

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 28, 1969

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

Let us follow after the things which make for peace.—Romans 14: 19.

Eternal God, our Father, in whom our fathers trusted and were never let down, bless us this day as we bow before Thee in loving memory of those who laid down their lives for our country.

We thank Thee for men and women in time past who gave themselves that freedom may have fresh air in our Nation, and we are grateful for those in time present who are giving themselves that liberty may continue to live in our land.

That these may not have lived and died in vain we pray Thee to unite our people in one great purpose to preserve the principles of freedom, justice, and good will, and by Thy grace may we learn to live together in the spirit of true brotherhood.

Pour out Thy spirit upon us in such measure that we may turn from war to peace, from poverty to plenty, and from hate to love, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 23, 1969, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 33. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8794. An act to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 278. An act to consent to the New Hampshire-Vermont interstate school compact.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development.

FLAG DAY CEREMONIES

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 192d anniversary of Flag Day will be celebrated on Saturday, June 14, 1969. It was

on Saturday, June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress adopted a resolution which provided "that the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white: That the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

During the ensuing 191 years, 37 stars have been added to that blue field, and the American flag has continually flown as a symbol of true liberty.

In 1917, during the First World War, President Woodrow Wilson issued the first Presidential proclamation calling upon the entire Nation to hold appropriate ceremonies on June 14 to honor our flag. For the past 2 years the House of Representatives has reinstituted dignified and appropriate Flag Day ceremonies in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe it important that the House of Representatives continue this tradition, to again give honor to our Stars and Stripes and to the principles which our flag symbolizes, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, June 12, 1969, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day in such manner as the Speaker may deem appropriate.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state for the information of the Members of the House that after consultation with the distinguished minority leader the Chair has informally designated the following Members to constitute a committee to make the necessary arrangements for appropriate ceremonies in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement just adopted: The gentleman from Texas, Mr. BROOKS; the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. NICHOLS; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ROUDEBUSH; and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HALL.

POSTAL REFORM

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, through the years, the U.S. postal system has been something like the weather. Everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it.

Now President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount have come forward with innovative ideas for reforming the postal system, for bringing it into the 20th century, so to speak. The Pony Express had a place in its time but that time has long passed.

Certainly there must be improvement in the general management of the Post Office Department. There must be better service at reasonable rates.

The fact that the Nixon administration clearly recognizes the need for reform of the postal system is a proposed long step toward the achievement of this goal.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading here a little about a new bill to turn the Post Office Department into some kind of corporation—a la big business.

If they are going to turn it over to a corporation, for example, like the automobile companies that cannot even build automobiles that will not fall apart, I am not so sure that they are going to improve the Post Office Department at all. In fact, possibly they could make it worse.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. We are hearing a great deal about this noble enterprise of establishing in the Federal Government probably the biggest monopoly, at least one of the biggest monopolies, in the history of this country—a monopoly that would involve a \$7 billion annual business and 740,000 employees.

There are any number of questions—scores of unanswered questions concerning this proposal. I hope this proposal will be fully explained to the public and I hope those who now so enthusiastically support this proposition will be prepared to answer all of the vital questions.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know that they will be prepared to answer. There is one thing wrong with the proposition, it will not get enough votes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD, FISCAL YEAR 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-27)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to you the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1968. During that year, retirement and survivor benefit payments totaled \$1,403,000,000 and were paid to over one million beneficiaries. Unemployment and sickness benefits provided by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act amounted to \$76,000,000 and were paid to almost 300,000 beneficiaries. I commend this report to your attention.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 28, 1969.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, FISCAL YEAR 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-123)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth annual report of the Office of Economic Opportunity, covering that office's activities during fiscal year 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 28, 1969.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-122)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Americans have for many years debated the issues of foreign aid largely in terms of our own national self-interest.

Certainly our efforts to help nations feed millions of their poor help avert violence and upheaval that would be dangerous to peace.

Certainly our military assistance to allies helps maintain a world in which we ourselves are more secure.

Certainly our economic aid to developing nations helps develop our own potential markets overseas.

And certainly our technical assistance puts down roots of respect and friendship for the United States in the court of world opinion.

These are all sound, practical reasons for our foreign aid programs.

But they do not do justice to our fundamental character and purpose. There is a moral quality in this nation that will not permit us to close our eyes to the want in this world, or to remain indifferent when the freedom and security of others are in danger.

We should not be self-conscious about this. Our record of generosity and concern for our fellow men, expressed in concrete terms unparalleled in the world's history, has helped make the American experience unique. We have shown the world that a great nation must also be a good nation. We are doing what is right to do.

A FRESH APPROACH

This Administration has intensively examined our programs of foreign aid. We have measured them against the goals of our policy and the good of our conscience. Our review is continuing, but we have come to this central conclusion:

U.S. assistance is essential to express and achieve our national goals in the international community—a world order of peace and justice.

But no single government, no matter how wealthy or well-intentioned, can by

itself hope to cope with the challenge of raising the standard of living of two-thirds of the world's people. This reality must not cause us to retreat into helplessness, sullen isolation. On the contrary, this reality must cause us to redirect our efforts in four main ways:

We must enlist the energies of private enterprise, here and abroad, in the cause of economic development. We must do so by stimulating additional investment through businesslike channels, rather than offering ringing exhortations.

We must emphasize innovative technical assistance, to ensure that our dollars for all forms of aid go further, and to plant the seeds that will enable other nations to grow their own capabilities for the future.

We must induce other advanced nations to join in bearing their fair share—by contributing jointly to multilateral banks and the United Nations, by consultation and by the force of our example, and by effective coordination of national and multilateral programs in individual countries.

We must build on recent successes in furthering food production and family planning.

To accomplish these goals, this Administration's foreign aid proposals will be submitted to the Congress today. In essence, these are the new approaches:

1. ENLISTING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I propose the establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The purpose of the Corporation is to provide businesslike management of investment incentives now in our laws so as to contribute to the economic and social progress of developing nations.

The majority of the Board of Directors, including its President, will be drawn from private life and have business experience.

Venture capital seeks profit, not adventure. To guide this capital to higher-risk areas, the Federal government presently offers a system of insurance and guaranties. Like the Federal Housing Administration in the housing field here at home, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation will be able to place the credit of the United States Government behind the insurance and guaranties which the Corporation would sell to U.S. private investors.

The Corporation will also have a small direct lending program for private developmental projects. It will carry out investment survey and development activities. And it will undertake for A.I.D. some of the technical assistance required to strengthen private enterprise abroad. The financial performance of OPIC will be measurable: It is expected to break even or to show a small profit.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation will give new direction to U.S. private investment abroad. As such, it will provide new focus to our foreign assistance effort.

Simultaneously, I propose a mandate for the Agency for International Development to direct a growing part of its capital, technical and advisory assistance to improving opportunities for local private enterprise in developing countries—on farms as well as in commerce and industry.

We do not insist that developing countries imitate the American system. Each nation must fashion its own institutions to its own needs. But progress has been greatest where governments have encouraged private enterprise, released bureaucratic controls, stimulated competition and allowed maximum opportunity for individual initiative. A.I.D.'s mandate will be directed to this end.

2. EXPANDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

I propose a strong new emphasis on technical assistance.

Over one-fifth of the funds requested for fiscal year 1970 are for technical assistance activities. Imaginative use of these funds at the points where change is beginning can have a gradual but pervasive impact on the economic growth of developing nations. It can make our dollars for all forms of aid go further.

Technical assistance takes many forms. It includes the adaptation of U.S. technical knowledge to the special needs of poor countries, the training of their people in modern skills, and the strengthening of institutions which will have lives and influence of their own. The main emphases of technical assistance must be in agriculture, education and in family planning. But needs must also be met in health, public administration, community action, public safety and other areas. In all of these fields, our aim must be to raise the quality of our advisory, training and research services.

Technical assistance is an important way for private U.S. organizations to participate in development. U.S. technical assistance personnel serving abroad must increasingly come from private firms, universities and colleges and non-profit service groups. We will seek to expand this broad use of the best of our American talent.

A.I.D. is preparing plans to reorganize and revitalize U.S. technical assistance activities. A new Technical Assistance Bureau headed by an Assistant Administrator will be created within A.I.D. to focus on technical assistance needs and ensure effective administration of these activities. The bureau will devise new techniques, evaluate effectiveness of programs, and seek out the best qualified people in our universities and other private groups.

To make it possible to carry through these plans most effectively, I am requesting a two-year funding authorization for this part of the A.I.D. program.

3. SHARING THE ASSISTANCE EFFORT

I propose that we channel more of our assistance in ways that encourage other advanced nations to fairly share the burden of international development.

This can be done by:

- Increasing jointly our contributions to international development banks.
- Increasing jointly our contributions to the United Nations technical assistance program.
- Acting in concert with other advanced countries to share the cost of aid to individual developing countries.

Most development assistance—from other advanced nations as well as the United States—is provided directly from one country to another. That is under-

standable. Such bilateral programs provide assistance in accordance with each country's own standards, make the source more visible to the recipient's people and can reflect historical political ties.

But assistance through international development banks and the United Nations is approaching a fifth of total world-wide aid for development and should be expanded. Multilateral programs cushion political frictions between donors and recipients and bring the experience of many nations to bear on the development problem. Moreover, they explicitly require shared contributions among the advanced nations. This calls for funds in addition to those which I am proposing today.

I appreciate the prompt response by the Congress to my earlier proposal authorizing the United States to join with others in the second replenishment of the International Development Association. I urge early passage of appropriations for this contribution so that we may meet our pledge.

I reaffirm my request for appropriations in Fiscal 1970 of \$20 million for the ordinary capital of the Asian Development Bank, and \$300 million for our scheduled contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

In separate legislation I will submit a new proposal for a U.S. contribution of \$25 million to the Special Fund of the Asian Development Bank in FY 1970. I am convinced that a fairly-shared Special Fund, to enable the Bank to provide concessional financing for priority needs, is a necessary supplement to the Bank's ordinary lending facilities. The United States should join with other donor countries in establishing this Special Fund, and strengthen the Bank so that it can better deal with Asia's current development problems and future needs.

The United States will consult with the management of the African Development Bank and with other potential donors, to identify the most appropriate way we can support the objectives of African development and assist in meeting the needs of that continent.

Today's proposed legislation includes a 43 per cent increase in the U.S. contribution to multilateral technical assistance through the United Nations Development Program. Our contribution will be on the same sharing basis as in the past.

4. FURTHERING FOOD PRODUCTION AND FAMILY PLANNING

This Administration, while moving in the new directions I have outlined, will apply the lessons of experience in our foreign aid programs.

One basic lesson is the critical importance of releasing the brakes on development caused by low agricultural productivity. A few years ago, mass starvation within a decade seemed clearly possible in many poor nations. Today they stand at least on the threshold of a dramatic breakthrough in food production. The combination of the new "miracle" seeds for wheat and rice, aid-financed fertilizer, improved cultivation practices, and constructive agriculture policies shows what is possible. They also

demonstrate the potential for success when foreign aid, foreign private investment and domestic resources in developing countries join together in a concerted attack on poverty.

The experience of this decade has also shown that lower rates of population growth can be critical for speeding up economic development and social progress. An increasing number of countries have adopted national family planning programs to attack the problem. At least another decade of sustained hard work will be needed if we are to win the battle between economic development and population. But our assistance to voluntary family planning programs and support for the work of the United Nations and other international organizations in this field must continue to have high priority, as will our support of efforts to increase food production.

Another important lesson is that our aid programs need better means of continuous management inspection. We are creating a new position of Auditor-General in the Agency for International Development. His job will be to make sure that A.I.D.'s funds are used for their intended purpose and that A.I.D.'s operations are managed as tightly and efficiently as possible. He will report directly to the A.I.D. Administrator.

LEGISLATIVE AND BUDGET REQUESTS

The proposed legislation revises that part of the present Foreign Assistance Act which deals with economic aid, to reflect the priorities of this Administration. The proposals are designed to accomplish the following:

- Create the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and authorize its programs for an initial five years.
- Strengthen A.I.D.'s mandate to use official aid to stimulate private initiative in development.
- Expand the role of technical assistance under consolidated legislation and a two-year authorization.

The proposed budget includes new appropriation of \$2,210 million for A.I.D., \$138 million below the January budget request of the previous Administration. In addition, the budget includes \$75 million to augment existing reserves for guaranties to be issued by the proposed Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The appropriation request for economic assistance will support these regional programs:

- For Latin America, \$605 million.
- For the Near East and South Asia, \$625 million.
- For Africa, \$186 million.
- For East Asia, \$234 million.
- And for Vietnam, \$440 million.

In order to protect the U.S. balance of payments at the same time we are providing assistance abroad, goods and services will be purchased in the United States wherever practicable. Over 90 per cent of all A.I.D. expenditures and virtually all purchases of goods will be made in the United States. The remaining funds that are spent abroad are mainly for living expenses of U.S. personnel and for other local expenditures in support of technical assistance programs.

For military assistance, the proposed budget includes \$375 million, the same

as in the January budget. Maintenance of a climate of international security still calls for military strength sufficient to deter aggression. Seventy-seven percent of the total amount available for the military assistance program will be allocated to four of our long-standing allies—Korea, the Republic of China, Turkey and Greece. The balance of the request will be used to provide modest amounts of training and equipment to 44 other countries where our security and foreign policy interests are partially met by this form of assistance. We are negotiating a renewal of our base agreement with Spain. If these negotiations succeed, we shall then need to request an amendment to this authorization asking for additional funds to cover our year's needs for Spain.

The United States will continue to provide military assistance from the U.S. Armed Services budget to Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

I am also asking in separate legislation for \$275 million for credit necessary to facilitate the purchase of essential military equipment by countries now able to buy all or a growing part of their defense requirements. These funds will be returned to the United States during the next few years as the purchasing countries meet their repayment obligations.

PLANNING FOR THE SEVENTIES

I believe these proposals for fiscal year 1970 are sound—and necessary to make clearly desirable improvements in our foreign aid program.

But we need to learn more about the role which foreign assistance can play in the development process and the relationship between development and overall U.S. foreign policy.

I am therefore establishing a task force of private citizens to make a comprehensive review of the entire range of U.S. aid activities, to consider proposals of the United Nations bodies and international commissions, and to help me determine what our national policies should be toward the developing countries in the decade of the 1970s. I will look to the task force's report in developing the program next year, in my response to the Javits Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, and in considering the recommendations of the internationally-sponsored Pearson Commission report to be published in the fall.

TOWARD A WORLD OF ORDER

Foreign aid cannot be viewed in isolation. That is a statement with a double meaning, each side of which is true.

