation must come to grips with a complicated world, and all of us together must plan for a future in which our traditional view of the dignity of man, free speech, and orderly procedure will be maintained.

College administrators and legislators who condemn all young people for the excesses of a few simply compound the problem. Those who are willing to accept the excesses, as many college administrators seem surprisingly willing to do, are doing themselves and the society a disservice. No one should talk with those who have committed violent acts of destruction about their grievances. But no grievances about which students wish peacefully to talk should be considered out of the bonds of discussion.

Society, however, must defend itself from those who advocate the use of violence to destroy it. This is the goal of the leadership of the S.D.S. and other militant New Left groups, although it is not the goal of the majority of the rank and file members. If society will not defend itself, if the university will not defend itself, it is an indication that the revolutionaries are right, that America has lost the will to continue, that the intellectual community believes that nothing is worth preserving. We do not believe that this is the case.

"HE WHO SAVES"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I inserted into the RECORD with introductory commentary, a review of a book by Col. Kazimierz Franek-Acmecki telling of the Polish efforts to save Jews during World War II.

In recent weeks we have had statements made on the House floor by Members who are unaware of historic facts and in effect have charged that Poles are guilty of anti-Semitism. The facts are that the Moscow-imposed government of Poland has joined the tyrants of the Kremlin in anti-Semitic propaganda and activities in conjunction with the Russian Middle East adventure.

It must be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Poland do not subscribe to the anti-Semitic policies of the government which oppresses them.

Due to its present significance, I ask consent to place into the RECORD at this

point, my insert as it appeared May 2, 1968.

The insert follows:

"HE WHO SAVES"

(Motto: "He who saves life . . . saves as if it were the world". (Polish efforts to save Jews during the Second World War.) Author: Colonel Kazimierz Franek-Acmecki.)

LONDON, 1968.—In April, 1943, the Germans had started final liquidation of Jewish people in the Warsaw Ghetto. The Jews offered an armed resistance known as "Warsaw Ghetto Uprising". There is now the 25th Anniversary of it.

On every anniversary of the fighting in the Warsaw Ghetto all major Jewish groups pay homage to the heroes who laid down their lives in the struggle. The fighters in the Warsaw Ghetto have become a symbol of the fate of the Jews in the World War II. They were an inspiration to the troops fighting for the future of Israel in the campaigns of 1948 and 1967; victorious campaigns which may serve as an example to the most efficient and brave armies.

The hopeless fight in the Warsaw Ghetto will remain forever a symbol of the struggle for human dignity. It has also another significance. It was an act of protest to the whole world for having allowed the infliction on the Jews of unprecedented sufferings as well as irremediable biological and material losses. The protest was sealed in the West by the suicide of Szymon Zygielbojm.

How much did the Jews suffer? How high were their losses?

Statistics attempt to put into figures the number of people massacred. If the actual figures of the victims approximate to the truth—there is no established norm or measure with which to calculate or give a true picture of the enormity of the sufferings inflicted on the Jews by the Germans. This cannot be assessed in figures, nor can human imagination encompass it.

Documents surviving from this period books and memoirs describing the experiences of Jews, throw light on mere fragments, on the fate of a group, on an extermination camp, on individual bereavement. They cannot give a full picture of the sufferings, of their infinite variety of shades; the heart throbs; the agony of mothers helplessly watching the death of their children; the tragic groans of hundreds of thousands dying of starvation, cold and ill-treatment; the experiences of millions of human beings suffocated in gas chambers.

He who has not actually lived through this nightmare, or did not witness it, will never understand the depth and extent of horror facing those condemned to destruction. For a very long time the West would not believe the information relayed from land.

The extermination was taking place within sight of the Polish people; they were the direct witnesses of the horror, but by no means passive witnesses.

This book is to give testimony of the behavior of the Polish nation regarding the extermination of the Jewish people. It shows that, in addition to the spontaneous initiative of the Polish people, the Polish Underground State, although itself in the throes of a deadly struggle with the invader occupying the country, created a special extensive organization to bring assistance to the Jews.

The Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress, in conjunction with publication of this book is forming a supporting Committee in Illinois. The Committee is headed by Atty. A. A. Mazewski, President, Polish National Alliance; Hon. John C. Marcin, city clerk, city of Chicago; Hon. Judge Thad. V. Adesko of Chicago; Edward J. Derwinski, M.C., and Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, President, Polish American Congress, Illinois Division. Many outstanding members of Illinois will be invited to join this project.

NEED TO SOLVE THE ACUTE PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL SHIPPER

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Charles D. Roche, the executive vice president of the Freight Forwarders Institute, has made clear the position of his member freight forwarders to cooperate with other transportation modes and the Government in solving acute problems in the movement of freight. His speech on May 22 before the Federal Bar Association Council for Transportation Law and Water Carrier Law Committee pointed out the crucial problems involving small- and medium-sized businesses in sending and receiving shipments. Mr. Roche's remarks are worthy of consideration by persons interested in transportation, and I am including them in the RECORD at this time, as follows:

SPEECH BY CHARLES D. ROCHE, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, FREIGHT FORWARDERS INSTITUTE, MAY 22, 1969

I'm pleased to see you all at this "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner" luncheon.

And, I want to especially thank Neil Garson and Herb Mutter, the dotting parents of the Council for Transportation Law and the Water Carrier Law Committee.

I really didn't know much about some kinds of discrimination until I took off my government uniform and joined the dock crew of the Freight Forwarders Institute.

But thanks for the equal time. The boys at the Federal Communications Commission must have got to you.

I've had considerable experience with the equal time law in another vineyard. And I've been toying with an executive reorganization plan that would merge the FCC and the ICC so as to maximize the inherent advantages of providing equality by intermodal regulation, and without sex and violence in the living room.

Following Mr. Perlman of Penn Central and Mr. Beardsley of ATA to your podium is like promoting the abandonment of the cigarette habit. I get one-third time and a paucity of conversions. But it's free time and for that I am most appreciative.

I am here today to launch a rescue operation to save a real competitive common carrier force in the freight transportation resources of this nation.

At this moment the Freight Forwarders Institute is confronted—

With raving and ranting opposition from long haul truckers who control the American Trucking Associations;

With a sort of "I'll hide behind the bushes" defacto opposition of the American Association of Railroads;

With an Interstate Commerce Commission that can find 9,000 problems without proposing any seemingly plausible solutions;

With a Department of Transportation that's still in its nursery years;

With a Congress that can count its "no" votes perhaps better than its "yeas"—but which is awakening to the problems;

And with a new White House administration which so far can only "thank you for your expression of interest."

Now, before your tears of sympathy flood upon me, let me suggest the possibility of having 200,000,000 allies—that's all of us who as individuals are becoming more and more experienced with increasingly lousy service and spiraling prices when sending and receiving freight—particularly small shipments.

And then there are the thousands of small businesses who fear being wiped out by prohibitive shipping costs and problems. And there are the truckers and railroads and suppliers whose services and goods we purchase.

The plain fact is that freight forwarders as common carriers are not treated equally as other regulated common carriers. There is only one real consideration and that is fair and equal treatment under law—without fairness and equality, competition goes out the window.

Right about now, I should explain what a freight forwarder is and what function he performs. In the words of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

"A freight forwarder is one who in the ordinary course of business assembles and consolidates small shipments into a single lot, assumes the responsibility for the transportation of such property from a point of receipt to a point of destination, utilizes the services of carriers by rail, water and motor vehicle to help accomplish the movement, breaks the consolidated shipment into its component parts, and distributes the goods to their destination point."

The transportation officials of the country are waking up to the problem of handling small shipments. It is relevant to note that the domestic freight forwarder supplies services that are used extensively by small and medium sized shippers. About 70 percent of all of the shipments handled by domestic freight forwarders weigh less than 300 pounds.

In serving the small shipper, the freight forwarder ought to be his bargaining agent with the railroads and trucking companies. There is no practical way that a small shipper can even obtain railroad freight services directly.

Although the freight forwarder is geared to help the railroads help the small shipper, he operates in a straitjacket that prevents in many instances competitive or realistic rates. I noted with interest that Mr. Alfred E. Perlman, President of the Penn Central, in his talk before you on your January 28th luncheon, stated three times that railroads cannot afford to carry some commodities at a loss and "make up the difference on high-rated commodities." I can assure you that the railroads are not losing money on freight forwarders' cargo. We are among those users of the railroads who are subsidizing the rest of the operations by providing them \$100 million profitable rail business.