If we turn inward, if we adopt an attitude of letting the underdeveloped nations shift for themselves, we would soon see them shift away from the values so necessary to international stability. Moreover, we would lose the traditional concern for humanity which is so vital a part of the American spirit.

In another sense, foreign aid must be viewed as an integral part of our overall effort to achieve a world order of peace and justice. That order combines our sense of responsibility for helping those determined to defend their freedom; our sensible understanding of the mutual benefits that flow from cooperation between nations; and our sensitivity to the desires of our fellow men to improve their lot in the world.

In this time of stringent budgetary restraint, we must stimulate private investment and the cooperation of other governments to share with us in meeting the most urgent needs of those just beginning to climb the economic ladder. And we must continue to minimize the immediate impact on our balance of payments.

This request for foreign economic and military assistance is the lowest proposed since the program began. But it is about 900 million dollars more than was appropriated last year. I consider it necessary to meet essential requirements now, and to maintain a base for future action.

The support by the Congress of these programs will help enable us to press forward in new ways toward the building of respect for the United States, security for our people and dignity for human beings in every corner of the globe.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 28, 1969.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FOREIGN AID

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have always supported the foreign aid program in principle because I believe it helps to further one of America's national goals—that of promoting peace and order in the world. However, I have become increasingly critical of the manner in which our foreign aid program has been administered, the repeated instances of waste, stupidity, and corruption, and the appalling lack of results in relation to tremendous U.S. investments.

Against this backdrop of comment, I would like to say that I am pleased by the thrust of President Nixon's foreign aid message. It appears to signal a new direction in our foreign aid program, focusing as it does on a fresh approach to private enterprise involvement in the program and on multination assistance programs rather than unilateral U.S. aid to the third world.

On the face of it, the President's proposed Overseas Private Investment Corporation appears to be an excellent idea. Assuming its approval by the Congress, the proof will be in the implementation of the proposal. I also heartily approve the President's declared intention to place a mandate upon the Agency for International Development to help improve opportunities for local private enterprise in the developing countries.

I particularly commend the President for his proposal to create a position of Auditor General in AID, assuming that the new Auditor General will be a man of great determination and the courage to ride herd on his own people. I am hopeful that President Nixon can greatly strengthen the AID program by establishing the new position of AID Auditor General. I base that hope in part on the fact that the Auditor General will be reporting directly to an excellent administrator, former Michigan State University President John Hannah.

In essence I endorse the Nixon foreign aid program. But I take no position on the dollar amount. The Congress will scrutinize the dollar requests and then work its will. We can make a judgment on the fund requests only on the basis of supporting data.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in the area of foreign aid, as in so many other areas of Government action, the Nixon administration has demonstrated a capacity to think anew and act anew. The President's message on foreign aid makes clear his belief that the important thing is not the amount of money you spend but the way in which you spend it. The most important question is "how?" and now "how much?"

This ability to distinguish quantitative and qualitative questions is a heartening development. In a society as huge and complex as ours, political discussion and debate too often degenerate into mere comparisons of quantity. It is easy, after all, to write a headline which says that the budget for a certain program is up so many dollars or down so many dollars. It is much harder to measure quickly and to communicate concisely the skills and strategies with which those dollars are administered. But the Nixon administration has nonetheless put its emphasis on quality, on getting better results for each dollar we spend. Though the headlines may not fully express that emphasis, I believe that the Congress will fully appreciate the point.

The President's strategy for foreign aid reflects the advice of those who have examined our programs most closely over the last few years. It places greater emphasis on private investment abroad, going beyond mere exhortation and actually creating new means for action toward that end. It puts a great emphasis, too, on technical assistance which will help other countries do more for themselves. Third, it significantly increases our efforts to encourage multilateral forms of foreign assistance and greater contributions by other developed countries. Fourth, it meets squarely the issue which is rapidly becoming the most important one of our time after the question of war and peace. I refer to the critical matter of food production and population control. In addition, through the provision of an Auditor General for AID, the new approach will improve the level of performance in existing programs.

In all of these ways, the Nixon strategy breaks through the conceptual stagnation of the past and offers a refreshing approach to a very important area of foreign policy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, in his foreign assistance message to Congress, struck directly at the basic aim of our entire assistance program when he described our efforts as "essential to express and achieve our national goals in the international community—a world order of peace and justice."

President Nixon's emphasis on technical assistance and on greater participation by private enterprise is to be commended. These are two areas which should be strengthened.

I was pleased to see the President firmly state the continuing importance

of foreign assistance, while at the same time proposing a comprehensive review of the entire range of these activities. This review could lead to further recommendations to improve and strengthen our assistance to developing nations.

As a longtime supporter of foreign assistance, it is my hope that Congress will act quickly along the lines recommended by the President for our aid program.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked that we redirect our foreign aid efforts in four major ways:

First. We must enlist the energies of private enterprise.

Second. We must emphasize innovative technical assistance.

Third. We must induce other advanced nations to join in bearing their fair share.

Fourth. We must build on recent successes in furthering food production and population control.

The key word here is "redirection." The President has wisely shown that although the ultimate goal of foreign aid is the same, we must strike out on new paths to better reach that goal.

These, then, are the four new paths: of private initiative, of technological genius of burden sharing among advanced nations, and of direct human aid in needy areas.

The four new paths will, I am certain, be seen as new directions in a journey toward a better world.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress directed the President to undertake a study of all U.S. foreign assistance programs, economic and military, to make interim recommendations by June 30, 1969, and to submit a final report by March 31, 1970.

The interim recommendations are contained in the President's foreign aid message, in the provisions of the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, and in the foreign aid program presentations to the Congress.

The major conclusions and recommendations are these: foreign assistance remains an essential function of U.S. foreign policy and must be continued for reasons of national self-interest and collective good conscience; private enterprise and individual initiative must play an even greater role in development; technical assistance must be more imaginatively used, more effectively managed and more generously funded; our highest priorities must continue to be increasing food production and reducing soaring population growth rates.

This year's foreign aid bill replaces substantial parts of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which authorizes the AID program, to reflect new priorities and new directions—primarily the increased use of private enterprise in development and the greater focus on technical assistance.

The bill creates a new Overseas Private Investment Corporation to take over most of AID's present U.S. investment incentive programs and carry out other activities in cooperation with developing nations to increase the contribution of U.S. investment to development. The bill lays new stress on AID's role as a stimulant to private enterprise abroad. The legislation emphasizes the impor-

tant role of technical assistance in the development process by grouping in one place the provisions relating to bilateral and multilateral technical assistance and providing a 2-year funding authorization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, during the presidential campaign last year, President Nixon pointed out that the world was very much like a city, and that in the world city, as in our own American cities, "we can preserve our hard-won abundance only by bringing the have-nots within the affluent society." He echoed that affirmation of the mutual interdependence of mankind when he said in his inaugural address that we are all "riders on the earth together, brothers in that bright loveliness in the eternal cold."

The Presidential message to the Congress on foreign aid, provides another manifestation of his commitment to these truths. At a time when some say the whole idea of international aid is obsolete, the President has reaffirmed the place of such programs in our foreign policy. What is obsolete is not the notion that nations should help one another, but rather the particular ways in which we have tried to put that notion into practice in the past. By emphasizing new kinds of aid and new ways of providing help, he has given us reason to believe that these programs will work more effectively in the future.

The President has asked for less in quantitative terms. The dollar amount of his request for foreign economic and military assistance is the lowest that any President has proposed since the program began. But the advantage possible per dollar spent promises to be much greater than it was previously. The new administrative procedures, along with new emphasis on private investment, technical aid, multilateral programs, and food and population control, should make for much wiser spending strategies.

I am confident that the more we study the Nixon proposals, the greater will be our confidence in the way the money will be used. For this is not a President who spends money recklessly, nor does he ask for authorizations which are greater than the need. We must take him at his word when he says that he considers this request barely sufficient to meet essential requirements.

I applaud the President's message on foreign aid and hope that other Members of the Congress will do the same. Our foreign aid programs need a new infusion of energy, creativity, and support. This program can provide all three.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have heard so long of the evils of the march of technology that we have begun to believe it.

I commend the President for reminding us in his message that technology is only as inhuman as we choose to make it. We are not fated to become victims of computer morality or mechanized joy or dehumanizing automation.

Technology can be—and our moon voyages have demonstrated that it already is—not an enemy of our spirit but its best friend.

The President's request for increased

technical assistance in foreign aid is proof that he is not afraid of the future, that he will not criticize man's technological genius for political ends, that he knows that it is in our power to use technology to protect and enhance human values.

There are those who say we spend too much in dollars and time on technological progress. They say we should be doing other things in other areas.

They are like the men in England led by the man they called King Lud, who chose to break the machines that were building a new world. We say instead: direct the machines with human concern and the new technology can build a better world. In foreign aid technological progress can restore the spirit of a people and help to give each individual his chance in the world.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there is much to be pleased about in the President's foreign aid message. I am especially impressed with his emphasis on food production and population growth.

There is historic good news from the less developed world: gains in grain production in the developing nations are outrunning the rate of population growth. Furthermore, in an increasing number of developing nations, the threats of runaway population growth is generating official family planning and other programs. In the face of these twin developments, the recent predictions of widespread famine by 1980 are giving way to cautious optimism.

In South and East Asia and parts of the Near East, yields of new varieties of wheat, rice and other grains are doubling and tripling traditional output. In India and Pakistan between 1961 and 1968, the combined population grew by 18.7 percent—while the two countries' production of wheat and rice rose by 21.3 percent. In 1961, with a population of 1.4 billion, all of the developing nations of the free world together produced 268 million tons of grain. In 1968, with a population more than 20 percent larger—1.7 billion—the same countries harvested over 24 percent more grain—335 million tons.

Today, accelerated progress is possible on the farmlands of the developing world. But whether the poor countries make this progress will depend largely on the availability of adequate aid from advanced nations, particularly development loans.

Good weather helped—but by no means explained—the gains in food production of the last few years. A case in point is India which expects this year's food grain harvest to be close to last year's record, even though this year their weather has not nearly matched last year's outstanding monsoon.

The larger harvests in the poor countries are the result of innovations in economic policies, as well as in science and technology. The United States has helped introduce and encourage both types of innovation—by furnishing critical extra resources and skills, and by helping to influence development policies.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the President's message and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS WITHIN OFFICES OF CLERK AND SERGEANT AT ARMS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 425) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 425

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House and Sergeant at Arms be and is hereby directed to pay such sum as may be necessary, from the balance available of the 1968 appropriation and the various funds of the 1969 appropriation, where balances may be available, for the House of Representatives to meet the May and June payroll of Members, officers of the House, and employees of the House. Moneys expended from these funds and/or appropriations by the Sergeant at Arms and the Clerk will be repaid to the funds and/or appropriations from the Sergeant at Arms and Clerk's supplemental appropriation upon its approval.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to intercede before action is taken on this resolution. I would like to have some points of information. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and the Speaker protecting the Member.

Mr. Speaker, I gather from this resolution—and I had hoped there would be a complete explanation of it—that maybe somebody is running out of money and wants to get his hand in a pocket where there is a little money, in order to pay the "troops" between now and the time the supplemental appropriation that was passed here the other day goes into effect, or a new fiscal year rolls around and all the pay increases are in—or something to that effect.

My first question is: Just who is out of money?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Sergeant at Arms is out of money. He cannot pay salaries of Members on June 1 unless we transfer funds from the Clerk of the House to the Sergeant at Arms. Next month the Members, their staffs, and other employees of the House will not be able to be paid unless we pass this resolution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, House Resolution 425 says: "That the Clerk of the House and Sergeant-at-Arms"—presumably of the House also—"be and is hereby directed to pay such sum as may be necessary."

How can the Sergeant at Arms pay this money and who is putting whose

hand into whose pocket? That is what I want to know, and it is not clear from the way the resolution is written.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Clerk of the House has some funds left over and unexpended in his accounts—such as the furniture account. Also, the Members have not used all their allowances and we have some amount of money left in the contingency fund in the Clerk's office. This will be transferred to the Sergeant at Arms to pay Members for this month. If we do not pass this resolution, we cannot pay the Members. It is just a bookkeeping transaction.

In other words, we have already passed the supplemental appropriations bill, and we are awaiting action by the Senate. Once that bill becomes law, the funds will be available.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is very kind. I must say he talked to me ahead of time about this resolution. "This is a nice clean, sweet, little resolution," he said. I appreciate what the gentleman believes and has said. But is it the intent of the committee or whoever is knowledgeable as to the contents of the resolution to take a little time to explain to the Members where these funds are? I cannot imagine getting enough money out of the "furniture account" to pay the Members' salaries pending the passage of the supplemental appropriation. I hope the distinguished gentleman will yield or will take time to give us in the House a little bit of accounting about whose hand is going into whose pocket. From the way this is written, it looks like the Clerk of the House and Sergeant at Arms can have their hands in each other's pocket. It still is not clear where the money is coming from.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The reason for this resolution is because on July 1 of last year there was an increase which went into effect for our clerk hire. Then last month there was an increase which went into effect which pertained to the Members of the House.

Last week a supplemental appropriation bill was passed by the House, which included the funds for these increases for fiscal year 1969. That bill has not been passed by the Senate yet.

Inasmuch as we have a payday for the month of May coming up tomorrow, and a payday for the month of June coming up later, it is necessary to acquire the necessary funds in the accounts of the House of Representatives to keep current on our pay.

This resolution was introduced to give the opportunity to the Clerk of the House and to the Sergeant at Arms to meet the payroll by transferring funds from accounts which have enough funds left at this time to in effect loan the money.

Now, there could well be a deficit by the end of June in these accounts for pay, in the amount of over \$5 million. The idea is to borrow from various accounts where funds are available, such as court reporting and telephone and telegraph and others, and to spend that money for salaries now; and, then, when the supple-

mental is passed by the Senate, we will put the money back in the various accounts and balance the books. This is strictly a bookkeeping entry proposition. The money will be put back into the various accounts and used for the proper purposes. It is strictly a transaction on the books.

Since this resolution was introduced a day ago, some members of the Committee on House Administration have had the opportunity to look at the records of the Clerk of the House to see what accounts they are going to use and the balances available, and we feel that this resolution will do the necessary job to meet the payrolls that are coming up in May and June.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for a question.

Mr. HALL. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman's statement, along with that of the chairman, that there are various funds available which would "bail out" the Sergeant at Arms until such time as the supplemental is passed; and that in the interim, since this House resolution was introduced so quickly and so recently, the accounts have been seen and audited, so to speak, by the gentleman and the Committee on House Administration; and that they are in order; and, finally, that this resolution simply other fund's pocket on a pro tem basis and provides for restoration after the makes it legal for the hands to be in the supplemental is passed? Are those all statements that can be answered "Yes."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Absolutely.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield further, I can answer the statement "Yes" with one qualification. We had a chance to look at the balances that were available in the various accounts, including the leftover funds from fiscal year 1968 which are still available, but I want to specifically say we did not have a chance to audit the funds. We saw the balances which were available.

Mr. HALL. Of course, a question arises as to why funds not used in 1968 did not revert to the General Treasury. I shall not raise that question at this time, in view of the assurances the gentleman has given me. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield further, I would be pleased to answer that on the record, because I think it is an important point.

Funds that are 1-year funds are returnable to the Treasury, but they remain in the hands of the authorized person to handle those funds for 2 years afterward to pay bills that may be outstanding, and then the funds revert to the Treasury.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. At this moment it is not known whether there are telephone bills or furniture bills or other bills outstanding which may have to be paid out of the fiscal year 1968 funds.

At the required legal time the Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms will return unused funds to the Treasury.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. There is one other point that ought to be made. The Clerk has the money to pay part of these salaries but just not enough to pay them all. So he is asking in this resolution to borrow a small amount, in the sum of \$210,000, from these other funds. It is not as though he does not have any money to pay any of the salaries, but it is just that he does not have enough to pay them all.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is it common or uncommon practice to juggle funds in this fashion?

Mr. FRIEDEL. There have been precedents.

Mr. GROSS. And it is possible to step in and get funds out of the woodwork as easy as this?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is only a question of bookkeeping.

Mr. GROSS. When did the Committee on House Administration meet on this subject and approve this resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We were notified the other day that the Clerk and Sergeant at Arms will be out of funds, and the resolution is for this funding.

Mr. GROSS. Did the full committee ever meet on it?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We polled the committee and got a majority vote.

Mr. GROSS. You did what?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We polled the committee.

Mr. GROSS. You did not have a session?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, sir. But we looked into all of these figures to verify what has been said on the floor here today.

Mr. GROSS. This whole pay increase business has been a juggling process. This is the clincher.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. In view of the inquiry which has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I would like to point out that after the introduction of this resolution and its being called to the attention of the committee the minority at least expressed their view that this should have come before us in due course; that is, before the subcommittee and full committee, but it was explained to us that there was not enough time to get this through in order to be meaningful so as to take care of the payroll which is due now. We have been given every assurance by the chairman of the committee that in the future we will go through the regular course of business and items will not be sprung on us in the fashion that this resolution was. I know from previous experience with the chairman of the Committee on House Administration that he will see to it it is done.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not put the question yet.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

[Roll No. 70]

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

Abbutt	Evins, Tenn.	Moss
Anderson, Calif.	Fallon	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Tenn.	Findley	Ottenger
Bates	Ford	Pirnie
Beall, Md.	William D.	Pollock
Bell, Calif.	Foreman	Powell
Berry	Fulton, Tenn.	Randall
Bevill	Gallagher	Rees
Blatnik	Gettys	Reifel
Bow	Gibbons	Reuss
Brademas	Goldwater	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Gray	Roudebush
Brown, Calif.	Griffiths	Roybal
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Sandman
Burton, Calif.	Harsha	Scherle
Cahill	Hébert	Scheuer
Carey	Heckler, Mass.	Shipley
Cederberg	Helstoski	Springer
Celler	Hicks	Steed
Chisholm	Hosmer	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Hungate	Stephens
Clausen, Don H.	Hunt	Stratton
Clawson, Del.	Ichord	Stubblefield
Colmer	Joelson	Stuckey
Conyers	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Corbett	Karth	Thompson, Ga.
Corman	Kirwan	Thomson, Wis.
Cowger	Kyl	Tieran
Cramer	Landrum	Tunney
Daddario	Leggett	Vander Jagt
de la Garza	Long, La.	Watts
Diggs	Lowenstein	Whitten
Dulski	Lukens	Wiggins
Dwyer	McClure	Wilson, Bob
Edmondson	Macdonald, Mass.	Wilson,
Edwards, Ala.	Martin	Charles H.
Edwards, Calif.	May	Wold
Edwards, La.	Michel	Wylder
	Mizell	Wyman
	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 317 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I still object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not now present and make the point of order that a quorum is not now present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Two hundred and forty-two members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader to give the program for the balance of the day, for the balance of this week, and for next week.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, for today we have one more bill, H.R. 4204, and the rule relating thereto which is on the program for this week. That will conclude the business for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. In addition there are eight suspensions which are as follows:

H.R. 763, to provide for a study of State laws governing the operation of youth camps.

H.R. 2667, to revise the pay structure of the police force of the National Zoological Park.

H.R. 692, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided for veterans.

H.R. 693, to provide that veterans 70 years of age shall be deemed unable to defray hospital expenses.

H.R. 2768, to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care for service-connected veterans.

H.R. 3130, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish certain medical services.

H.R. 9334, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes.

H.R. 9634, to improve the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows: Tuesday is Private Calendar day. In addition there is scheduled for the consideration of the House H.R. 10946, to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. Also, H.R. 11102, Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1969 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. SAYLOR. Have rules already been granted on the last two bills to which the majority leader made reference?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further; they have.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. These eight suspensions on Monday next will not in any way interfere with the junket to Paris which is about to start or may have already started?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield further, insofar as I know there is no junket

which will interfere with the consideration of these bills. I know of no junket, and in any event, such would not be taken into consideration in programming the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am just trying to think ahead on Monday when there might have to be some votes on some of these bills and if the junket is still in effect on next Monday, I think the Members ought to be on notice that there are eight suspensions scheduled for consideration.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield further, that is the purpose of making the announcement, to give the Members notice of the program for next week. These are important bills and I trust that the Members will be present.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate that. The gentleman is always kind in notifying the Members on most things.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WAR CLAIMS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 426

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4204) to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against sections 2 and 3 of such substitute are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 426 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4204 to amend the War Claims Act of

1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict. Also, the resolution provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and all points of order against sections 2 and 3 of the substitute are waived.

Points of order are waived due to the fact that Vietnam and *Pueblo* personnel have not been covered heretofore under the War Claims Act and a question of germaneness might be raised.

The bill would authorize payments under the War Claims Act to members of the Armed Forces captured and held prisoner by the forces of North Vietnam, and to persons captured by North Korea while assigned to duty on board the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, for the period of their captivity at the same rates and under the same conditions as applied with respect to the members of the Armed Forces held prisoner during the Korean conflict.

The substitute would provide for payment to members of the Armed Forces held prisoner by the forces of North Vietnam at the rate of \$1 per day for each day on which the member received an inadequate quantity or quality of food during his captivity and \$1.50 per day for each day on which he was required to perform forced labor, or was subjected to inhumane treatment.

The bill also provides for payment to all civilian American citizens who are held captive by the North Vietnamese forces at the rate of \$60 per month, which is in addition to any payments they may receive under the Missing Persons, Defense Base, or War Hazards Acts.

In addition, the bill provides for payment, at the same rates and under the same conditions as applied under the Korean conflict claims program, to all persons captured while serving on board the U.S.S. *Pueblo*—\$1 per day for each day he received inadequate food and \$1.50 per day for each day he performed forced labor.

Such amounts as may be necessary are authorized since there is no way at this time to know how many claimants there will be.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 426 in order that H.R. 4204 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 426 does provide for an open rule with 1 hour to consider the bill, H.R. 4204, the war claims act amendments.

Points of order are waived on sections 2 and 3.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize payments to members of the Armed Forces captured by North Vietnamese forces, and also to those captured aboard the *Pueblo*.

Similar payment programs, carried out by the Foreign Claims Commission, have been undertaken with respect to captured American servicemen during World War II and the Korean war. The payment is \$2.50 per day during the time one is a prisoner of war. The bill also authorizes payment to American civilians held prisoner at the rate of \$60 per month, again similar to a Korean war program.

American servicemen who "voluntar-

ily, knowingly, and without duress" collaborated with the enemy do not qualify for the payment. Under Foreign Claims Commission procedure, the Commission recognizes that prisoners are often tortured, both physically and mentally to force cooperation. Such cases are not disqualified, nor are those who have voluntarily surrendered—*Pueblo*.

The cost of the bill can only be estimated because we do not know how many American servicemen and civilians will be captured. Relying on Korean war figures, the estimated costs for the Vietnam war are about \$500,000.

The Department of Defense does not support the legislation at this time, preferring that it be deferred now. The Claims Commission supports it and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 4204) to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4204

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 United States Code, Appendix 2005) is amended by:

(1) rewording subsection (e) (1) to read:

"(e) (1) As used in this subsection the term 'prisoner of war' means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time, by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States were actually engaged in armed conflict, between June 25, 1950, and August 21, 1954, or August 5, 1964, and the date ending the Vietnam conflict as shall hereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of Congress except any such member who, at any time, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any such hostile force"; and

(2) by rewording sub subsection (5) (A) to read:

"(A) August 21, 1954, for those with service during the Korean conflict"; and

(3) by redesignating sub subsection (5) (B) as sub subsection (5) (C); and

(4) by redesignating sub subsection (5) (C) as sub subsection (5) (D); and

(5) by inserting immediately after sub subsection (5) (A) the following new sub subsection:

"(5) (B) effective date of this amendments for those with service in the Vietnam conflict."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 6 of the War Claims Act of

1948 (50 App. U.S.C. 2005) is amended as follows:

"(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

"(2) by inserting immediately after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) (1) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'Vietnam conflict' relates to the period beginning February 28, 1961, and ending on such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress; and

"(B) the term 'prisoner of war' means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time during the Vietnam conflict by any force hostile to the United States, except any such member who, at any time, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with, or in any manner served, such hostile force.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the failure of the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, to furnish him the quantity or quality of food prescribed for prisoners of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this paragraph shall be at the rate of \$1 for each day on which he was held as a prisoner of war and on which such hostile force, or its agents, failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation—

"(A) for the failure of the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, to meet the conditions and requirements prescribed under chapter VIII, section III, of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relating to labor of prisoners of war; or

"(B) for inhumane treatment by the hostile force by which he was held, or its agents. The term 'inhumane treatment' as used in this subparagraph shall include, but not be limited to, failure of such hostile force, or its agents, to meet the conditions and requirements of one or more of the provisions of article 3, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 97, or 98 of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949.

"Compensation shall be allowed to any prisoner of war under this paragraph at the rate of \$1.50 per day for each day on which he was held as a prisoner of war and with respect to which he alleges and proves in a manner acceptable to the Commission the failure to meet the conditions and requirements described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph or the inhumane treatment described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph. In no event shall the compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under this paragraph exceed the sum of \$1.50 with respect to any one day.

"(4) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto, and shall, in the case of death or determination of death of the persons who are entitled, be paid only to or for the benefit of the persons specified, and in the order established, by subsection (d) (4) of this section.

"(5) Each claim filed under this subsection must be filed not later than three years from whichever of the following dates last occurs:

"(A) the date of enactment of this subsection;

"(B) the date the prisoner of war by whom the claim is filed returned to the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States; or

"(C) the date upon which the Department of Defense makes a determination that the prisoner of war has actually died or is presumed to be dead, in the case of any prisoner of war who has not returned to the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"The Commission shall complete its determinations with respect to each claim filed under this subsection at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than one year after the date on which such claim was filed.

"(6) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection.

"(7) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including necessary administrative expenses."

"Sec. 2. Section 6(e) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 App. U.S.C. 2005(e)) is amended as follows:

"(1) In paragraph (1), strike out 'except any such member' and insert in lieu thereof 'or any person (military or civilian) assigned to duty in the U.S.S. *Pueblo* who was captured by the military forces of North Korea on January 23, 1968, and thereafter held prisoner by the Government of North Korea for any period of time ending on or before December 23, 1968, except any person'.

"(2) At the end of paragraph (5), add the following new subparagraph:

"(D) In the case of any person assigned to duty in the U.S.S. *Pueblo* referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, one year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph."

"Sec. 3. Section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 App. U.S.C. 2004) is amended—

"(1) by striking out in subsection (e) 'subsection (g)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (g) and (1)'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) (1) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'Vietnam conflict' relates to the period beginning on February 28, 1961, and ending on such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress; and

"(B) the term 'civilian American citizen' means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict by any force hostile to the United States, or who went into hiding in Southeast Asia in order to avoid capture or internment by any such hostile force, except (1) a person who voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any such hostile force, or (2) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to February 27, 1961, during which he was held by any such hostile force as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid capture or internment by any such hostile force.

"(3) The detention benefits allowed under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be at the rate of \$60 for each calendar month.

"(4) The detention benefits allowed under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be allowed to the civilian American citizen entitled thereto, or, in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

"(A) the widow or husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(B) the widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal shares;

"(C) the child or children of the deceased in equal shares if there is no widow or dependent husband.

"(5) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection, and shall be paid to the person entitled thereto, except that if a person entitled to payment under this section is under any legal disability, payment shall be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

"(6) Each claim filed under this section must be filed not later than three years from whichever of the following dates last occurs:

"(A) the date of enactment of this subsection;

"(B) the date the civilian American citizen by whom the claim is filed returned to the jurisdiction of the United States; or

"(C) the date upon which the Commission, at the request of a potentially eligible survivor, makes a determination that the civilian American citizen has actually died or may be presumed to be dead, in the case of any civilian American citizen who has not returned to the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Commission shall complete its determinations for each claim filed under this subsection at the earliest practicable date, but not later than one year after the date on which such claim was filed.

"(7) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including necessary administrative expenses."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out of the committee unanimously, and we recommend its passage. It would authorize payments under the War Claims Act of 1948 of \$2.50 per day to all members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese since February 28, 1961, and would provide for a similar payment to persons serving on board the U.S.S. *Pueblo* for the period of their captivity by the forces of North Korea. These payments, which would be in addition to regular pay and allowances are the same amounts as were provided under the War Claims Act for persons who were held as prisoners of war during World War II, and persons who were held as prisoners of war during the Korean conflict.

It is estimated that the bill will not cost more than one-half million dollars. We recognize that the amounts provided are certainly inadequate compensation for the hardships suffered by these men; however, the committee feels that this symbolic payment provides some recognition to these men for the added hardships they have suffered. It is clear from information received through escaped prisoners, and former prisoners, that the treatment of our servicemen after their capture by the North Vietnamese has been in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention, and a similar pattern of mistreatment applied to members of the Armed Forces captured on the *Pueblo*.