Forwarders now pay the published tariff rates of the railroads and assume the expense of assembling and consolidating small shipments. After assembly and consolidation, the freight forwarder also accepts through common carrier liability for the through movement of each shipment.

The carload, less-than-carload rate structure might appear to be a viable basis for the freight forwarder to do business. There are two basic problems with it. First, carload rates are available to any one, including non-regulated associations of shippers. Second, common carrier trucking companies which utilize the services of railroads under the same circumstances as freight forwarders pay approximately 30 percent less than the freight forwarders for identical hauls.

As common carriers, freight forwarders should be able to negotiate rates with railroads in the same manner as common carrier trucking companies can do. The Interstate Commerce Act, however, denies us this right. Even though common carrier trucking companies can and do negotiate privately for space with the railroads, the American Trucking Association has successfully thwarted proposed legislation that would afford freight forwarders the same operating economies.

The domestic freight forwarding industry because of inequities in the Interstate Commerce Act is in serious trouble. Freight for-

warders are carrying less freight today than they were fifteen years ago. We have been forced out of the short haul business almost entirely because of our inability to compete with trucking companies under existing unrealistic rate structures.

Approximately 60 per cent of our business has been lost to non-common carrier shipper associations which are able to utilize railroads under rate structures that are just as favorable as those which the regulated freight forwarder can obtain. The shippers associations, I might say, are comprised largely of extremely large shippers and in themselves will not offer any real benefit to small shippers.

It is a tragedy and irreparably damaging to our national transportation policy for freight forwarders to be forced out of competing for important segments of business. Small and medium sized shippers suffer and a giant step is being taken toward making it practically impossible for small business to continue to engage in interstate commerce.

I consider it rather ironic that Mr. Peter Beardsley, the General Counsel of American Trucking Associations, in his talk at your March 20th luncheon, stated that he could not—

"Remember a single amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act in the last twenty-five years which was enacted over railroad opposition."

There could hardly be any bleeding hearts insofar as the American Trucking Associations is concerned since by any objective analysis it is perhaps the most powerful and influential lobbying group on Capitol Hill. Under these circumstances, it is not difficult to see why the freight forwarding industry, which is tiny in comparison to other common carriers, has not yet achieved parity under the Interstate Commerce Act.

Not to be outdone by the railroads as blockers, in the last fifteen years the American Trucking Associations has been responsible for defeating every legislative proposal that would have offered any material benefit to the freight forwarding industry.

In addition to the inability of the freight forwarder to enter into joint rate agreements with railroads, as common carrier trucking companies can do, the freight forwarder is at a number of other disadvantages under the Interstate Commerce Act. For example, the freight forwarder cannot acquire a short haul trucking company even though such a trucking operation in today's market might be essential to its assembling and distributing functions. The inability of a freight forwarder to acquire any other carrier under the Act is an example of the inequitable statutory treatment which the freight forwarder receives.

Under existing law, a railroad or a motor carrier or a water carrier may acquire control of any other carrier of the same or of a different kind, if the acquisition is first approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission as being in the public interest and as being in conformity with other standards set forth in the law. *Any of these carriers may acquire control of a Part IV freight forwarder without any ICC approval whatsoever.* A freight forwarder, however, is prohibited from acquiring control of any other carrier of any kind, although it may acquire another freight forwarder without approval. This status of the law has led to the situation where motor carriers and railroads have acquired and do own freight forwarders. Motor carriers, in fact, already own more than 25 per cent of the forwarding industry.

In order to improve their services to the public, freight forwarders obviously need the right, where economically sound, to acquire adjunctive carriers, particularly short haul motor carriers for use in the gathering and distribution of freight forwarder traffic. Freight forwarders now operate their own trucks within the terminal areas of cities, but

they cannot go outside in order to reach industries which for 20 years have been moving increasingly to suburbia. Coordination is the basic function of freight forwarding, and if given the right to buy supplemental truck lines, forwarders could materially advance transportation coordination. As in the case, however, of other legislative proposals that might have offered some benefit to the freight forwarding industry, the last legislative proposal, offered in the 88th Congress, sponsored by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would have permitted freight forwarders under certain circumstances to acquire short haul common carrier trucking companies, was defeated through the efforts of the American Trucking Associations.

I have been around this town long enough to know that I can't beat the trucks, the railroads, the shippers associations, and the government. At least not at one time with one hand tied behind my back.

I also know that this country won't solve its transportation problems with every interest shooting at each other. The forwarders have convinced me that they will try to help solve problems, if given a fair shake. I hope you will all exert influence to bring about a cooperative effort in this direction.

SBANE'S PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the Smaller Business Association of New England—SBANE—met with the House and Senate Small Business Committees and the New England congressional delegation to present their specific proposals on behalf of small businesses. As usual, the presentation of SBANE was imaginative, informative, and thoughtful. The subjects covered by the SBANE Washington presentation team included the Small Business Administration, private pension plans, Government procurement, labor relations, patents, transportation, and taxation.

SBANE, which was founded in 1938, is a private, nonprofit, nonpartisan association of small businessmen throughout New England. It has been effective in promoting and supporting legislation and governmental activities beneficial to small businesses. The proposals were introduced by Mr. Douglas S. Dillman, the president of SBANE and vice president of Horn Packaging & Paper Co., Cambridge, Mass. The presentation was delivered by Roland L. Sutton, Jr., chairman, Washington Presentation Committee and vice president, Maine Products Co., South Paris, Maine. I recommend these proposals to my colleagues for their careful reading and, at this point, I submit them for inclusion in the RECORD:

1969 SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC., PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

INTRODUCTION

Gentlemen: We welcome another opportunity to visit with you at our nation's Capitol and deliver our annual Washington Presentation of Proposals for Congressional Action on behalf of our nation's small businesses.

SBANE, as the only regional Association for small business in the country, is composed of a cross-section of small companies from the six-state New England area. Small businesses from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts join our Association because they believe through joint, unified action they can fulfill many of the needs of small business.

SBANE's member firms range from the one and two employee company with total business in the thousands to employers with up to 500 on the payroll and volume in the millions. Over 50% of the 700 members are manufacturers with products that depict the versatility and ingenuity of small business. A myriad of service firms, retailers, wholesalers, distributors, etc. make a major contribution to our New England economy and compose a truly representative body of our American free enterprise system.

The various programs of this group action include conferences and seminars, often held with leading New England universities, to provide opportunities of continuing education in improving managerial skills and exploring business possibilities. Best known of the SBANE educational programs is our annual "Live-In" Seminar at the Harvard Business School which has been attended by over 1,000 small business executives in over a decade.

Legislation on the national level has been a major interest of the Association since it was founded in 1938. By making known the needs and problems of small business, we have contributed through the years to much of the legislation beneficial to small business.

The Congress has compiled an impressive record of rallying to the cause of small business and we genuinely appreciate your cooperation and support.

This Presentation is a result of several committees working long and hard to sift and sort through key issues affecting small business today. We now offer the essence that is distilled from these meetings and urge your continued attention and support to small business—the foundation of our American economy.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

The Small Business Administration Act of 1953 is by far the most significant piece of legislation passed on behalf of the nation's small business. The wording of the Act is indeed impressive and provides the general outline for preserving free and competitive enterprise for the 5½ million small companies who provide employment for 40 million or 50% of the total work force and account for some 40% of the country's gross national product. Passage of the Act finally recognized that the problems and needs of small business were different from the multi-billion dollar corporation. As an Association which has supported and studied the SBA in the past 16 years, we are impressed with the many accomplishments this small agency has recorded. However, we also believe that much more must be done to fulfill the wishes of the people and the intent of Congress.

There have been frequent irregularities in the smooth functioning of this agency through insufficient funds for the loan programs, lack of progress in developing greater procurement opportunities and irregular direction. Time and energies have been expended to defend the independent status of the SBA amid rumors that it would become part of other Federal agencies. All this, we believe, has been at the expense of building a bigger and better agency for the nation's small businesses.

1. Excessive turnover in SBA Administrators

In the 16 year history of the SBA, there have been 10 SBA Administrators and 9 in the last 10 years. SBANE believes that the SBA has had many dedicated administrators

who have made a great contribution to this agency. However, short terms of leadership make it difficult to maintain continuity of direction and purpose.