In addition, there have been a very small number of civilians who have been captured in North Vietnam and the bill provides for payment of benefits to these persons in the same amounts as were

provided for civilians who were captured and detained during World War II and during the Korean conflict.

We urge adoption of the bill by the House.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, after World War II it was considered appropriate to compensate members of the armed services and civilians who had been interned for hardships and indignities suffered while in the hands of the enemy. At that time the United States held in its possession millions in assets belonging to nationals of the enemy nations. It was considered only just and proper that such assets be used for such compensation.

The amounts provided for internees and prisoners of war were minimal even by the standards of the immediate post-war period. Military personnel received \$1 a day where inadequate food was provided and an additional \$1.50 a day if mistreatment occurred. Civilians were allowed \$60 per month plus medical care. Because of the number of people involved in World War II the payments totaled \$123 million.

When the Korean conflict came along, a fairly similar situation obtained, but obviously it affected a smaller number of individuals both military and civilian. Also, at the time of the Korean conflict there were no appreciable assets of Korean nationals in the hands of our Government. In fairness to those who would be considered entitled to such compensation, the Congress appropriated the necessary funds to make payments which were in the same amount and for the same purposes as those in World War II. These payments amounted to slightly less than \$9 million.

The purpose of the bill before us today is to extend the War Claims Act to provide identical compensation for both military and civilian personnel held by the North Vietnamese. Compensation at the same rate as that provided in the original act is obviously a token payment. It is, however, a recognition of the fact that the North Vietnamese are depriving our prisoners of adequate accommodations and subjecting them to mistreatment.

It is difficult at this time to say how much such a program will cost, but based upon the number of prisoners we know about, it would seem to be a safe projection that the funds required would be in the neighborhood of \$500,000. As in the Korean conflict payments, reimbursement will not be approved for individuals who voluntarily collaborate with the enemy.

The bill before us goes one step beyond extending the legislation to the Vietnamese conflict and makes a special provision to include the crew of the *Pueblo*. There are 81 members of the armed services included in this provision and two civilians. Total cost of the claim arising out of this incident should be slightly over \$68,000. In my opinion it is only just and reasonable that these victims of this North Korean aggression should be compensated.

This expression by the Congress and by the Government of the United States recognizing the plight of our prisoners whether already released or still in the hands of the enemy should properly be made at this time, and I recommend this legislation to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POSTAL SERVICE ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing today the "Postal Service Act of 1969." I introduce this bill in the belief that it meets the major questions we have been asking about the Post Office Department. There will be many questions asked about this particular bill, and the long-range effects of such a major transformation. While I am not irrevocably bound to every detail of this bill, I strongly support its major features. We will have to study it carefully, making whatever changes are necessary, and making sure that all persons involved in this procedure are given an opportunity to be heard.

This is the administration-sponsored postal reform bill, carefully drawn to permit the Post Office to be run in an efficient, responsible, business-like manner in the public interest.

We are all well aware of the problems confronting the Post Office as it enters the last third of the 20th century. We are familiar with the vast annual postal deficit, the complaints of poor and deteriorating service, the aging physical facilities, the unsatisfactory working conditions for its employees, and the ever-present menace of collapse under a constantly increasing volume of mail. At the same time, we are told, and justly so, that it is not the fault of the postal managers, or of the postal employees or their organizations, or of the Congress. All of these groups are working loyally and competently to provide the best and most efficient service possible. The fault lies with the outmoded "system," the organizational structure that keeps the best efforts of honorable, conscientious men and women from being good enough.

It is to go to the heart of the faults in "the system" that a basic and far-reaching change is proposed by the bill which I introduce.

It would create a Postal Service Corporation, wholly owned by the Federal Government and operated by profes-

sional management that would not be replaced automatically with each change in administration. It would remove the Post Office from the Cabinet and would remove politics from the Post Office. It would provide, by statute, for true collective bargaining between postal management and labor. It would permit the postal service to raise its own capital to meet its needs, to employ modern management techniques and personnel policies for the benefit of all who use and all who work for the postal service. It would permit the postal service through fair, orderly and public procedures, to maintain the best possible rate structure, subject to congressional review. And it would give to the postal service sufficient control of its own affairs so that its management could fairly be held accountable for the quality and efficiency of its performance.

The need for postal reform is evident. It is not a partisan issue. Both Republican and Democratic administrations have called for far-reaching changes. Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle agree that major reform is urgent. Let us then carry out a reform which addresses all of the critical problems of the Post Office at one time and gives relief to all of our people, whether as users of the mail, as postal workers, or as taxpayers. All have a stake in postal reform and all stand to benefit from the total reform that is contained in the bill which I introduce.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I congratulate the gentleman from Arizona. I am honored to be a cosponsor with him upon this legislation.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would like to join in congratulating the gentleman from Arizona and am very pleased that I can also cosponsor this legislation. Today, our postal system is bogged down in a maze of impossible rules and regulations, is drowning in a sea of politics, and handcuffed by special interest groups who enjoy the privilege of having their mailing costs subsidized by the taxpayers. The reason I did not support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) yesterday was that it was confined to second-class rates, and I believe that third-class mail is not only a greater deficit producer, but also there is a clear difference between the way the two classes of mail is generated. You ask for second-class mail through a subscription; you get third-class mail forced on you, and it floods your mail box, unwanted, unasked for, unread, and unpaid for except through a subsidy which runs to \$324 million annually.

I certainly hope that favorable action will be taken to establish a Government corporation to run our postal system. The American people deserve better postal service, and I firmly believe they will only get it through the mechanism recommended in this bill.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable dismay that I noted the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) who on Monday implied that the naming of the new law school building at the University of California at Davis for the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a part of the so-called Communist conspiracy.

In his inimitable fashion, the distinguished Member of Congress has given credence to the libelous and ridiculous charges that Dr. King was a Communist.

I have already remarked on the naming of the law school for Dr. King. My remarks may be found in the March 19, 1969, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 6882.

I stated that—

As we approach the anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., one is reminded of the unique contribution of his life and of his sensitive understanding of the times in which he lived.

The University of California at Davis is in my Congressional District, and it is with a deep sense of pride and satisfaction that I point out to my colleagues that the new Law School Building on the USC campus has been named after Dr. King.

I still feel that same sense of pride and satisfaction, and for this reason consider the slanderous remarks of Mr. RARICK an insult to myself, the people of California and all other citizens who value the rule of law.

My office periodically receives newsletters which purvey the most insidious garbage attacking almost every prominent American, Dr. King among them, as a member of the Communist conspiracy. The fact that this verbal manure is spread is due to the American concept of the free press and certainly not because there is the slightest bit of truth contained in them.

I dispose of this material. Apparently one Member of this body accepts this filth as the gospel and uses the prestige of office as well as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to further distribute this nonsense.

I can assure the gentleman from Louisiana that the people of California are proud to have a building at one of their leading universities named after a man who exemplifies the tradition of the rule of law and rule of reason. It was Dr. Martin Luther King who was in the forefront of the movement for justice under the law for all peoples. In this time of turmoil, we need a multitude of Kings who can see that it is through the law that progress is made.

Fortunately, the people of California and the board of regents recognize this fact.

The University of California at Davis—site of the law school in question—is in my congressional district. I am proud to represent an intelligent group of constituents who see the world for what it is and what it could be. Fortunately, I do not consider that I represent a group of neanderthals and mental midgets who must be fed a continuing line of tripe

from a Congressman whose view of the world borders on the absurd at best.

I am confident that the law school at Davis will train leaders of the bar who will exemplify the traditions of Dr. King and put reason ahead of violence and law above revolution.

COAL DUST STANDARDS

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following WTOP editorial, which was broadcast on May 27 and 28, speaks for itself:

COAL DUST

(Editorial broadcast May 27 and 28, 1969, over WTOP radio and television)

This is a WTOP editorial.

The nation's coal miners have been kicked again.

This time it has to do with the amount of poison they're permitted to inhale. The Labor Department has just installed a watered-down standard for coal dust per cubic meter which applies to coal mines benefitting from federal contracts.

Coal dust is a crippler and a killer. It contributes heavily to various kinds of lung disease, and especially to the dreaded pneumoconiosis or "black lung." Tens of thousands of miners have gone through the closing years of their lives wheezing and gasping because of irreversible damage inflicted by dust.

Several months ago, the Secretary of Labor, who then was Willard Wirtz, posted in the federal register a tough rule setting a limit on coal dust of 3 milligrams per cubic meter. Soon after George Shultz succeeded Wirtz as Secretary, he had the rule frozen for "further study."

One week ago, a new standard went into effect, permitting up to 4.5 milligrams of dust. It represents a shocking capitulation by Secretary Shultz to the coal operators. The U.S. Surgeon-General has testified before Congress that the higher dust level will contribute very materially to the incidence of lung disease among miners.

Almost nobody stood up for the miners on this one. An advisory committee named by Shultz for the re-study didn't hold a single public hearing. In order to obtain minutes of the proceedings of the committee, one Congressman had to threaten legal action. The five labor representatives on the committee failed to signal a loud protest over the impending change. In predictable fashion, the United Mine Workers union sat on its hands.

The last hope appears to rest with Congress, where a broad bill governing health standards in all mines is being drafted. The 3-milligram ceiling must not be compromised there.

Meanwhile, workers in about 800 coal mines can thank the Secretary of Labor for personally intervening to insure that the air they breathe continues to be foul and dangerous.

This is a WTOP editorial . . . Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

ROGERS INTRODUCES BILL TO EXTEND SEA-GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with 17 of my colleagues from the Subcommittee on Oceanography, a bill to extend the national sea-grant college program.

The intent of the original legislation, when enacted into law in 1966, was to produce manpower for the many areas of marine-related work and to further develop our Nation's marine resources.

Despite limited funding, we have seen the intent of the sea-grant program carried out during these first formative years.

Colleges and universities from all over the Nation have applied for the grants offered by this program and I would add that the response has been amazing. There have been hundreds of inquiries and applications from every State in the Union.

This legislation is geared to develop our marine resources and the intent of the law was not to limit participation by geography, and again this goal is being accomplished.

The administration of this program, under the guidance of Mr. Robert Abel, has been outstanding.

Indeed, this single program has been one of the most significant programs yet enacted to launch this Nation into its adventure with the oceans and lakes and environment around us.

We have an excellent blueprint to guide our future development in the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources. In this report we have been given the outline of a program which will eventually bring all the Government's marine-related departments and agencies together into a single agency. This report points out the work which has been done thus far by the national sea-grant college program and the importance of having it included in the overall marine program and marine agency once it is developed and in operation. But in the interim it is very important that we continue the work which is being done by the national sea-grant college program.

The sea-grant college program was broadly based in legislation so as to call upon all facets of talent throughout the Nation, including colleges, universities, junior colleges, and industry.

To date, approximately 25 grants have been awarded to outstanding colleges and universities. And the Nation has already benefited from these grants.

In Wisconsin, a load of manganese granules was found by the University of Wisconsin after that school had been awarded a grant to do work in Lake Michigan.

I would also add that the American Association of Junior Colleges has also applied for a grant, indicating that the program has also considered the advantages of tapping this source of talent.

I believe, and I think I speak for my colleagues, that this Nation has a great potential in the oceans, yet we have done very little to realize these benefits. Our manpower supply in this area has been woefully inadequate.

The National Sea Grant College program is the surest and most direct way to eliminate this shortage. It is vital to

this Nation's interests that we continue this very worthy program.

I am pleased to have the following of my colleagues join with me in sponsoring this legislation: Mr. LENNON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PELLY, Mr. KEITH, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. BRAY.

I understand that the Honorable CLAIBORNE PELL is introducing an identical bill in the Senate along with some of his colleagues and would commend the Senator for the leadership he has shown in the field of oceanography.

STUDENT UNREST

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the president of the State University of Iowa, Howard R. Bowen, recently made a speech on student unrest at the honors convocation held in Iowa City, Iowa, on Saturday, May 3, 1969, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. It is as follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to greet you this morning, honor students, parents, friends, and teachers. The accomplishments of the honor students speak for themselves and need no embellishment from me. I do congratulate you on your dedicated hard work, on your superb talent and on your bright future prospects. The world belongs, as never before, to intellectual ability. And that fact obviously places upon bright, energetic, and well-educated people like you a heavy responsibility to use talents and opportunities in socially useful ways.

The past four years, during which you have been in college, have been some of the most adventurous and rewarding years in the history of higher education, and they have been splendid years at the University of Iowa as well. The University has grown prodigiously in enrollment, buildings, faculty, library books, and equipment. Students have come to the University better prepared and with more experience and sophistication than ever before. Scholarship has been highly respected, and students have been highly motivated.

The campus has come alive with discussions about the way of life of a university community, about the war in Viet Nam, about racial injustice, about the desecration of our air and water, and about moral and aesthetic values. New art forms have been explored and interest in the arts has reached a new high. All of this activity and discussion has been healthy, but some of it has been accompanied by a new element which is totally alien to the spirit of a university—namely, disorderly protest, boycotts, incivility, intolerance for differing opinions, intimidation, and lack of consideration for the rights of others. Very few students have been guilty of this kind of behavior, and untoward incidents have been rare at Iowa. But the virus of lawlessness and violence has intruded into many campuses and has even been found on rare occasions at the University of Iowa.

We have by now had enough experience with this kind of behavior to know that it bodes ill for the university as a center of learning. As the daily list of institutions with violence, threats, disorders, and armed hostility increases, the public is becoming less tolerant of the ancient and indispensable tradition of university self-government. The people of this country feel they have had about enough of this mode of behavior. But,

the disorder and bigotry is evil not only because it threatens the university with outside control. It is intolerable because it is incompatible with the university's own central function as a place of learning. Learning can thrive only in an atmosphere of careful observation, judicious weighing of pros and cons, objective analysis, free exchange of ideas and openness to new concepts. This atmosphere is destroyed by noisy and intolerant pressure tactics.

I bring this matter to the attention of this audience, which is gathered to honor scholarship, because I know you will appreciate the dangers to the intellectual integrity, freedom, and excellence of the university that are inherent in these new modes of behavior. I call upon you, in the rest of your time here, and throughout your lives, to work toward the preservation of the university as a center of lively discussion—as a theater where new ideas are examined open-mindedly—as a place where people are civil to one another even when there are differences of opinion—as a place where the democratic processes are respected and followed—as a center of enlightenment and an enemy of bigotry and coercion.

The Universities of this country are in great danger. The scholarly values to which you and I have given much of our lives are in jeopardy. I ask you to be among the staunch defenders who will help to restore the balance.