Our Association recommends that the appointment of the Administrators be for a term of four years thus giving the administration continuity in carrying out its responsibilities as authorized by the Congress.

2. Keep SBA an independent agency

This Association is increasingly concerned and alarmed by recent reports that raise doubts about the continued independence of the Small Business Administration. As recently as March 5, 1969, Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans, stated before the National Press Club that the SBA "by definition belongs in the Department of Commerce."

SBANE has been actively involved in advocating the independence of this agency even before its creation and views with great alarm the recurrence of rumors that persisted with some strength in 1966.

After full debate on the SBA Act of 1953 by our nation's lawmakers, it was their contention that the SBA must be completely independent to be effective. It is unfortunate that the energies of the Congress must be devoted to defending the independence of this agency rather than to building and improving on its present effectiveness.

Our Association is strongly opposed to any change in present status of the SBA and looks upon the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, newly established within the Department of Commerce, to promote and expand business ownership by minority groups as an erosion of the responsibility of the SBA since the SBA has functioned effectively within this area for some time.

We are convinced that the only reason the SBA remains an independent agency today is due to the loud vocal outcry in support of the SBA's present status not only by the members of the Senate and House Small Business Committees but by concerned Congressmen who truly care about our nation's small businesses.

Our feeling on this subject is best summarized by this quote from an SBANE member's letter to his Congressman:

"... if there were to be a consolidation of these two agencies, the SBA should take over the Department of Commerce. I make this suggestion on the grounds that the most important segment of any structure is the foundation. Small business is the foundation of the American economy."

3. Extension of SBA lease guarantee program

This Association strongly endorses the recommendation of the Small Business Advisory Council to the Senate Small Business Committee of extending the present SBA Lease Guarantee Program to include other types of leases such as those for equipment, machinery, tools and other property suitable for leasing.

The present Lease Guarantee Program empowers the SBA to assist businesses in renting space in shopping centers. With the rapidly growing popularity of the leasing business today, we believe extension of the SBA Lease Guarantee Program would help to alleviate some of the financial inadequacies in obtaining equipment and tools to keep pace with our expanding, competitive economy.

We ask your support of this recommendation of the Council.

4. SBANE supports establishment of capital bank—S. 1213

For over two decades, our Association has sought solutions to the problems faced by small businesses in need of equity capital to grow and modernize to meet competition. In 1947 the Committee for Economic Development issued its policy statement "Meeting the Special Problems of Small Business" and suggested the idea of a "capital bank" to

help meet the financial needs of small business.

SBANE immediately seized on this idea since our own surveys, as well as others including the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston, showed an ever-widening gap between the funds which a small businessman who needed financing could raise himself from family and friends and the smallest amount which would interest an underwriting company or insurance company.

From that time on SBANE pushed the Capital Bank idea publicly, privately and in its testimony before various committees in the Congress, gaining increasing interest and support as the years passed. Ultimately, in 1958, the Chairman of SBANE's "Capital Bank" Committee testified before the Senate Banking & Currency Committee strongly supporting the Johnson-Patman-Sparkman Bill which later became the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. In many of its provisions, this bill was a far cry from the one Capital Bank in each Federal Reserve Bank District which we had envisioned, but at least it was going in the right direction.

During the past 11 years, we have followed the progress of the SBIC program with great interest. Of the various changes and amendments that have been made, practically all of them have been along the lines which we originally recommended in connection with our "Capital Bank".

The Capital Bank Bill—S. 1213—was introduced earlier this year with 19 Senators as cosponsors and will be considered by Senator Sparkman and his Banking and Currency Committee.

We support this legislation, designed to give SBIC's the opportunity to do a bigger and better job.

The establishment of the Small Business Capital Bank as planned would serve as a secondary source of financing for SBIC's, and eventually lead to the elimination of all government dollars in this program. SBIC's represent a unique and productive marriage of private enterprise and government assistance to accomplish the important national goal of providing the means for the future growth and expansion of small business.

PROCUREMENT

A saying used many times by large prime contractors and Government agencies, is "It is good business to do business with small business." SBANE asks simply, "Why don't they?"

At the recommendation of the Procurement Sub-Committee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, an ad hoc Government-Industry Committee was named by SBA to study methods and procedures to preserve and strengthen the position of small business in the subcontracting field under existing and changing conditions of Government procurement. SBANE appreciated the opportunity to serve on this committee but was distressed by its upstream fight against preset unyielding convictions. We do not concur with the committee on some of their recommendations and feel that Congress, when they review the report of this committee, with their keen perception, will unveil facts that will benefit the smaller businessman.

Obstacles to small business participation in government procurement continues to include boilerplate, source qualification and accounting procedures, all of which drain profits and discourages highly qualified small companies.

The continuing decline in the percentage of small business military procurement from 21.8% in 1966, to 18.8% in fiscal 1968 and thence to 16% for July to December 1968, a total of 5.3% since 1966 indicates to SBANE the need for Congressional action.

1. Commission on Government procurement

SBANE feels strongly that a complete study of Government procurement and the

ASPR is long overdue. We, therefore, support the establishment of a Procurement Study Commission, provided small business is represented. This Commission should review the entire field of Federal Government procurement practices and regulations. Bills of this nature were not allowed out of Committee last year. We request that H.R. 10070 and H.R. 474 be reported out and that you vote favorably for this commission.

2. Disputes between prime and subcontractors

The small businessman, experienced with Government procurement subcontracting, generally feels the need for direct access to the Contracting Officer in the event of contract disputes.

SBANE has proposed for several years that the matter could be best solved through administration regulation, such as a recent suggestion that the Small Business Specialist be allowed to pass on to the Contracting Officer, claims that he felt were valid.

In view of Government agencies' reluctance to make any change and in view of many possible terminations, in the near future, needing an expeditious settlement, SBANE will request and support legislation such as H.R. 8928, which gives the subcontractor the right to sue the Government for non-payment after expiration of a reasonable period of time and SBANE would support legislation requiring compulsory and binding arbitration.

3. Small business and research and development

There is a vast reservoir of highly developed skill and scientific knowledge in numerous small firms, much of which is not being utilized under Government contracts. The Small business share of defense R & D prime contracts in 1966 was a dismal 4.4%. In 1967 the total share dropped to 3.9% and in 1968 to 3.5%. This trend must be reversed. R & D in the past has frequently enabled a small business to establish a firm position in the competitive market place. Lack of small business set-asides in this area is a matter of serious concern. Also many unrestricted procurements in this area appear to be directed toward a single technical authority.

Another area of concern which appears to be discriminatory is the procurement personnel's refusal to discuss or explain the reason for determination of non-responsive or the technical deficiency of their proposal until after an award has been made. This, of course, denies the small businessman any rights of appeal or reconsideration.

4. Right of small business to appeal

Present regulations require that a small business bidder be notified that his bid has been declared non-responsive in only two situations: (1) in the judgment of the pre-award survey team the small business lacks the necessary financial resources to complete the contract or, (2) that he lacks the production capability to meet the required delivery schedule. Other instances of possible judgments of non-responsiveness are: lack of tenacity and perseverance, lack of integrity and does not meet the requirements of applicable laws and regulations. In the first two situations the small business is notified of the rejection of his bid and then may appeal to the SBA for a Certificate of Competency. In the other cases there is no appeal from the judgment of the Contracting Officer nor is he notified that his bid is rejected nor the reasons for rejection given. We feel this is grossly unfair to the small businessman. In our opinion the right to appeal to the SBA for a Certificate of Competency should apply to all small business bids rejected as non-responsive.

TAXATION

1969 appears to be the year of the Tax Reform. Not since the Boston Tea Party has there been so much momentum created for

a more equitable system of taxation. For several years SBANE has sought tax adjustments on behalf of small business and has gained some specific measures of success. We have always weighed our tax proposals not in the selfish good of small business or at the expense of someone else, rather our concern has been that the financial conditions of a new or growing small company are very different from a large company that has reached a more mature rate of growth. We have urged for the adoption of tax programs that would be a stimulus to increased investment of internal earnings and a freeing of capital for this expansion in new facilities through liberalized rates of taxation. The end result of freeing more working capital for small business will be greater growth and fuller employment in the years ahead.

We also support the extension of the 10% surtax if measures are taken to reduce government spending.