INDIA CONSORTIUM

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 and 23, the consortium of governments and institutions concerned with assistance to India met in Paris to review progress in Indian economic developments. A concise summary of this meeting was issued May 23 by the World Bank. In the very near future, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, is scheduled to hold hearings on foreign aid, a sizable portion of which is programmed to India. So that other Members may share the contents of the summary of the Paris meeting, I include as follows:

INDIA CONSORTIUM, MAY 23, 1969

The following announcement was issued today at the World Bank's European Office in Paris:

"The Consortium of governments and institutions interested in development assistance to India met in Paris on May 22 and 23, 1969 under the chairmanship of the World Bank. The meeting was attended by representatives of the Governments of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. The presence of Sweden as a member of the Consortium for the first time was welcomed. The International Monetary Fund and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development sent observers.

"The purpose of the meeting was to review the progress of economic development in India and to consider India's aid requirements for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1969 and the terms on which aid should be made available.

"A delegation representing the Government of India, led by Dr. I. G. Patel, Special Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, was present to describe recent economic developments and aid requirements.

"The meeting commended the considerable improvements in India's economic situation in 1968/69. All Consortium members welcomed the continuation of the momentum of growth in agricultural production, the sub-

stantial recovery in industrial production, the restoration of a stable price level and the efforts made in the last budget to mobilize additional resources for development. Particularly noteworthy was the very good export performance, especially with regard to such items as engineering goods; exports as a whole were 12.5 per cent above those of 1967/68. Members also commended steps India was taking to extend the family planning program, for which budgetary appropriations during the next five years are planned at a level 12 times the amount spent during the Third Plan period.

"It was agreed that India needed substantial new commitments of non-project as well as project aid if the general recovery of the economy was to be maintained and consolidated. Members agreed that, for the year which began April 1, 1969, India required non-project assistance of about \$700 million, including approximately \$100 million in the form of debt relief. Toward this total of \$700 million most members indicated the contributions they would be able to make, subject to necessary approvals, and others expected to be able to do so later in the year.

"India's need for increased project assistance as an essential complement to non-project aid was also recognized, and Consortium members agreed that India's request for \$400 million was reasonable and that efforts would be made to meet it.

"It was generally agreed that a further improvement in the terms of aid was desirable and several members in fact announced such improvements."

CONGRESSMAN CULVER PROPOSES INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join several colleagues in the House in introducing legislation which would increase social security benefits by 15 percent, increase the minimum monthly benefit from \$55 to \$80 per month, and provide for periodic, automatic increases in social security benefits to meet increases in the cost of living.

The abundance of our Nation continues to bless the vast majority of Americans. But that abundance still continues to be denied to the very generation which has labored long, hard years to bring our country to its present fullness and richness. Justice as well as reason requires that we in the Congress renew our concern over the kind of life our society forces upon its senior citizens.

We are today a younger Nation than at any time in our history. Nearly half of our population is under 25 years of age, and about a third is under 15. But our preoccupation with the problems of the young should not be allowed to mask the fact that 19 million persons, or nearly 10 percent of the population, are 65 years of age or older. The choice which must be open to this 10 percent is a life of dignity and productivity—not a disheartening period of dependency or deprivation.

Problems such as health and housing, employment and recreation, are dealt with in a routine way by most individuals. But, because of their precarious economic existence, these same problems present formidable challenges to many older Americans. As the strongest and richest Nation in the world, we cannot in the exercise of responsible judgment afford to overlook these critical concerns.

I believe we can act immediately to

relieve the hardships under which many now suffer. By increasing social security benefits and tying future benefits to the cost-of-living index, we can provide for a greater measure of economic security in the lives of America's elderly.

Higher income levels are obviously not the total answer; but they will serve to blunt the forces of poverty which now threaten too many of the country's senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, by the beginning of 1970, inflation will have eliminated the effect of past social security increases in 1965 and 1967. I can think of no better way for the Congress to honor the month of May, which has been proclaimed Senior Citizens Month, than to begin immediate consideration of this legislation.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the last full session of Congress we have heard a great deal about how much less is being spent on foreign aid. One would be led to believe that the so-called mutual security program is being gradually reduced to nothing and that the taxpayers of America could look forward to the day when they would no longer have to bear this burden.

What are the facts?

Mutual security will require appropriations totaling approximately two billion seven hundred million dollars for fiscal 1970, which the proponents of the program consider a barebones amount. This, however, is only about one-quarter of the total amount of assistance that the United States will provide for foreign countries next year. Mutual securities is but one of the many foreign aid activities.

A perusal of the budget that Lyndon B. Johnson submitted to the Congress just before turning over the reins of Government to Richard M. Nixon shows that obligations for foreign aid for fiscal 1970 will total \$9,572,268,000, not counting the amounts that will be obligated by the Department of Defense. If such sums were added, the total would be substantially in excess of \$10 billion. A table that I will submit for the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks breaks down this enormous sum by the various departments and agencies of the executive branch and also gives comparative figures for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

There are numerous reasons why we must drastically curtail this huge outflow of funds, but I will list only a few of them.

The Committee on Appropriations of this body has proposed a spending limitation of \$192,900 million for the year that will begin less than 6 weeks from today. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, on which I am privileged to serve, believes that this gargantuan sum can be reduced by \$5 billion. What better place can we start than the foreign aid programs?

The public debt at the end of fiscal 1970 will reach the astronomical figure of \$371,482 million, unless measures are taken to sharply cut spending. In order

to show my colleagues just how great our indebtedness is, let us compare our burden of debt with that of all the other nations of the world, almost all of which have received handouts from the United States during the period 1946 to 1969. The last date for which a meaningful comparison can be made is December 31, 1967, when the public debt of the United States was \$345,947,345,000, as compared with the combined public debts of all the other nations of the world, which came to \$302,128,345,000. The latter figure would of course have been much higher had it not been for foreign aid. As it was, however, it was \$43,819 million less than our own national debt figure. One half of our indebtedness represented total foreign aid from 1946 to 1968 plus the interest we had to pay to borrow the money before we could give it away.

The interest on the public debt of the United States for fiscal 1970 will be \$15,958 million. One half of this amount became necessary because of our past foreign aid expenditures plus interest.

According to the Taxpayers Committee To End Foreign Aid:

Various foreign aid agencies and programs have (since 1946) provided foreign countries with our most modern machinery and equipment. . . . Foreign industrialists and technicians have (with foreign aid dollars) been brought to the United States to study and take home our latest industrial technology. With low cost foreign labor, foreign tax concessions, free ultra-modern U.S. machinery and technology, foreign industry has been able to undersell much of our domestic production. . . . Foreign aid, in many instances, has promoted the export of American industry. With indirect foreign aid and private finances, U.S. industries have established foreign branches in order to take advantage of low cost labor, favorable taxes, and local markets. This industrial exodus has taken jobs from American labor and given them to foreigners.

The following tabulation shows where the bulk of our foreign aid has gone:

United Kingdom	\$7,394,000,000
France	7,021,200,000
Korea	6,986,800,000
India	6,585,200,000
Italy	5,329,100,000
Turkey	5,126,400,000
Vietnam	5,042,800,000
China (Nationalist)	4,873,500,000

West Germany and Berlin	\$3,668,700,000
Greece	3,605,100,000
Japan	3,528,300,000
Pakistan	3,126,500,000
Yugoslavia	2,633,100,000
Brazil	2,476,400,000
Netherlands	2,052,700,000
Spain	1,952,700,000
Iran	1,848,400,000
Philippines	1,761,400,000
Belgium and Luxembourg	1,757,200,000
Indo-China	1,535,200,000
Chile	1,221,600,000
Norway	1,132,400,000
Austria	1,122,900,000
Thailand	1,063,900,000

Total----- 82,845,500,000

As my colleagues study these figures, I hope they will ask themselves, "Just what has all this spending on foreign aid accomplished?" I would not go so far as to say that no good has been achieved, but as a general proposition I must say that the statistics for the 24 nations that have received at least \$1 billion each are rather disillusioning.

Foreign aid has been sold to the American people under many different labels during the quarter century since the end of World War II. We were told that it was needed to stop communism. Among the nations that have received a tremendous amount of assistance is Communist Yugoslavia, which has benefited to the extent of \$2,633,100,000.

We were told that it was better to use foreign soldiers against the Communists than American young men. How many foreign soldiers are fighting alongside the several hundred thousand young Americans in Southeast Asia? France, the very nation that abandoned Indochina, received \$7,021,200,000 in help from America.

The only country to receive more assistance from us is the United Kingdom, to which we contributed \$7,394,000,000; that nation carries on trade with Communist North Vietnam and Communist Cuba, our enemies.

Other nations that trade with our enemies are Italy, the recipient of \$5,329,100,000 in aid from us; West Germany and Japan, each of which received over \$3,500,000,000; the Netherlands, which got \$2,052,700,000; Belgium, to which we gave approximately \$1,750,-

000,000; and Norway, which received \$1,132,400,000.

Many of our colleagues are disturbed because Greece and Spain are governed by regimes of which they do not approve. Spain has received \$1,952,700,000 in assistance from the United States, while Greece has done much better, getting \$3,605,100,000. An even greater amount, \$5,126,400,000, has gone to Turkey, which, along with Greece, was one of the earliest beneficiaries from American aid. Undoubtedly aid to Greece and Turkey stopped communism two decades ago, but these two nations have in the meantime become bitter enemies of each other.

India and Pakistan are two other countries that have often been at swords' points during the years since both achieved independence, not only from the British Empire but from each other. These two nations have received \$6,585,200,000 and \$3,126,500,000, respectively, from the taxpayers and bond purchasers of the United States.

A great deal of the more than \$10 billion that we will be asked to provide for the various foreign aid programs for fiscal 1970 will be distributed among the more than 60 nations that have achieved independence during the last quarter century. The great majority of these new nations were formerly colonies of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium.

Since the British, French, Dutch, and Belgian Empires disappeared, the United States has been asked to finance the one-time colonies in many of their activities, just as we assumed the burden of fighting the war in Southeast Asia when France resigned from that responsibility. Although it was Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium that exploited the colonial populations, it is Uncle Sam who is expected to help solve the problems of the new nations with huge outpourings of borrowed money.

Mr. Speaker, I have given but a few of the many reasons for ending foreign aid. Suffice it to say that if we are going to balance the budget, cut spending, reduce the debt, and end the surtax, we ought to start with the foreign aid programs.

The table to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks follows:

				1968	1969	1970	
				actual	estimate	estimate	
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.			
International financial institutions:				Foreign assistance—Continued			
Investment in Inter-American Development Bank, obligations				Economic assistance—Continued			
Subscription to the International Development Association, obligations				Grants and other programs—Continued			
Investment in Asian Development Bank				U.N. Relief and Works Agency	13,300	13,300	13,000
Foreign assistance:				U.N. Children's Fund	12,000	13,000	12,500
Military assistance, obligations				International Atomic Energy Agency operational program	1,000	1,000	1,000
Foreign military credit sales, obligations				U.N. "peacekeeping":			
Liquidation of foreign military sales fund, executive, obligations				Emergency force	5,197		
Advances, foreign military sales: procurement assistance, obligations				Cyprus	1,162	6,300	6,300
Economic assistance:				World food program	2,000	1,300	1,500
Grants and other programs:				Indus Basin Development Fund, grant, International Secretariat for Volunteer Service	20,900	17,600	16,000
Technical cooperation:				U.N. Institute for Training and Research		50	50
East Asia				World Health Organization, medical research	500	300	500
Near East and south Asia				Special contributions for Vietnam	150	150	150
Africa				U.N. population program	1,000	400	1,000
Latin America				World Meteorological Organization, World Weather Watch	500	500	2,500
Interregional and special programs				U.N. special programs for Southern Africans		1,500	2,000
American schools and hospitals abroad				International organizations and programs, loans, Indus Basin Development Fund			50
Surveys of investment opportunities							
International organizations and programs, grants:							
United Nations development program							
U.N. technical and operational assistance to the Congo							

[In thousands of dollars]

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.			
Foreign assistance—Continued			
Economic assistance—Continued			
Grants and other programs—Continued			
Supporting assistance:			
Vietnam.....	400,273	343,576	440,000
East Asia.....	127,707	88,395	88,860
Near East and south Asia.....	18,978	11,000	
Africa.....	16,900	14,483	11,000
Latin America.....	26,103	11,796	6,500
Nonregional.....	9,881	17,644	4,650
Contingency fund.....	27,538	27,130	50,000
Alliance for Progress, technical cooperation and development grants.....	87,255	86,455	120,600
Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development.....	57,078	54,586	55,000
Administrative and other expenses, Department of State.....	4,167	3,661	3,800
Total obligations.....	1,129,868	1,002,048	1,196,740
Informational foreign currency schedules:			
Assistance to American schools and hospitals abroad, obligations.....	5,986	5,100	1,700
Foreign currencies, foreign assistance:			
Military purposes (projects).....	153	4	
Economic purposes.....	6,417	7,231	6,908
Projects.....	8		
Procurement for third countries.....			
Total obligations.....	6,578	7,235	6,908
Foreign Currency from Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act:			
Emergency relief assistance.....	1,340	695	
Purchase of goods or services for other countries.....	5,940	9,167	8,550
Total obligations.....	7,280	9,862	8,550
Foreign Currency from Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act:			
Grants:			
Procurement for the common defense.....	125,614	145,910	126,500
Promoting economic development and international trade.....	36,474	58,150	68,400
Financing activities related to maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and problems of population growth.....	8,282	20,490	30,415
Financing activities related to animal and plant pest control.....		1,500	1,000
Loans:			
Promoting economic development and international trade.....	441,444	341,950	176,975
Assisting private enterprise for business development and trade expansion.....	14,707	85,960	45,085
Total obligations.....	626,521	653,960	448,375
Alliance for Progress, development loans:			
Capital outlay, funded:			
Loans to developing countries.....	324,140	375,935	377,178
Interest capitalized.....	1,662	149	
Change in selected resources.....	-42,675	49,279	17,557
Adjustment in selected resources (loan obligations).....	20,986	50,030	25,265
Population grant program:			
Obligations funded.....	941	7,900	10,034
Change in selected resources.....	11,934	5,697	-10,034
Operating costs, expenses (obligations).....	140	165	165
Total obligations.....	317,128	489,155	420,165
Development loans, revolving fund:			
Capital outlay, funded:			
Loans to developing countries.....	636,499	660,752	579,873
Interest capitalized.....	2,520	1,644	
Change in selected resources.....	6,376	-275,477	103,827
Adjustment in selected resources (loan obligations).....	92,906	72,170	44,500
Operating costs, expenses (obligations funded).....	262	300	300
Total obligations.....	738,562	459,589	728,500
Development Loan Fund, liquidation account:			
Loans repayable in dollars.....	7,850	8,500	5,000
Interest capitalized.....	1,296		
Unapplied loan disbursements.....			
Loans repayable in foreign currency.....	21,003	21,230	18,528
Interest capitalized.....	557	540	
Change in selected resources.....	-41,900	-43,207	-23,528
Adjustment in selected resources (loan obligations).....	12,439	13,477	
Total obligations.....	1,853	540	
Foreign Investment Guaranty Fund:			
Claims expenses.....	623	8,200	7,530
Administrative costs.....	1,090	3,207	3,626
Recovery of prior year obligations.....	16		
Change in selected resources.....	44	-73	
Total obligations.....	1,773	11,334	11,156