1. Investment credit

A. SBANE urges retention of 7% investment credit

SBANE opposes the repeal of the investment credit because the loss of this credit would be an especially severe blow to small businesses which look to their after-tax profits as the prime source of funds for capital expansion. Small businesses must be encouraged to grow and to become efficient producers and it is for this reason that we urge that the credit be retained. We believe the credit must be retained as an incentive to business to modernize its plant and equipment. Efficient production will help obtain fuller employment and will keep American business competitive in the world market. We recommend that other fiscal measures be adopted to offset the credit's inflationary effects. However, in the event Congress does choose repeal, we urge that the credit be retained for the first \$50,000 of annual investment in qualified property.

B. Elimination of credit limitation for small business

Taxpayers are now entitled to claim investment credit only to the extent of their first \$25,000 of tax plus 50% of their tax in excess of \$25,000. Carryovers and carrybacks of investment credit in excess of that limitation are permitted. Many small businesses are unable to utilize investment credit in the year earned or to carry it back to a preceding taxable year. Thus, to avail themselves of that credit they must await the realization of taxable income in a future year. We recommend that small businesses be exempted from the limitation and that they be permitted to receive a refund of tax in a loss year. Since large corporations are almost always able to use all of the investment credit in the year earned, the existing limitations usually affect only small businesses. This recommendation would place small business on the same footing as larger businesses and would also cause a significant reduction in the administrative burdens necessitated by the filing of claims carrying back unused investment credit to earlier taxable years.

2. Support Interstate Taxation Act

For the past two years we have depicted the dilemma of small business when engaged in interstate business as the Jungle of Uncertainty in determining if subject to the tax and the Jungle of Mystery in trying to compute the tax.

Last year on May 22, H.R. 2158, a bill to remove the state-imposed burdensome tax collection requirements, passed the House by a 3 to 1 margin 284-89 and only one House member from New England did not vote for this bill. Since the Association has been actively involved in gathering support for H.R. 2158, we were very pleased with your vote which, coincidentally, was taken on the day of our Washington Presentation.

Since no action was taken by the Senate

another Interstate Taxation Bill is now in the House—H.R. 7906. This bill is designed to relieve small business from the inequities and onerous record-keeping duties which result from the multi-farious income apportionment rules used by the various states. We believe this is one of the most important small business bills in the 91st Congress and again urge your strong support of the Interstate Taxation Bill.

3. Repeal of accelerated estimated tax payments

SBANE recommends the repeal of those provisions of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 which removed the exemption from estimated income tax payments for the first \$100,000 of tax. This acceleration in tax payments has caused undue and inequitable hardship on small businesses since in many cases more tax is paid in advance than is finally determined to be due when the company's tax return is filed with the consequent drain on badly needed working capital.

4. Depreciation guidelines

In 1962 depreciation guidelines were adopted by the Treasury Department which accomplished an overall reduction in the useful lives of plant and equipment allowable for depreciation purposes. The guidelines also contained so-called objective tests which were to be the tools through which contests arising out of the determination of estimated useful lives were to be settled. These tests known as the reserve ratio test and the guideline class life test have proved to be extremely complicated and have not substantially reduced controversy. We recommend that Section 167, I.R.C., be amended to permit taxpayers to elect any or all of the lives contained in Revenue Procedure 62-21 and that the reserve ratio test and the guideline class life test be abandoned. This will permit the use of the uniform liberalized lives without the threat of protracted litigation with the Internal Revenue Service.

5. Accumulated earnings tax

A. Increase Minimum Accumulated Earnings Credit

Corporations which retain their after-tax earnings beyond the reasonable needs of the business and for the purpose of avoiding a dividend tax to their shareholders are subject to penalty taxes. The Internal Revenue Service and taxpayers often differ in their understanding as to the reasonable needs of the taxpayer's business. In 1954 Congress recognized that small businesses were frequently unable to accumulate funds for expansion because of the threat of the accumulated earnings tax. Further, the difficulties of proof and the cost of litigation frequently proved to be insurmountable obstacles to smaller companies in defending against the imposition of the penalty. For this reason Congress provided a minimum amount of \$60,000 which could be accumulated without the necessity of providing reasonable business needs. The exemption was increased to \$250,000 to permit small businesses to retain funds necessary for expansion without the constant concern that they may be subjected to a penalty tax.

B. Permit Accumulation to Pay Death Taxes

The stock of a small business is frequently the major asset of the estate of a deceased stockholder. Section 303, I.R.C., permits (within limitations) the redemption of shares from the estate in an amount equal to the estate and inheritance taxes and funeral and administration expenses without the imposition of a dividend tax. This redemption alleviates the necessity of a forced sale to outsiders to obtain the necessary cash. However, the corporation must have accumulated the funds through earnings in order to enable it to redeem the shares. The Internal Revenue Service takes the position

that the accumulation of earnings for such a purpose is not a business purpose and, absent any other business purpose, will impose the penalty tax. SBANE recommends that Section 535, I.R.C., be amended to provide that accumulations for the purpose of redeeming the shares of a stockholder to pay the taxes and expenses specified in Section 303, I.R.C., will be considered accumulations for the reasonable needs of the business.

6. Increase first year depreciation allowance

The Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958 added Section 179 to the Internal Revenue Code permitting businesses to claim an annual deduction for 20% of the first \$10,000 of investment in machinery and equipment. This deduction was designed primarily to aid small businesses to finance the cost of new equipment. The deduction is not a grant or a subsidy to business since it merely accelerates to the first year a deduction which would otherwise be obtained over the useful life of the property.

The cost of new equipment and the needs for funds for expansion have increased substantially over the past 11 years and for these reasons, SBANE recommends that the base upon which the 20% allowance is determined be increased to \$50,000.

PATENTS

A U.S. Department of Commerce study published in 1967 reported that some \$100 billion had been spent in the past 20 years on research and development, a large share, by big business with the facilities and manpower. Despite this enormous investment, over 50% of the technical innovations in the U.S. are the creation of individual inventors and small business. For this reason during the past two years, this Association has given careful study to the recommendations of former President Johnson's Commission on Patent Reform and legislation that has been filed in the Congress as a result of this study.

We would urge your opposition to any legislation that would curb this individual and small business incentive to invent and innovate.

1. Favor "first to invent" over "first to file"

Of particular interest to small business is the proposal to change the system of priority from "first to invent" to "first to file" or various modified "first to file", rules that have been submitted to the Congress.

SBANE opposes legislation that would change the present system under which patents are issued to the first inventor.

The cost of a patent application to an inventor is from \$500 to \$1,000 and higher in complex cases. These changes in the patent laws would impose a serious financial burden on small business and the private inventor who often lacks the funds to file patent applications that have not demonstrated commercial utility. These inventors must conserve their funds to develop inventions for which there is substantial expectation of commercial use and value. Large businesses, however, can afford to file and prosecute patent applications on all likely inventions without knowing their commercial value.

The present cost to the Patent Office in conducting first invention contests and interferences is less than \$250,000 with a staff of 20 employees. This low expenditure of manpower and money to insure the patent goes to the first inventor is a good indication of the efficiency, economy and reasonableness of the present system. Furthermore, interferences are won by the inventor second to file as often as they are won by the inventor first to file. The proposed changes would encourage half-baked applications that would lead to more expensive contests and a greatly increased workload contests and a greatly increased workload on the Patent Office.

These proposed changes would preclude an inventor from contesting the priority of an

invention merely because he failed to file a patent application within a prescribed period before another who claims the same invention.

We ask that you resist any changes in the patent laws from the present first to invent system that has successfully protected and encouraged American inventiveness for so many years.

2. U.S. trademarks

A bill in the Congress, S. 766, The McClellan-Scott Bill, amends the Trademark Act of 1946. It broadens and puts more teeth in the Trademark Act. The bill is broadened to protect not just registered trademarks, but to protect against "unfair competition" which is generally defined in four categories: (1) that which is likely to cause confusion or deception as to the origin of products or services, (2) that which falsely represents goods, or misrepresents other's goods, (3) that which wrongfully discloses or misappropriates trade secrets, and, (4) that which otherwise misrepresents or misappropriates.

The Bill is strengthened by allowing recovery of profits, damages, court costs and attorneys' fees and permits the court to take possession of all violating paraphernalia.

SBANE favors the changes proposed by this bill because of the broadened protection against unfair competition and the increased recovery. The latter makes litigation less burdensome from an economic standpoint and so benefits small business.

3. U.S. Government relations to patents

A. Inventions infringed by Government Contractors (H.R. 2898—90th Congress)

It has been proposed by the American Bar Association and in H.R. 2898 that Federal agencies adopt as a policy that the government procure a patent license from the owner of any patent which will be infringed by a government procurement and that the government pay the owner a royalty no greater than the lowest commercial rate for the license. H.R. 2898 proposes that the government royalty be added to the bid of all unlicensed bidders. The ABA proposes that invalidity or non-infringement of the patent can be shown by the non-licensed being reasonably successful and does get the government decide these matters.

Small business may gain more than it loses from the general proposition of pre-procurement licenses. Small business usually bids only on government procurements for which it has particular competence, which usually means some patents. H.R. 2898 will put such a small business in a better bidding position.

NASA has practiced on a limited scale "Instant Licensing" which is similar to pre-procurement licensing for over a year. It has been reasonably successful and does get the work done.

B. NASA and AEC contracts

The contractor with these agencies gets no title to any inventions conceived or first reduced to practice in performance on the contract. The contractor can petition the agency for a waiver of title (subject to a government license) and succeeds by showing contractor's ability to promote the invention for the public's benefit. Big businesses can do this, but small businesses frequently cannot.

SBANE proposes that small business not be obliged to show the capacity to promote the invention, but only show a willingness to license others to promote the invention, in order to qualify for a waiver of title.

C. Armed Forces Contracts

The contractor with these agencies gets title subject to government license according to ASPR provisions. Clearly, these inventions are not the subject for "Instant Licensing" or pre-procurement licenses provided for in H.R. 2898.

SBANE proposes that exceptions be made

to the ASPR provisions with respect to particularly significant inventions made by the contractor. SBANE proposes that the contractor in such cases need not give a royalty free license to the government; but enable the contractor to give a license for minimum royalty similar to the pre-procurement license proposed in H.R. 2898. Thus, the contractor would be rewarded for his significant invention even though he would not be able to compete with larger businesses in the implementation of the invention for government use.

PENSION PLANS

Social Security and private pensions are the two major systems that provide a measure of financial independence to persons at time of retirement. In the few decades since the enactment of the Social Security Act, millions of people and billions of tax-dollars have come under its influence. The private pension system which is much older than Social Security, was propelled to multibillion dollar status during World War II when wage ceilings precluded salary competition among employers for scarce labor.

Deferred compensation through private pensions cover over 25 million people and have assets of about \$100 billion.

The most striking difference between the two systems is the difference between mandatory and optional; and it is this difference that makes the private pension system the more fantastic. While the private pension arises from an assortment of factors (for example, competition for good employees and collective bargaining agreements) it remains that the employer has paid over \$100 billion to promote the secure and dignified retirement of his employees all without the compulsion of legislation.

Because the money that an employer pays for a private pension plan is for the benefit of the employees, the I.R.S. has elected to treat such cost as they do salaries. There is, however, a notable difference between salaries and pension costs. The salary is paid to an individual to be used for current needs. It is a measure of past and present performance. The pension cost is also a measure of past and present performance. But more importantly, it is an encouragement for future performance. It is a method by which an employer can hire and keep a good group of employees. It is for the group of employees that an employer establishes a pension plan. It is profit produced by the group that keeps the pension plan alive; and it is the group of employees that share in the financial success of their pension fund.

The employer gets no personal advantage by putting a dollar into a pension fund instead of a pay envelope. The tax situation is the same. Indeed there are countless instances when employees would rather have the dollar in hand, and the employer is severely criticized for putting it into a pension fund.

Whether the dollar goes into the pay envelope or into the pension fund, it is lost to the employer. Even the earnings of the pension fund do not rebound to the employer, unless you say that they reduce his future deductible contributions to the pension fund. Each dollar put into the pension fund experiences the interaction of investment return, mortality, disability, turnover, etc., and finally produces many dollars for employees retiring under the pension plan—nothing for the employer.

It concerns this Association to see the present wave of proposed legislation that seeks to "protect" the employee. Private industry has been cognizant of the need to protect the employee, and has nurtured this belief with over \$100 billion. Hand-in-hand with the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Department of Labor and several state-level agencies, the private pension system has given backbone to the retirement dreams of millions upon millions of persons.

Each time a flaw has appeared in the pri-

ate pension system, it has been rigorously attacked by employers, attorneys, actuaries, accountants and the interested governmental agencies. Throughout its life the private pension system has been diligent in keeping its own house in order.

We agree that government has the right and the duty to protect and enhance the private pension system but legislation that restricts and penalizes needlessly is not good legislation.

The following four points are present in most of the pension legislation proposed to date, and we strongly suggest the defeat of any bill containing them:

1. Vesting at very early stages.
2. Portability.
3. Reinsurance of unfunded liabilities.
4. Minimum Funding.

1. Vesting

Vesting refers to the employee's non-forfeitable right to receive at retirement age all or a portion of his accrued pension regardless of the continuation of his participation in the plan. For employees remaining in the plan to retirement, vesting is academic. For terminating employees, it may be a valuable benefit in recognition of the long period of service with the employer. Since vesting is usually contingent upon attaining a certain minimum age, such as 45, and/or the completion of a minimum period of service, such as 15 years, not all terminating employees are entitled to vested benefits. Also, full vesting may be granted in one single step or in several steps, such as 10% per year.

There is general agreement that vesting is desirable, but the exact requirements should be determined for each plan based on the circumstances peculiar to a particular employer. The cost of vested benefits will vary depending on the age, sex, service and salary distribution of the covered group, but could add as much as 10% or more to the cost of a plan. From the point of view of controlling costs and the historical and projected turnover pattern of the particular group, each plan should be free to set its own vesting requirements to best meet the needs and objectives of the employees and the employer.

There seems to be no need for legislation making vesting compulsory, since the trend toward adopting vesting either initially or by subsequent amendment has been marked in recent years and will probably continue. Currently, over 80% of all plans contain vesting provisions and, if early retirement is taken into consideration as a form of vesting, which it is, about 95% of all employees participating in pension plans are covered for vested benefits. These statistics are from a Department of Labor study of almost 16,000 plans covering over 15½ million employees.

One might wonder why, with such extensive coverage already, we should not make vesting mandatory, thereby raising the figure to 100%? The answer is that many plans now providing vested benefits started without this feature, but added it as actuarial gains emerged and economic forces exerted pressure. Had a vesting provision been mandatory initially, it is fair to say that some of the employers would not have established a plan in the first place.

The major argument for mandatory vesting seems to be to promote labor mobility. Since the younger and shorter-service employees are the most likely to terminate and since their accrued pensions would be rather small, it would seem that vesting would have a very limited influence on the decision to terminate and move on to another job. In the absence of meaningful statistics on the interrelation of vesting and labor mobility, the very definite trend toward including vesting on an essentially voluntary basis, and the need for flexibility in setting the vesting requirements, legislation in this particular area seems to be premature at best and a

more reasonable approach would be to allow the forces of our economic system to continue to operate without compulsory federal standards.

2. Portability

Portability is nothing more or less than 100% vesting. For every year a person works for an employer, he vests in the benefit accrued. Although only two methods of portability appear in presently-proposed legislation, it could be accomplished in at least 3 ways.

A. Let the reserve for benefits earned follow the employee from employer to employer.

B. As an employee terminates each employer, the employer would send the reserve on accrued benefits to a central agency.

C. As an employee terminates, an employer would set aside a reserve for his accrued benefits, and when the employee finally retired he would get one pension check from each of the employers for whom he worked at any time.

Not only is this an extremely costly benefit, which could very definitely keep many employers out of the pension field, but it is inequitable and unworkable, since it gives preferential treatment to terminating employees and requires that a standard actuarial value be placed on accrued benefits to be applied throughout the country.

Legislation on Portability should be discarded as being too costly, unworkable, needlessly restrictive, and very detrimental to the growth of private pension plans.

3. Reinsurance

Reinsurance is the protection of vested benefits upon termination of a plan. An annual premium or charge would be paid to a central agency, based on the amount at "risk" under the plan. The amount at risk is the difference between (a) and (b):

(a) is the present value of accrued vested benefits, and

(b) is the amount of the plan assets.