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.			
Foreign assistance—Continued			
Economic assistance—Continued			
Advance acquisition of property, revolving fund:			
Operating cost, funded:			
Domestic program.....	2,063	1,566	1,709
Foreign program.....	2,727	3,401	2,729
Change in selected resources.....	-1,310	-121	-75
Nonoperating obligations.....	577		
Total obligations.....	4,057	4,846	4,363
Office of the Inspector General of Foreign Assistance Inspections (costs, obligations).....	899	980	980
Advances and reimbursements, economic assistance: Miscellaneous services to other accounts, obligations.....	59,590	30,516	30,530
Economic assistance, trust fund:			
Technical assistance, U.S. dollars advanced from foreign governments, obligations.....	2,034	2,300	2,400
Informational foreign currency schedules:			
Technical assistance (Agency for International Development), obligations.....	92,285	86,621	83,526
Military assistance projects, obligations.....		10,177	
Peace Corps:			
Peace Corps:			
Volunteer and project costs.....	78,227	72,800	78,900
Administrative expenses, limitation.....	28,619	30,251	30,900
Total obligations.....	106,846	103,051	109,800
Gifts and donations:			
Volunteer and project costs.....	134	134	136
Administrative expenses.....	67	66	67
School partnership program.....	321	432	432
Total obligations.....	522	632	635
Informational foreign currency schedule:			
Volunteer and project costs.....	872	890	883
Administrative expenses.....	400	410	417
Total obligations.....	1,272	1,300	1,300
Philippine education program:			
School building construction project.....	9,677		
Textbook projection project.....	2,564		
Cultural development fund project.....	3,500		
Assistance to secondary education project.....		6,154	
Projects being negotiated.....		2,837	
Total obligations.....	15,741	8,991	
Special foreign currency activities:			
Department of Agriculture, translation of publications and scientific cooperation:			
Agricultural and forestry research.....	201	206	
Change in selected resources.....	-192	-206	
Total obligations.....	9		
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Agricultural Research Service:			
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program):			
Market development research.....	1,942	1,600	1,400
Agricultural and forestry research.....	4,892	5,000	5,600
Translation and dissemination of scientific publications.....	113	128	135
Total program costs, funded.....	6,947	6,728	7,135
Change in selected resources.....	362	-424	1,747
Total obligations.....	7,309	6,304	8,882
Advances and reimbursements: Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	2,532	1,841	1,808
Cooperative State Research Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	76	187	166
Extension Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	1,240	1,951	1,320
Farmer Cooperative Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	180	167	167
Soil Conservation Service:			
Advances and reimbursements:			
Technical services to International Agricultural Development Service.....	40	51	60
Technical services to Agency for International Development.....	1,075	1,120	1,170
Economic Research Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	959	1,100	1,100
Statistical Reporting Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	216	213	213
Consumer and Marketing Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	99	131	128
Foreign Agricultural Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development program.....	176	219	219

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.			
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued			
International Agricultural Development Service:			
Advances and reimbursements:			
Training of foreign participants.....	674	627	650
Technical consultant on and support service.....	477	392	410
Special projects.....	812	951	950
Project leaders.....	166	150	150
Subsistence for foreign training while in United States.....	3,701	3,790	4,000
Total obligations.....	5,830	5,910	6,160
Foreign assistance programs and special export programs:			
Public Law 83-480:			
Sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and for dollars on credit terms.....	1,134,841	927,100	841,313
Commodities disposed of and other costs incurred in connection with donations abroad.....	344,596	375,600	364,548
Total program costs, funded.....	1,479,437	1,302,700	1,205,861
Changes in costs financed by balance in Commodity Credit Corporation and by receipts.....	-303,937	-472,700	-189,261
Total obligations.....	1,175,500	830,000	1,016,600
Foreign Agricultural Research and Development: Integrated foreign agricultural development program, agricultural research and development—Obligations			
Rural Electrification Administration: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	2	5	5
Farmers Home Administration: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	699	800	833
Office of Information: Advances and reimbursements; Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	2	2	2
National Agricultural Library: Advances and reimbursements; Agency for International Development (funds appropriated to the President).....	3		
Forest Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development.....	303	359	354
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Business economics and statistics:			
Office of Business Economics: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development.....	78	78	78
Bureau of the Census: Advances and reimbursements, foreign statistical training.....	2,020	2,722	2,627
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Office of Education: Advances and reimbursements, miscellaneous services to Agency for International Development.....			
	1,520	1,935	1,935
Social and Rehabilitation Service: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development.....			
	166	320	320
Social Security Administration: Advances and reimbursements, providing training and other services for foreign nationals for the Agency for International Development.....			
	77	84	85
Departmental management: Advances and reimbursements, international health activities.....			
		749	1,130
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Public Land Management: Bureau of Land Management; advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development program.....			
	242	255	300
Mineral resources:			
Bureau of Mines:			
Advances and reimbursements, international activities.....	416	430	430
Contributed funds, international activities.....	2		
Water and power development:			
Bureau of Reclamation: Advances and reimbursements, consolidated work fund, Agency for International Development.....	3,594	3,890	3,896
Water quality and research:			
Office of Saline Water, cooperation with foreign agencies:			
Cooperation with foreign agencies (program costs funded).....	6,115	10,500	1,075
Change in selected resources.....	5,282	-10,213	-1,075
Total obligations.....	11,397	287	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Administration of Foreign Affairs:			
Advances and reimbursements:			
Representation by the Foreign Service of the United States abroad, foreign assistance program (Department of Defense).....	107	102	102
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities, Agency for International Development.....	222	178	178
Kabul Hospital:			
Agency for International Development.....	156	193	193
Peace Corps.....	38	27	27

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued			
International organizations and conferences:			
Contributions to international organizations:			
United Nations.....	33,620	37,180	41,571
U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.....	9,085	9,085	10,531
International Civil Aviation Organization.....	3,140	3,225	3,530
World Health Organization.....	16,771	18,075	19,533
Food and Agriculture Organization.....	7,551	8,750	8,750
International Labor Organization.....	5,618	6,209	6,653
International Telecommunication Union.....	581	591	616
World Meteorological Organization.....	514	668	699
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.....	93	103	121
Inter-American Indian Institute.....	62	62	62
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.....	2,050	2,223	2,400
Pan American Institute of Geography and History.....	90	90	90
Pan American Railway Congress Association.....	5	5	5
Pan American Health Organization.....	5,888	6,550	8,402
Organization of American States.....	11,920	12,662	13,900
South Pacific Commission.....	179	180	198
North Atlantic Treaty Organization.....	3,698	3,837	4,241
North Atlantic Assembly.....	59	58	61
Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.....	319	318	348
Colombo Plan Council for Technical Cooperation.....	6	6	6
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.....	4,180	4,398	4,971
International Control Commission for Laos.....	394	394	320
International Atomic Energy Agency.....	2,813	3,294	3,374
Other international organizations.....	391	490	748
Total obligations.....	109,027	118,453	131,130
Educational exchange:			
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities:			
Exchange of persons.....	29,742	18,722	22,600
Special educational and cultural projects.....	603	682	1,185
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad.....	2,053	1,600	2,000
Cultural presentations.....	1,575	1,200	1,000
Multilateral organizations activities.....	406	444	444
Program services.....	6,804	6,495	5,975
Administrative expenses.....	2,500	2,282	2,196
Total obligations.....	43,683	31,425	35,400
International educational exchange activities (special foreign currency program): Exchange of persons—Obligations.....			
		1,033	
Educational exchange permanent appropriations:			
Educational exchange fund, payments by Finland, World War I debt—Obligations.....	363	377	377
Educational exchange trust funds:			
U.S. dollars advanced from foreign governments.....	204	250	250
Contributions educational and cultural exchange.....	58	60	60
Total obligations.....	263	310	310
Other:			
Migration and refugee assistance:			
Contribution to Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.....	2,500	3,000	3,000
Contribution to U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.....	600	600	600
Refugees from European Communist countries.....	875	914	914
Refugees from Communist China.....	272	300	300
Contribution for care of refugees from Middle East crisis.....	125		
Cuban refugees.....	619		
Administration.....	574	647	647
Contributions to the International Committee of the Red Cross.....	50	50	50
1967 program funds obligated in 1968.....	74		
1968 program funds obligated in 1969.....	-712	712	
Total obligations.....	4,977	6,223	5,511
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Office of the Secretary: Advances and reimbursements, Agency for International Development.....			
	51	87	90
Federal Aviation Administration: Advances and reimbursements, administration, training, and technical services in connection with Agency for International Development programs.....			
	6,662	8,138	7,254
Federal Highway Administration:			
Inter-American Highway:			
Inter-American Highway program.....	3,753	9,000	8,000
Change in selected resources.....	3,791	-3,545	-7,600
Total obligations.....	7,544	5,455	400
Other Federal Highway Administration trust funds:			
Technical assistance, U.S. dollars advanced from foreign governments.....	1,847	2,000	3,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate		1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES				FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION			
Total obligations (operations program).....	133,524	173,758	198,210	Advances and reimbursements: Technical assistance,			
Total obligations (capital outlay).....	2,391,856	2,829,578	2,767,700	Agency for International Development.....	17	19	20
Total obligations (loan program).....	2,525,380	3,003,336	2,965,910	Grand total obligations.....	9,229,111	9,150,972	9,572,268
Purchase of equipment—Capital outlay.....	16	170	45				
Total obligations (guarantee and insurance program).....	-4,501	157,299	201,555				
Total obligations.....	2,520,895	3,160,805	3,167,510				

NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is especially heartening to the supporters of our national space program to read an editorial in the Evening Star on Friday, May 23, by Mr. Carl T. Rowan, which has enumerated only a very, very few of the benefits from our space program Americans are now enjoying and have been for many years. As a newsman and editorialist, Mr. Rowan deserves to be complimented in the succinct way he has illustrated how space research is providing answers through technology for many of our social ills. I think it is very evident that the fulfillment of the promises made in 1958 to the American people when Congress enacted the national space program is being carried out. At this point, I would like to include Mr. Rowan's editorial for the benefit of all Members of the House and for the edification of the relatively few, but highly vocal, critics of space research and development:

SPACE PROGRAM SPINNING OFF EARTHLY BENEFITS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Millions of Americans watch in pride and astonishment as those intrepid astronauts, Tom Stafford, John Young, and Eugene Cernan, move us ever closer to touchdown on the moon.

But millions of Americans also ask some nagging questions about the wisdom of spending at least \$24 billion to plant Old Glory on the moon before the Russians' hammer and sickle is anchored there.

Is it all just a woefully costly gambit in a never-ending ideological contest? In terms of ultimate value to mankind, is the moon program about the equivalent of giving America's poor people roundtrip tickets to the Sahara Desert?

The late John F. Kennedy said, in giving the go-ahead for this costly space program, that men want to go to the moon for the same reason they want to climb a mountain: "because it is there."

Perhaps the search for the unknown, a yearning that has pushed man to new continents and new knowledge down through the ages, is justification enough for some. But fortunately for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), there are some more tangible and substantial arguments.

Though not designed primarily to solve "earthly" problems, "spinoffs" and "transfers" from the space program have indeed produced some remarkable benefits at home.

And more dramatic side benefits are certain to come.

Thousands of Mexicans in the twin towns of Gomez Palacios and Torreon can vouch for this. Their cities were saved from possible disastrous flooding in the wake of Hurricane Naomi last year, thanks to photos and data from a weather satellite launched by NASA.

Hospital patients are discovering the benefits, too. A tiny temperature sensor and FM radio transmitter, developed for space research, is now being used as an alarm to warn if tracheotomy patients have trouble breathing. And crippled persons are learning to walk with a training device that evolved from one the astronauts originally used to practice for low-gravity walks on the moon.

In overcrowded, poverty-riddled India, plans are being discussed to teach improved agricultural techniques and family planning methods to millions of persons by television beamed into villages via satellite.

Traveling in the United States will be safer this Memorial Day, as a result of NASA research. Studies of landing accidents on wet runways have led to the use of grooved designs for runways and highways. Fifteen major airports have modified their runways and 25 states are experimenting with grooving treacherous stretches of highway. Some of these experiments show a 90 percent reduction in rainy-day accidents.

Scores of other benefits from the space program are helping, or soon will be, in every field from medicine to agriculture, industry to education.

A computer technique used to improve the clarity of pictures televised from spacecraft is now being used to make medical X-rays clearer and more detailed. One NASA official says brain X-rays are now 200 percent better.

To make the Apollo spacecraft fireproof, tests were conducted on hundreds of materials. These are now available to make safer clothing, upholstery, drapes, and other goods.

As a result of the cleanliness requirements for space components, giant "clean rooms" were developed which now are being copied in hospitals.

An especially tough coating developed for spacecraft is the basis of long-wearing paint now being developed for consumer use.

Out of an attempt to develop a heated, glass canopy for research airplanes has come a cradle cover for newborn children—especially valuable for premature babies whose temperature must be closely controlled.

Electrocardiogram data on a heart-attack patient can be flashed ahead from the ambulance to the hospital, thanks to technology developed at NASA's flight research center.

A battery-operated television camera not much bigger than a pack of king-sized cigarettes, which photographs the separation of Saturn V rocket stages in flight, is on sale in a commercial version for monitoring industrial processes.

Is even all this worth the cost? Who at this early day in the history of space travel can say yea or nay?

BETTER POSTAL SERVICE AND REMOVAL OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FROM PARTISAN POLITICS

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

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, when I was first a candidate for Congress in 1966, one of my major pledges was to work for better postal service and to support efforts to separate the Post Office from partisan politics. Consistent with those promises, and because it is right, I am today cosponsoring the Postal Service Act of 1969.