The present value of accrued vested benefits is certainly a nebulous figure, as is the asset value. By the use of various actuarial assumptions the present value of accrued vested benefits can move over a rather wide range of values. So too can the value of assets, what with book values, market values, dollar-average values, values of exchange securities versus values of privately-placed securities. Indeed it is possible for an employer to use overly-liberal assumptions, thus endangering his plan, while at the same time dodging the Reinsurance premium. Thus the employer who may need the reinsurance the most, might be the one who doesn't have it. In addition to the amount at risk, the other critical element in determining the reinsurance premium should be the probability of the plan terminating. This would be impossible to determine. Also, the added cost of reinsurance would probably curtail the liberalization of vesting requirements, since this would increase the cost of vested benefits, and so increase the cost of reinsurance by increasing the present value of vested benefits. Even with time controls, plan amendments could be introduced which would liberalize vested benefits shortly before the plan terminates and thus abuse the reinsurance program.

As the general observation, the proposed legislation removes the pension plan from the category of a promise in good faith to a binding contract.

It should be noted that smaller plans generally use more conservative actuarial assumptions than the larger plans, thereby producing a proportionately greater amount at risk and a higher reinsurance premium for a given level of funding, although the smaller plan is actually more adequately funded. Also, because experience fluctuations can be rather sharp, the smaller plans normally fund at as rapid a rate as financially feasible to

build up margins against future business contingencies and this makes reinsurance much less critical an item.

From the limited information available on plan terminations, it has been estimated by an Actuary of a noted consulting firm that about one-tenth of one percent of all covered employees have been affected each year by plan terminations. Also, since assets are normally allocated on the basis of age when a plan terminates, the employees least able to replace their accrued pensions are taken care of first and the younger employees with smaller vested benefits who can more readily recover from the loss are last in line. Thus, the problem of plan termination is exceedingly small and the normal allocation method further helps to solve the problem. From conservative calculations, this Actuary concluded that less than .6 of 1% of the covered working force suffered some loss of accrued benefits. The proportion losing all or a significant amount of the accrued benefits would have been even less. The problem as it currently exists doesn't warrant the significant amount of time, effort, and cost necessary to establish and operate the reinsurance program or the cost to the plan for the additional actuarial and investment valuations necessary to determine the annual reinsurance charges.

4. Minimum funding

The feature of pension plan funding that probably has had as much as anything to do with the rapid growth of pensions is the latitude of funding permitted. P.S. 57 of the Internal Revenue Service sets a reasonable and safe minimum requirement. There is every indication that the prescribed minimum level is not only adequate, but, in combination with conservative actuarial assumptions of interest, mortality and most valuation methods, allows amortization of the past service liability.

Most employers, especially the small business employer, pay well above the minimum prescribed by P.S. 57. Indeed, many employers argue, not that the minimum is too high, but that the maximum is too low.

A wide range of permitted funding is necessary and, to the small employer, indispensable. Curtailment of this latitude of funding would needlessly restrict an employer.

Conclusion

A system so vitally important to the economic well-being of the nation is deserving of attention by the Congress. Indeed this attention has been too long in coming. It is just unfortunate that most of the proposed legislation to date has been inspired by the defects of a few of the private pension plans.

When meaningful legislation is proposed that will tend to encourage more employers to provide more benefits to more employees, SBANE will back it just as strongly as we protest poor legislation.

LABOR

1. Oppose "common situs picketing" bill

SBANE is opposed to legislation entitled the "Common Situs Picketing" Bill which would permit a union in the construction industry to picket an entire construction project in furtherance of any dispute which it might have with one of the sub-contractors at a project.

Secondary boycotts bring substantial harm to parties neutral to a labor dispute and were outlawed by the Congress in the Taft-Hartley Act and in the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959. The proposed legislation would permit unrestricted picketing which would shut down an entire project over one dispute. This would not only be harmful to the general public, but small business contractors in particular.

We ask you to support our opposition to H.R. 100, the bill that would allow "Common Situs Picketing".

2. Establish labor courts to resolve critical labor disputes

Strikes against the public interest such as the frequent labor stoppages in the transportation field, are not only crippling to the economy, but indicate that present procedures for preventing such occurrences are outmoded and inadequate.

SBANE recommends that appropriate legislation be enacted to curtail the possibility of such strikes against the public interest, and that Federal Labor Courts be established, staffed by life tenure judges who are empowered, through legislation, to settle such problems before they reach the strike stage.

3. Require secret ballot for union recognition

In the original statute creating NLRB procedures, Congress set forth the use of the secret ballot. Since that time, their intent has been ignored as evidenced by the numbers of cases in which the NLRB has held that employers must recognize and bargain with unions based only on employee signatures union authorization cards. These signatures do not necessarily show the same results that would be obtained by use of a secret ballot.

It is the hope of many in small business that the use of secret ballots will be re-established in all cases.

TRANSPORTATION

Few areas have reflected so vividly the rapid growth of technology and progress as much as the field of transportation. Our early agrarian economy's dependence on the horse long ago gave way to the automobile, railroad, shipping, and the airline. Even within each area of transportation, progress has been vast, varied and revolutionary. Every day small business is dealing with many modes of transportation and regulations as applied by the present transportation regulatory agencies. This year we bring to your attention some of the problems encountered by small business in this area and our recommendations for legislative action.

1. Urge Congress to develop a system for settling small freight loss and damage claims

Settlement of freight loss and damage claims by carriers is not subject to ICC jurisdiction except for certain rules providing for time limits on acknowledgment and decisions on claims. There is no remedy for disputes except through the courts. The problem for small businesses is that most claims are less than \$1,000, not justifying long and costly court proceedings. As a result, carriers pass off many valid claims by just saying "no" because they have learned that small business has neither the technical knowledge nor financial resources to fight. Larger companies with professional traffic managers can fight and have established a record for winning so carriers treat their claims with more consideration.

At present, the Department of Transportation has a study under way for the purpose of defining the claims problem. Congress should place priority on consideration of the solutions which will come from the study. Among the possibilities would be a small claims court under the jurisdiction of the ICC or, preferably, a new regulatory agency with authority over all forms of transportation.

2. Urge Congress to enact legislation creating a combined transportation regulatory agency governing all modes

At present the transportation regulatory structure consists of the following agencies: Interstate Commerce Commission regulates rail, truck, bus, inland waterway, surface freight forwarders.

Federal Maritime Commission regulates merchant marine.

Civil Aeronautics Board regulates airlines, air freight forwarders.

The functions performed by each of these agencies is almost completely economic related (routes, rates, company finances and inter-relationships). The safety functions related to all modes are now consolidated in the U.S. Department of Transportation (Federal Railroad Administration, Federal Aviation Administration, Transportation Safety Board).

Because of the increasing trends toward development of new transport technologies (such as containerization) making possible intermodal transportation (truck-rail, truck-air, truck-water, rail-water, etc.), substantial conflict between the agencies has developed. For example, the CAB claims regulation over air freight including the ground trucking services. The ICC also claims regulation over ground trucking. As a result, many shippers outside commercial zones must pay high joint rates and receive inferior service because proper intermodal coordination cannot be obtained. Similar problems arise in rate and service conflicts between water (FMC regulated) and land (ICC regulated) transportation. It is apparent that three agencies cannot regulate different sectors that overlap substantially without expensive and time-consuming duplicative action before more than one body by shippers and carriers alike.

Congress should enact legislation creating one transportation economic regulatory agency. Such action would provide all shippers with more efficient transportation services and reduce their costs of representation before multiple bodies.

3. Support the Trade Simplification Act

All companies which have either sold or purchased goods in foreign markets are aware of the paperwork and transportation cost complications. The carriers and businessmen have worked together for a simplification of procedures for several years. In 1968 the U.S. Department of Transportation submitted legislation entitled, "Trade Simplification Act" which would streamline procedures and allow through bills of lading and through freight rates in international trade. Presently no one transportation company can quote through rate in international trade (except in some limited air freight applications); as a result, a shipper must contact more than one carrier and prepare rate analyses himself to determine the lowest total cost route. Separate bills of lading are also required for the land and sea (or air) portions of the trip, complicating goods ownership, insurance, tracing and record keeping.