There are many reasons for supporting this legislation. As a former member of the House Post Office Committee I can testify without reservation that our postal system is running a headlong race with disaster. This is not legislation to improve the postal system; this is legislation to bring a halt to the increasing inefficiency tied to a rapidly rising volume of mail strangling our postal system. Furthermore, partisan politics and postal excellence do not mix, yet, for 200 years have hindered the entire postal operation. President Nixon and our outstanding Postmaster General, Winton Blount, have taken great forward strides toward the goal of removing the Post Office from politics. Abolition of the old "political advisor system" for filling postmasterships and rural carrier vacancies was a remarkable action. Now, with legislation I am introducing today, we can bring about the final divorce between the postal system and partisan politics.

The Postal Service Act of 1969 removes the Post Office from direct relations with necessarily politically partisan Government officials. The postal service will no longer be headed by a Postmaster General. In place of this historically political figure, there will be a board of seven directors, chosen by the President and confirmed by the Senate to be sure, but selected from private life and without regard for political affiliation. These seven directors will in turn appoint two other members who will be the chief full-time managers of the postal service. They will be selected for their ability as managers and will be accountable to the board for their management of the service.

The Postal Service Act specifically prohibits the use of any political consideration in the selection or promotion of the managing officers and the employees of the service and requires that

all such personnel action be based on merit and fitness.

Prohibitions on political influence within the postal system are valuable. They are needed. A distinct virtue of the present bill is that it not only contains such prohibitions but also creates an organizational structure which fosters their effectiveness. The service is removed from the center of the political stage by the creation of a nonpolitical board of directors. It is twice removed by making its active day-to-day managers immediately responsible to this nonpolitical board.

LEONARD RATNER RECEIVES THE GOLDEN DOOR AWARD

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this evening the Golden Door Award of the Cleveland Nationalities Services Center will be presented to Mr. Leonard Ratner, founder and chairman of the board of directors of Forest City Enterprises, Inc., and nationally known Cleveland philanthropist.

Mr. Ratner is a unique man whose life's philosophy of looking back to where he has been so he can know where he is going, has put service to others in the forefront of his life.

Arriving with his family from Russia over 50 years ago, he has never forgotten the pain and suffering that he left; and has since then, by helping others with financial aid, and even more important, jobs and a place to work, has truly followed his own motto: "Service is our room rent on earth."

The Cleveland Nationalities Services Center is a nonprofit, voluntary agency, member of the Cleveland Welfare Federation and affiliated with the American Council for Nationalities Services in New York City. It is dedicated to aid in community absorption of the foreign born, to prevent isolation of and conflicts between the groups, and to facilitate the enrichment of American culture by their contributions.

Leonard Ratner has made a major contribution to international understanding and to the cultural life of our city and our Nation and is most deserving of this outstanding award.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have opposed the kind of farm programs which are costing the taxpayers of this Nation more than \$3 billion in payments to a small group of producers. The Government farm program has never lived up to its promises. It has meant lower income for farmers, less-efficient production, continuing surpluses, and little or no benefit to consumers.

The American consumer has to pay more for food than the supermarket price; through taxes, he has to hand over his share of the \$3.3 billion that last year went to subsidize farmers—some farmers to the tune of over a million dollars. What a spectacle we offer when we have the Federal Government lavishing payments on wealthy farmers in some of the very counties which have not lifted a finger to set up for their malnourished poor the Federal food-aid programs so easily available to them. The present costly and ineffective farm program is scheduled to end at the close of 1970. I believe that the concept of expensive direct payments to farmowners should end with the program.

Starting in January 1971, the legislation which I am introducing today would regulate an orderly phaseout of farm payments and Government controls. By 1975, it will have eliminated acreage allotments, base acreages, marketing quotas, processing taxes, and direct payments for wheat, feed grains, and cotton. During the 5-year phaseout, a land retirement program would be put into effect to provide a transition period.

The supply management needed to balance production and demand should be worked out by the farmers themselves through their associations, and not imposed by the Government. I am convinced that the farm operators are quite capable of developing whatever policies and programs are called for in adjusting supply to market demand. They will certainly not do any worse than the current program.

The bill also contains—and this is an important point—a special voluntary provision for Government assistance to those noncommercial farmers who have no hope at all of transforming their farms into paying propositions. Here, for the first time, legislation separates the commercial farmer from the noncommercial farmer. We all know that there is a vast difference between the two, and that difference, I think, calls for an appropriate distinction in Government policy.

If we do away with Government controls and make the effort to increase our exports, I believe that we will once again have a healthy agricultural industry.

POSTAL SERVICE ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Postal Service Act of 1969. This is the bill sent up by the President for total reform of the Post Office to meet the needs of today's United States. It is one of the most important steps toward good government that the first session of the 91st Congress can take.

The Post Office today is in deep trouble. If it is not totally reformed—and quickly—the mail system may simply break down and cease functioning.

The Post Office is in trouble because it is trying to meet 20th century needs with a 19th-century organization. It is in

trouble because its equipment is inadequate, its buildings are obsolete, its operating practices are outmoded, and its working conditions are archaic. It is chronically ridden with deficits measured in hundreds of millions of dollars. Unless there is basic reform, we can expect postal deficits of more than \$15 billion in the next 10 years—\$15 billion of tribute to a system whose hallmark is inefficiency.

The Post Office is in trouble because we have not demanded of it the modern management techniques and modern labor-relations techniques that virtually every other major enterprise in the country has employed for decades. We should tolerate no less for the Nations most basic communications system—the U.S. mails. But the mails cannot keep pace with the needs of our expanding population and the demands of our ever-burgeoning economy unless there is thoroughgoing legislative reform.

The Post Office is starved for capital. It cannot fully avail itself of the enormously productive fruits of modern American technology. Postal needs, in a very real sense, are competing with other national needs for congressional appropriations. They have proved unequal to the competition. Alternate means must be provided for meeting the Post Office's requirements for investment capital with which to provide the modern buildings and high-speed equipment needed to move the growing mountain of mail efficiently and economically.

Relations between postal management and the three-quarters of a million dedicated postal workers have been less than satisfactory. The pallid substitute for collective bargaining that now exists in the Post Office gives postal employees no real voice in determining their conditions of employment. Labor and management have no authority to bargain collectively over issues like wages and working conditions—issues on which most employees in the service industries of this country have long enjoyed a right to be heard. As a consequence, there is only frustration and dissatisfaction for all concerned. As the President said yesterday, postal workers should have a stake in the quality of the service that they provide for the public and a reason for pride in themselves and in the job they do.

In the area of postal rates, needed changes and adjustments are too often caught up in a legislative process that is far better suited to deliberating and resolving great issues of national policy than to managing the detailed cost controls and price-adjustment needs of a public service enterprise like the Post Office. Postal rates have not been as responsive as they should be to changing market forces or to the needs of postal users. Changes in postal rates need the public scrutiny of expert, professional rate analysts.

To remedy these ills the bill which I introduce proposes the creation of a separate postal service authority—the U.S. Postal Service—wholly owned by the Federal Government, to be operated in the public interest using the best and most efficient of management methods and techniques to provide up-to-date

postal service for the needs of all Americans.

Responsibility for the management of the postal service will be in a board of directors, seven members to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, and two, the top full-time managers of the service, to be selected by the remainder of the board. The board will have the authority to go with its responsibility for providing efficient postal service at reasonable rates. The postal service will be able to hire and promote employees solely on the basis of merit. It will be able to borrow on the open market for necessary capital investments. It will be able to bargain collectively with employee representatives on wages and working conditions. And the board will be responsible to the Congress and to the American people for the exercise of this authority.

In the discharge of its duties the postal service will at all times be bound by policies established by the Congress. In addition, in the important area of maintaining the best possible rate structure, postal rates will be subject to examination by a panel of expert rate commissioners acting on a public record to insure compliance with the policies which the Congress has established by statute. And before any change in rates becomes final it must be reported to the Congress, which may disapprove the change by concurrent resolution. At every step the public interest will be protected.

The bill that I introduce represents major change; but major change is needed—and needed now—if the Post Office is to give the American people the postal service they deserve. The postal service bill has been designed to keep what is best in the Post Office: The honest, devoted work of thousands of loyal men and women at all levels of postal operations, men and women whose lot will be improved as efficiencies and modernization bring the service into line with other enterprises; the historic tradition of integrity of the mails; and the universality of service which makes the mails the most important of our communications networks.

The bill has also been designed to improve the Post Office where improvement is needed: There will be continuity of professional management; badly needed capital resources will be available; postal rates and postal services will be responsive to the needs and demands of postal users; and postal employees will have a real voice in determining their wages and conditions of employment.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the President's recommendations that this legislation be promptly considered and promptly enacted.

My friend from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) spoke a moment ago about the introduction of a bill to reform the Post Office Department. We have been working on this legislation for a long time. The Post Office Department is in one big mess, and it is not due to any particular administration, and it is not due to any particular Postmaster General. I have served under six of the Postmasters General, and one goes off in one direction and one

goes off in another, and there are all kinds of new people who come in every time a new Postmaster General is selected.

Something has to be done about reforming the Post Office Department or we are going to have a complete breakdown—as a matter of fact, it is almost broken down now.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today two bills identical—but because we can only have a certain number of Members gathered together on one bill, and we have so much interest in this legislation—the bills will be the same, but the names will be different.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people are very much concerned about the postal system and the mess that it is in. I again repeat that this is not due to any one administration, it has just not been taken care of by continuity of management. It has been political, but it should be operated like any other private business, and that is all we hope to accomplish with the bill that I am introducing today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

I believe that the gentleman from Nebraska has succinctly laid on the table the critical problem we face with the present situation in the Post Office Department. I am glad to have joined with the gentleman in sponsoring the legislation the gentleman is introducing today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the minority leader.

THE ARAB STATES AND THE "DECLARATION FOR PEACE"

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 28 the names of 226 Members of Congress appeared on the "Declaration for Peace in the Middle East on the Occasion of Israel's 21st Birthday."

That document expressed the sincere desire of the signers that a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict could take place. It urged Israel and the Arab States to meet face to face to discuss their differences with the hope of ending the conflict which has led to suffering by Israelis and Arabs alike.

The declaration said in part:

We believe that the issues which divide Israel and the Arab states can be resolved in the spirit and service of peace, if the leaders of the Arab states would agree to meet with Israelis in face-to-face negotiations. There is no effective substitute for the procedure. The parties to the conflict must be parties to the settlement. We oppose any attempts by outside powers to impose halfway measures not conducive to a permanent peace. Achieving peace, Israel and the Arab states will be in a position to settle the problems which confront them.

I regret that this appeal by many of the most distinguished Members of the

House and Senate of the United States has fallen on deaf ears. It has unfortunately evoked from the Arab States neither reason nor an attempt at understanding of the issues that divide them from Israel. It has only evoked antagonism and dogma.

The following exchange of correspondence between Mr. Rashad Mourad, permanent observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, and myself, documents this:

MAY 27, 1969.

Mr. RASHAD MOURAD,
Permanent Observer of the League of Arab
States to the United Nations, Arab States
Delegations Office, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MOURAD: I regret that you have rejected the call to peace embodied in our Congressional Declaration, just as the Arab states have rejected all calls to peace for the past 21 years.

I regret that, as Israel celebrates her 21st anniversary, the Arabs are marking the 21st anniversary of their war against Israel. Twenty-one years ago, in defiance of the UN partition resolution and the UN Charter, the armies of the Arab states invaded Palestine/and seized East Jerusalem and what was to have been the Palestinian Arab state. The world community, through the United Nations, had offered self-determination to both the Arabs and the Jews in the area. It was the Arab states which deprived the Palestinian Arabs of their right to self-determination then, and it is the Arab states which still refuse to recognize the right of Israel—a member state of the United Nations—to self-determination.

I regret the plight of the Arab refugees, who left their homes at the behest of the Arab states with the understanding that their departure would be temporary and intended only to facilitate the onslaught of the Arab armies against Israel. I regret, too, that the Arab states, after failing to make good their promise, have refused to take the refugees into their own homes and permit them to lead productive lives, but have instead used their Arab brothers as just one more weapon in their war against Israel.

I regret, finally, that you imply that I, the Congress of the United States, and the American people are shirking our responsibility regarding the achievement of an Arab-Israel peace.

We believe, however, that an Arab-Israel peace should be just that—an Arab-Israel peace. I feel that by trying to bring about Arab-Israel peace negotiations, we are living up to our responsibilities. I look forward to the day when the Arab states will do the same.

Sincerely yours,
LEONARD FARBERSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

ARAB STATES DELEGATIONS OFFICE,
New York, N.Y., May 15, 1969.

HON. LEONARD FARBERSTEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The declaration bearing your signature and published in the form of an advertisement in the New York Times on Sunday, May 11, has prompted me to write you in an effort to present the under publicized version of the tragic Arab-Israeli dispute which is daily assuming alarming proportions.

Sir, while Israel is celebrating her 21st anniversary, allow me to draw your attention to part of the cost resulting from the establishment of this state: the creation of over 1,350,000 Arab refugees; the deprivation of the Arab people of their property rights in Palestine; the reduction to a state of poverty

and misery of the indigenous population; the eradication from the area of Arab culture and civilization and the substitution of a garrison state ruthlessly bent on exploiting her friends and foes alike.

On this 21st anniversary marking the eviction of the Palestinian Arabs, we express our concern at the fact that the Arabs of Palestine are still being denied their fundamental right of self-determination enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Likewise, we regret that after waging three futile and costly wars, the Israelis have not realized that the only path to peace lies in the restoration of Arab rights.

We sincerely believe that the issue which divides Jews and Arabs can be resolved if the Israeli leaders are willing to forgo their annexationist and expansionist designs. There is no substitute for a just and lasting peace other than Israel's withdrawal from occupied Arab territories. Peace, dear sir, cannot be achieved by the imposition of the will of the conqueror on that of the conquered.

The condemnation by the United Nations peace-keeping bodies of Israeli acts of aggression is a contribution by the United Nations to the establishment of an international order based on the rule of law in the area; Israel has not abided by any United Nations resolution.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that Israel, which presently occupies territories three times its original size, owes whatever progress she has achieved to the billions of tax-free American dollars which continue to pour into this state. We appeal to you in the name of justice and peace to approach the Arab-Israeli dispute in an even-handed manner bearing in mind the true interests of the American people.

Respectfully yours,

RASHAD MOURAD,

Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations.

AMERICA'S MILLIONS OF LEARNING DISABLED YOUNGSTERS WOULD BE HELPED BY H.R. 8660

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very long time ago, a wise man observed:

We cannot stand pointing our finger to the heights we want our children to scale. We must start climbing and they will follow.