The U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of Facilitation, has prepared and sent to Congress a bill under which through rates and bills of lading are legalized and a reduction in international documentation made possible. SBANE should urge Congress to pass the "Trade Simplification Act" this session to make participation in foreign trade easier, particularly for smaller business which cannot afford to retain traffic specialists to handle the complexities of foreign trade.

4. Urge Congress to pass legislation designed to stimulate the construction and near-term completion of ultra-high speed rail service between Boston and New York

Since the early 1960's much effort has been expended by the Federal Government and others aimed at solving Northeast Corridor intercity passenger transportation problems. Within the U.S. Department of Transportation is a section called the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation (OHSGT). This group has put substantial effort into basic and applied research of new technologies for the movement of people at high speeds and also a limited effort aimed at developing conventional type rail vehicles. The results to date would indicate that for the foreseeable future conventional rail technology is the best and most economical way to provide ground transportation at speed

in the 150 mph-200 mph range. However, OHSGT is continuing an in-depth new technology research program which may produce positive results applicable to the transport systems several decades from now.

In 1968 the New England Regional Commission let a contract to Systems Analysis and Research Corporation (SARC) of Cambridge, Mass., to report on the transportation needs of New England. SARC reported that Boston-New York ultra-high speed service was of first priority to foster the sound economic development of the region. As the region's economy becomes more service-industry oriented, efficient passenger transportation to other regions is extremely important to facilitate the personal interactions necessary. The SARC study outlines a feasible plan for providing 2½ hour travel time between downtown Boston and downtown New York using conventional rail technology with a top speed of 150 mph attracting sufficient passengers at a low enough capital and operating cost to be economically viable.

Congress should pass legislation providing backing for a government guarantee loan, a capital grant if a new rail line is constructed in the best location for long range planning, certain tax concessions concerning loan amortization and a franchise to operate by a new or existing business or an interstate agency. Support and passage this year could result in service by 1974. The bonds could be amortized in 30 years, so if new and better technology were developed in the future, today's investment would be paid off in full.

CONCLUSION

This presentation is designed to provide you with specific proposals and recommendations by those who represent the foundation of the American economy rather than merely striking out at the obstacles that confront small business. We have tried to be helpful to you, the Congress, whose time and talents are in the greatest demand of any other single group in our country by sifting and sorting the problems and alternatives in the most important areas that deserve your attention.

Thank you for your interest and support of small business.

PITTSBURGH PROBLEM HANDED TO THE PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, housing is one of Pittsburgh's most acute problems—some 62 percent of the housing supply is more than 45 years old, 22 percent is either deteriorating or dilapidated—and with our special problems of topography, there is a real shortage of land for new buildings, and a tremendous dilemma caused by relocation when homes are torn down to make way for urban renewal programs.

But I know of no city which has demonstrated more aggressive public leadership and new forms of private initiative than Pittsburgh, in making a real commitment to insure everyone a sense of opportunity, community, and responsibility.

The Christian Science Monitor carried a story recently describing the activities of a group known as HEART—highway emergency and relocation team—work-

ing in cooperation with city urban redevelopment authority officials. Because I think their innovative approach has great merit, I wish to include the article at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

PITTSBURGH PROBLEM HANDED TO THE PEOPLE

PITTSBURGH.—City officials may have found the answer to avoiding neighborhood opposition when a new housing development is announced.

The solution is to throw the ball to the residents and make them the sponsors of the new complex.

This approach is being tried now in Pittsburgh's Brighton Heights area of the North Side.

Plans call for a 300- to 400-unit housing complex to be built in a 34-acre site which is largely undeveloped. The area is composed of mostly white, middle-income families who have agreed to help develop the new housing complex. Designated as the sponsors are the Brighton Heights Citizens Federation and a group known as Highway Emergency and Relocation Team (HEART).

Both groups are citizen-oriented. The federation is composed of representatives from various groups in the Brighton Heights neighborhood. HEART, while it does not have Brighton Heights representation, is composed of residents from nearby East Street who are to be moved out of their homes by the State Highway Department to make room for Interstate 79.

CONSULTATION DESIRED

HEART has warned the state the residents want homes before they move. Otherwise, their cry has been, "No homes, no road."

Attempts by the city to get new homes built on other sites in the North Side have been dismal failures. And the main reason seems to be neighborhood opposition to "outsiders" moving in. There has also been considerable animosity against the planners who failed to discuss their programs with residents.

This newest technique may be the answer. At least William Farkas, executive director of Pittsburgh's Urban Redevelopment Authority is willing to stake the future of the development on it. So is Dr. Martin Krauss, vice-president of HEART and long a vocal critic of the State Highways Department's acquisition program and the city's failure to build new housing.

Dr. Krauss said he agreed to the Brighton Heights development only on the condition that all property be purchased amiably and that residents of the neighborhood help decide the type of housing to be built and the area needed for the overall development. Both of these conditions have been accepted by Mr. Farkas and city officials.

VARIETY OF HOUSING SOUGHT

To launch the program, the city has been asked to purchase a 13½-acre site owned by a private individual. With this land acquired, and since more than half the complex area is under public ownership, the city believes its problem of building the new housing development can be solved. At least one major industry, which has a subsidiary developing low-cost housing, has voiced an interest in serving as the developer. That decision—like nearly all others—will be made by the two citizen groups.

The plan under consideration calls for a variety of housing types, including some single-family homes, plus a small shopping community, a swimming pool, and other active and passive recreational facilities.

To help them plan, some of the residents have called on Town Consultants, a private planning firm, headed by Irv Rubenstein, onetime Urban Redevelopment Authority official. Mr. Rubenstein said the site is ideal for housing since the area is below the city's

coal seam and there is no worry about mine subsidence.

The agreement to sponsor the new housing complex came only after numerous meetings were held between the citizen groups and city officials to work out development problems. There's no question that Pittsburgh housing planners are keeping their fingers crossed that the program works. The city has too few vacant sites available for new housing, yet the cry for good housing had not stopped.

THE HOUSING CHALLENGE

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of *Business in Brief* contained a valuable examination of New York City's housing problem—a problem that reflects the difficulties faced in many other major urban areas. I believe my colleagues will find this piece most instructive and include it in the RECORD:

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING: A CASE STUDY

Of all the tasks facing the nation's cities the challenge of providing adequate housing is one of the foremost. It cuts across social and economic lines as few other urban problems do. The complexities involved are clearly illustrated by recent events in New York.

New York City is a case study of a housing market that has ceased to function properly. Private housing construction is at a virtual standstill; vacancy rates are at an 18-year low; and rent increases in the uncontrolled sector (postwar buildings and decontrolled units) averaged an estimated 9% a year in the latter part of 1968. As a result, demands for rent regulation in the uncontrolled sector intensified.

Recent large rent increases are merely an indication of underlying imbalances. At best, regulation will alleviate the symptoms; it provides no long-term cure. New York City's deeper problem—and it is shared in varying degrees by most central cities—is that it is not providing housing in quantity and quality to satisfy the needs of its diverse constituency.

In a city where three-quarters of the households are renters, and two-thirds of the rental stock is rent-controlled, discussion of housing is often emotional and politically charged. However, rent regulations, both those in effect since World War II and the more recent proposals, are only one element influencing New York housing markets. A wide range of forces—high costs, zoning, taxes, changing neighborhoods, lagging government programs—lies behind the latest housing "crisis."

THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF CITY HOUSING

New York City's housing picture is replete with surface paradoxes:

More than three-quarters of a million units have been built since 1946 (enough to house the city of Philadelphia). In this period, New York's population has changed little. Yet, the city seems to be running hard to stay in the same place.

Although new construction dropped drastically in 1966-1968, on average one-fifth more units were built per year in the 1960's than in the 1950's. Still, vacancy rates declined from 1.8% in 1960 to 1.2% in 1968.

At the same time that vacancy rates fell, abandonments rose. If the estimated 50,000 abandoned units were considered part of the stock, vacancy rates would be nearly

3.5%. Abandonments usually signify ease in housing markets. But in New York (and in other older cities too) abandonments partially reflect malfunctioning markets in which landlords are unable to profitably operate at rents low income tenants can afford.

Notwithstanding this mixed picture, broad conclusions can be drawn.

First, the housing inventory has risen, but the increase is much smaller than new construction because old housing is dropped from the inventory. Since 1946, 250,000 units have been demolished. In addition, many condemned or abandoned units have neither been destroyed nor returned to the inventory, rehabilitated. Inadequate data cloud the view, however. Local statistics indicate that the housing stock has risen more than 8% since 1960; U.S. Census data show a rise of under 2%.

Second, housing density has declined. Households are smaller—2.7 persons per household in 1968, compared with 2.9 in 1960. And overcrowding has been reduced—fewer than 10% of rental units have one or more persons per room against 14% in 1960.

Third, the worst units are being removed from the stock, but deterioration is a growing problem. In 1968, 81% of the city's 2.8 million units were sound and had all plumbing facilities (by U.S. Census definitions). This is a small increase over 1960 numbers. Dilapidated units and units lacking facilities declined 30% to 170,000. However, the number of deteriorating units rose by roughly 100,000 to reach 360,000.

Many factors contribute to housing deterioration. Under real estate tax law, improvements are assessed and are reflected in higher taxes. Unless the landlord can capture the added costs in higher rents, his incentive to maintain or upgrade property is reduced. In low income neighborhoods, where tenants carry a heavy rent burden (80% of tenants with incomes under \$3,000 pay 35% of income and more in rent), landlords often cannot obtain rent increases.

Rent control aggravates the situation further. Recent studies indicate that rent-controlled apartments are not particularly profitable investments. Services and maintenance tend to be reduced in efforts to hold up net income. In units with upper income tenants, it becomes worthwhile for both tenant and landlord to convert the building to tenant ownership. In the last three years, cooperatives and condominiums increased by 16,000 to reach 92,300. In low income neighborhoods, the cooperative route is not readily available. The net result is that buildings deteriorate, particularly those with absentee landlords. This process is greatly accelerated when rents can be drastically reduced if housing code violations are not eliminated. With inadequate cash to carry out repairs, the owner simply abandons the building.

Unfortunately, abandoned and deteriorating buildings are not quickly replaced. Low as the sale price may be, developers do not rush in. Private developers cannot build for low and middle income tenants without substantial subsidies, and they will not build luxury units in declining neighborhoods.

New York City's housing problem, then, is not simply the need for additional units—about 135,000 extra units would eliminate severe overcrowding and lift vacancy rates to 5%. Overshadowing these figures are the units requiring replacement or substantial rehabilitation. U.S. Census Bureau measures of quality indicate that more than 500,000 units are inadequate and should be rehabilitated or replaced. Housing experts in the city's government consider the potential renewal market to be in excess of 800,000 units. With requirements of these dimensions, the city can make progress over a reasonable time period only if:

The precipitous drop in construction of the past three years is reversed;

The rate of deterioration is slowed. Otherwise, mounting substandard units will simply offset new housing construction.

RECENT EXPERIENCE

After a bulge in construction in the early 1960's (as investors sought to build before restrictive zoning regulations became effective), new housing dropped sharply. In 1968, about 17,000 units were completed—the smallest number in 21 years. Shortages intensified throughout housing markets:

Vacancy rates dropped in all boroughs except Staten Island. Queens at 0.5%, has the city's lowest rate.

Vacancy rates declined in all rent classes. In the \$100-\$150 a month category vacancies are under 1%.

The immediate result of the tight housing market was a rash of rent increases in the uncontrolled sector. The increases were considerably larger than could be rationalized by higher costs. Rents in 400,000 units are potentially affected. (Rents in another 200,000 public and subsidized units are regulated under various statutes and adjusted for rising costs.)

In a normal market, where the forces of supply and demand operate freely, the response to spiraling rents would be an upsurge in construction. In time, the imbalance would be corrected. However, New York City is not a normal, smoothly functioning real estate market. Neighborhoods, characterized by distinct ethnic groups and income classes, set markets apart. Private luxury building, subsidized middle-income housing, and public housing serve three different sectors, and there are wide gaps between the rent ranges each caters to. Finally, rent controls split the private market into two sectors, since they do not apply to all units.

PROSPECTS FOR INCREASING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY

Normally, developers would have an incentive to build for those without access to units in controlled markets if new construction were free from regulation. As long as developers are not inhibited by rent regulations, some private construction will be stimulated by the current housing shortage (real estate developers typically respond with a lag, and then over-react). However, in New York's present climate, the very threat of rent controls could be enough to deter new building.

As it is, New York is becoming an increasingly difficult market for private builders to supply. Rising costs are pushing unsubsidized housing beyond reach of many upper income residents. In the 1950's, 73% of new housing was private, unsubsidized units; in recent years, the ratio has dropped below 60%. Among the changes that have occurred:

Site costs in desirable neighborhoods are estimated to have doubled in recent years. The new zoning law reduces the number of potential sites because larger sites are needed to develop property. Amassing large sites is time-consuming. Relocating statutory tenants in rent-controlled buildings takes years and adds to developers' costs.

Construction costs increased 34% between 1961 and 1968. The rise is in line with the national increase; but New York construction costs had been relatively high before the rise. Construction costs (excluding site and development costs) rose from roughly \$23,000 for a luxury unit to above \$30,000.

Financing charges have risen. In the early 1960's, apartment mortgage rates averaged 5½%; under present tight money conditions, rates are over 8%.

Real estate tax rates climbed 27% between 1961 and 1968. In addition, water and sewer taxes doubled.

Operating and maintenance costs rose substantially, probably by more than one-third.

Taking account of all of these factors, a luxury 4½ room apartment that could be built to rent for about \$300 in the early 1960's today would rent for over \$500. At rent-income ratios of 20%, an income of \$18,000 was needed in 1960 to support luxury rents; today an income of \$30,000 is required. At more typical ratios for high income families (in postwar buildings, 60% of families earning over \$15,000 paid less than 15% of income for rent in 1968), at least \$40,000 would be required. This is one reason why developers look to the "singles" market, where three or four roommates pool incomes to pay rent. Importantly, incomes are rising; in 1959, only 140,000 households had incomes of \$15,000 and over; in 1967, the number is estimated at 260,000, and of these about 55,000 had incomes of \$25,000 and over.

Thus, the pool of high income households that is the target of luxury construction is growing. The market is not big enough to support the total volume of construction required in the city, but it is important to the housing process. Postwar experience suggests that when families upgrade their units as incomes rise, their vacated units are opened to the income class below.

THE ROLE OF SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

Of course, subsidized housing plays an important role in New York. In fact, a large

part of New York's housing supply is now subsidized through rent controls. Tenants paying less than "normal" rent-income ratios in effect receive subsidies. The greatest beneficiaries are middle income families. In rent-controlled apartments, 68% of households earning \$8,000-\$15,000 pay less than 15% of their income in rent; in postwar buildings, only 16% pay this little. This is precisely why rent control is such a sensitive issue. Contrary to myth, New York is a middle income city, with 56% of its households earning \$5,000-\$15,000 a year. As vital as the middle class is to New York, subsidies distributed in this form are inequitable in their impact.

"Direct" subsidy programs are more easily identified. New York has a long history of middle income and public housing programs, and over 200,000 units have been built in the postwar period. Unfortunately for New York, subsidized housing declined just when private housing was curtailed. In part, publicly-aided programs were held back by cost limitations: rents in proposed middle-income projects are \$40-\$50 a room. The decline also reflects a revision of priorities by the city government.

Under existing circumstances, stepped-up momentum in public and assisted programs is needed if the city is to make headway in meeting its housing problems. More is required than laying out plans for 30,000 pub-

lic and assisted units per year. If the private sector is to be drawn in, housing must be produced on volume scale, the profit potential must be reasonably attractive, and time-consuming, costly delays must be minimized.

TAKING THE LONG VIEW

The city's concern for protecting tenants in the current rent crisis is understandable. However, it is also important to take a long view and focus on the primary goal of enlarging and upgrading the housing supply. The city should encourage new construction by streamlining its own housing programs, and by reviewing zoning regulations. Some way should be sought to prevent rent regulations from becoming a permanent fixture.

The problem of property deterioration should be faced realistically. This involves reviewing real estate tax laws and the operation of old-time rent controls. The problems suggested by the fact that low income tenants carry a heavy rent burden, but that property owners have difficulty maintaining their buildings should be recognized.

In resolving its housing problems, New York City—and other cities, too—can best begin by asking: who is the city for? The city cannot forget that it has a diverse constituency, represented by all income groups. A broad range of programs will be necessary to meet their needs.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]