I recall that advice as I stand here urging passage of legislation which I have introduced to help millions of American children with learning disabilities.

Less than 100 years ago, children were considered of little value.

Youngsters without parents were allowed to wander homeless in the streets.

Nine and 10-year-olds could be executed for crimes as minor as stealing food.

Children of 7 and 8 were sent to work in mills, mines, and factories—places which stunted their growth, destroyed their health, and killed them off anonymously, in tens of thousands.

To poor families, a child's birth was often a calamity. He became merely another mouth to feed. Unless that child could find means to support himself from a very early age, he was often cast out or allowed to die.

In this brutalized world, sheer survival consumed the energy, the health, and the lives of millions.

Late in the 19th century and in the early decades of the 20th century, this horror and cruelty began to end.

Through the efforts of writers, humanists, and missionaries from all walks of life, the conscience of the western world was moved to change the old order of things.

Gradually, the individual child became the focal point of man's hopes for a better future. The terror and disease that had blunted the lives of so many began to recede through legislation and through medicine, and, perhaps most important—through education.

Now we approach the end of the 20th century. Increasingly, man is concerned with unlocking the secrets of his uniqueness and his humanity.

The study of man as a special being—and the development of his potential for intellectual growth—are engaging the interest of people in dozens of inter-related professions—from economics to psycho-pathology.

We know, all of us, that a large measure of cognitive human development takes place in the classroom.

Children are taught to learn and, through learning, are impelled to carve a unique place for themselves in our complex and competitive society.

Significantly, in the sheer weight of numbers of students added to our classrooms each fall, we have encountered a phenomenon that multiplies more rapidly than we have thus far been able to prevent it—the phenomenon of the learning-disabled child.

There was a time when children who had difficulty learning were swept aside or described as "incurable" by teachers and parents.

Teachers devoted their time to good students. Anyone not classified as "good"—which usually meant submissive and capable of rote memorization—was dismissed as mentally defective or a discipline problem. We will never know the devastation these ignorant judgments made on the lives of children who were unable to defend themselves.

Nowadays, with our evolving sensitivity to the countless factors which determine human growth, the child who is having difficulty learning is no longer often written off as lazy, stupid, or merely defiant.

We now know that his inability to learn may be related to a variety of perplexing maladies.

His brain may have been slightly injured at birth, causing real—but often minimal—interference with his ability to perceive letters, colors, and figures as other children do.

He may have impediments to speech and to sight—impediments so slight they may go undetected for years, but which nevertheless prevent his participating to the full extent of his actual intellectual ability.

These handicapping disabilities have a variety of names. Names like dyslexia, a term used to describe any or all forms of reading disorders. Names like aphasia, which describes the impairment of the power to use or understand speech. Names like minimal brain dysfunction or MBD, as it is commonly used, which

means a slight irregularity of the brain's ability to function.

These, and other terms, describe the plight of the children affected, but techniques and solutions to combat the disabilities successfully have not yet been put into nation-wide use.

More and more, however, educators, physicians, psychologists, therapists, social workers—and parents—are becoming involved in discovering ways of helping the learning-disabled child.

And it is because legislators are also now involved in bringing this national problem into the light of public discussion and providing funds to help solve it that I am privileged to speak to you tonight.

The Federal Government, to state the obvious, exists for the people of the United States. All of them.

In recent years it has not been fashionable to hear the Government referred to as either relevant or responsive, but it can be—and usually is—both of these.

When I was first elected to Congress in 1958, the annual education budget of the United States—covering all forms of education—was \$1,081,000,000.

In 1969, the figure was \$7,165,000,000—an increase of more than 600 percent.

Money for elementary and secondary education has increased from \$259 million in 1959 to \$2,182,000,000 this year.

This assistance has provided increased funds for construction, for special materials, for teacher training, for library books and technical facilities, for grants and projects, and demonstrations and programs; all of them designed in cooperation with the individual States to reach as many children as possible with as much talent and technology as could be made available.

I believe most of us are familiar with title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This title provides special assistance to the 50 States for the education of handicapped and exceptional children.

These are children who may be mentally retarded; children who are deaf or hard of hearing; those with speech impairments and visual handicaps; those who are seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or afflicted with health problems that require exceptional facilities.

When we were writing this title into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we had hoped to reach most students with special problems and to assist their teachers, not only to recognize the unique needs of their pupils, but to help the children to develop and to learn.

Recent studies now being published and evaluated indicate there is an even greater need today—the need to reach children with learning disabilities.

Their needs are not being met to any significant extent. Not on a national level, and surely not on a local level.

Learning disabilities may be slight or overwhelming, but they can no longer be merely consigned to the skill, temperament, or the time of the individual teacher in a classroom.

The statistics on the extent of the problem, although incomplete, are nonetheless startling.

It is estimated that one child in seven in above average school districts has serious reading disorders, traceable to learning disabilities, emotional problems, or instructional deficiencies.

Reading disorders among the poor or disadvantaged youngsters range as high as one child in four, and may be even higher in specific school districts.

A study of 36,000 schoolchildren in Michigan revealed that 24 percent of children from low-income families have defective vision, attributable to a variety of causes, which prevent them from learning to capacity.

Of the handicapping conditions listed by the Children's Bureau, visual impairments affect approximately 12.5 million school age children between the ages of 5 and 17 at the present time. Many youngsters suffer multiple learning disabilities.

The bureau estimates that there are 5,400,000 emotionally disturbed schoolchildren; 3,270,000 children have speech impediments; and 2,720,000 are mentally retarded.

In all the definitions of what constitutes impediments to learning, there is a single, consistent element.

This element is that the learning disabilities are usually characterized by a significant discrepancy—usually 2 or more years—between the level where a child is expected to be functioning and the level where he is actually functioning in one learning situation or another.

In general, learning disabilities fall into three main categories: perceptual motor problems, language and communication disorders, and academic subject disabilities such as arithmetic or spelling.

These problems may be seen as a child's inability to transfer single letters into whole words.

He may be unable to reverse letters and numbers. He may be quick in math, but severely handicapped in coordination.

He may excel in spelling, and stumble in recitation. He may be unable to judge distances well or perceive distinctions in shapes and sizes.

The learning disabled child may have one or a combination of these disabilities affecting his memory in some way, his ability to think, his span of attention, his muscular coordination, his sight, his hearing, and his speech.

School districts across the Nation are only just beginning to feel the impact of the need to provide services for this uniquely disabled child.

There are three prevalent educational programs operating in a limited fashion in selected school districts at the present time to deal with learning disabilities.

They are: resource classrooms, self-contained classrooms, and itinerant teacher programs.

To explain further: A resource teacher would be employed by a school district or by a county board of education, for example. She might be assigned to a specific group of children in a particular schoolbuilding.

Those children in need of special assistance would be assigned various periods with this teacher during the day, the periods often coinciding with the

area of study that the children find most difficult.

If a child is experiencing difficulty in reading, then during the regularly scheduled reading period, he would go to the resource classroom and receive intensive work in reading or language.

This type of program has provided measurable success in working with the learning disabled child. It has the advantage that the child spends most of his schoolday with his fellow students in a regular classroom environment.

In the self-contained classroom, children associate almost entirely with other handicapped or other learning-disabled children.

This program is of most help for children who are experiencing problems of such magnitude that they cannot be handled in a regular classroom setting.

Under this program, the children spend the entire day in this special class and have no contact with so-called "normal" children in a school environment.

The third program currently in use in some school districts—primarily rural ones—is the itinerant teacher.

This program operates in a manner similar to the resource program except that, instead of the children coming to the teacher, the teacher travels from school to school with the children.

This provides opportunities for the teacher to work with selected children during a specific period of time.

Which brings us to the consideration of, perhaps, the most crucial problem of all when discussing the implications of learning disabilities for the children themselves, for their parents, and for their communities.

We need trained teachers, a lot more of them than we have now.

We need the brightness and enthusiasm of young teachers. We need the maturity and patience of teachers with long experience.

We need men and women who love to teach and who love children.

That I should spend time emphasizing this point may cause some to question my judgment, for most of us are used to hearing of the teacher shortage. It has been dinned into us for years.

We have heard it so often, in fact, it has lost a lot of its importance. Most of us tend to dismiss it as just another factor in our lives.

I have served on the House Committee on Education and Labor for more than 10½ years and each year I read more in-depth studies and listen to the well-documented testimony of countless witnesses—parents and educators—literally begging for qualified men and women to enter the classrooms of this country.

Several of our colleges and teacher training institutions have independently established programs to prepare teachers and other workers for careers in the field of learning disabilities.

These people are trained to spot the potentially disabled child and to get him to respond to a learning experience.

Up to now, it has been impossible to train people as fast and as quantitatively as the demands are made by State departments of education.

With the most recent estimates setting a figure of learning disabled children as high as 3 million in classrooms in cities and towns across America, we can no longer expect to wish the problem away.

Outside the pages of romantic literature, wishing has proved little good for anything except an alternative to action.

I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, H.R. 8660, to provide special programs for children with learning disabilities.

Basically, this bill would amend title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which I referred to earlier—the title dealing with assistance to handicapped children.

My legislation would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants and to enter into contracts with colleges, universities, State and local education agencies, and public and private education and research agencies to enable them to tackle this problem with every resource they can muster.

The bill would permit funding of surveys and research activities and would encourage pilot and demonstration projects in the field of learning disabilities.

It would provide for professional or advanced training for teachers of children with these special disabilities, as well as training for the supervisors and people who will be responsible for training the teachers themselves.

In particular, I want to emphasize that the bill does provide for special refresher courses for experienced teachers in order to keep them current on new techniques in teaching and ever-alert to the special needs of the children they influence so directly every day.

H.R. 8660 would provide for the establishment and operation of model centers designed not only to improve the learning experience, but to improve the education of the learning disabled child.

These model centers would test and evaluate children referred to them.

The centers would develop and conduct model programs to reach the children and encourage them to respond to a learning experience that emphasizes their genuine abilities.

Further, the centers would offer assistance and advice to agencies and schools interested in setting up model programs of their own. These programs and this assistance would be available to all children with learning disabilities, whether or not they are enrolled in private or public schools.

There have been many exciting experiments that have been undertaken by private laboratories and learning institutions in this field.

Most notably, I refer to the success of Robert Hamblin and David Buckholdt of the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory in St. Ann, Mo.

They have developed an exciting and vastly encouraging system of counteracting the disruptiveness of hyperaggressive children in a classroom by conspicuously rewarding cooperative behavior, thus benefiting all the children and encouraging them to help one another as well as themselves.

By working with teachers who were floundering in dealing with a group of

totally disruptive children, Mr. Hamblin and Mr. Buckholdt managed to give the teachers effective suggestions for reaching all of their students.

The purpose of my legislation is to recognize the extent of our national problem and to devise methods and means of treating it.

Our aim is to provide a systematic approach to encourage potential teachers and veteran teachers to obtain the training they can undoubtedly use to reach these unfortunate youngsters who need so much help.

Thousands of schoolchildren are failing because they are trapped in the cocoon of their special learning disabilities.

Years ago such children were "dunces," alternately hounded, ignored, teased, and shunned by their classmates and, sadly, by their teachers and parents in far too many instances.

With today's emphasis on achievement, with information doubling every 10 years, the child with a learning disability is all the more noticeable.

Once upon a time he would drop out of school after a year or two of failure and perhaps find employment in a trade requiring little skill.

Nowadays multiple skills are essential for people to support themselves decently.

With your help, with the help of organizations and agencies sharing your concern, with the assistance of therapists, teachers, doctors, and technicians of all kinds, the Federal Government hopes to provide a full measure of assistance to eliminate the tragedy of learning disabilities from the lives of millions of children.

As never before, we need the enriching culture of our people; the old ones and the young ones.

There is a place for everyone here. We need their individuality—in this technocratic age—to reinforce our belief in a future that is compassionate enough to revere all human life and safe enough to preserve it.

I am reminded, as I look out upon all of you, of the children we were once, and I recall the words of the man who said, in gazing at the adults of his own generation:

I believe in children—little ones, big ones, chubby and thin ones. There is faith in their eyes, love in their touch, hope in their attitude. I thrill with them at life's happiness, run with them in celebration, bow with them in prayer, and hold them close in tragedy.

I believe in children—the fragile dream of yesterday, life's radiant reality today, and the vibrant force of tomorrow.

For wherever I go I find yesterday's children, who were nurtured in faith and love and learning, at work in building the Kingdom of God.

I am pleased to announce the Subcommittee on General Education which I serve as chairman has agreed today to hold hearings on this important problem.

I am today including with my remarks a copy of H.R. 8660 which I hope will help stimulate discussion on this subject. The bill follows:

H.R. 8660

A bill to provide for special programs for children with learning disabilities

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 "Children With Learning Disabilities Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 be amended—

(1) by redesignating part "E" of such title as part "F" and redesignating sections "611" through "615" as sections "612" through "617" respectively; and

(2) by inserting after part D of such title the following new part:

"PART E—SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

"RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND MODEL CENTERS

"SEC. 611. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, and other public and private educational and research agencies and organizations (except that no grant shall be made other than to a nonprofit agency or organization) in order to carry out a program of—

"(1) research and related activities, surveys, and demonstrations relating to the education of children with learning disabilities.

"(2) professional or advanced training for educational personnel who are teaching, or preparing to be teachers of, children with learning disabilities, or such training for persons who are, or preparing to be, supervisors and teachers of such personnel; and

"(3) establishing and operating model centers for the improvement of education of children with learning disabilities, which centers shall (A) provide testing and educational evaluation to identify children with learning disabilities who have been referred to such centers, (B) develop and conduct model programs designed to meet the special education needs of such children, and (C) assist appropriate educational agencies, organizations, and institutions in making such model programs available to other children with learning disabilities.

In making grants and contracts under this section the Commissioner shall give special consideration to applications which propose innovative and creative approaches to meeting the educational needs of children with learning disabilities, and those which emphasize the prevention and early identification of learning disabilities.

"(b) In making grants and contracts under this title, the Commissioner shall require that—

"(1) to the extent consistent with the number of students enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served, whose educational needs are of the type which the program or project involved is to meet, provision has been made for the participation of such students; and

"(2) Federal funds made available under this title will not be commingled with State and local funds.

"(c) Payments pursuant to grants and contracts under this section shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner.

"(d) For the purposes of this section the term 'children with learning disabilities' means those children who have a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which disorder may manifest itself in imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations. Such disorders include such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Such term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental disadvantage.

"(e) For the purpose of making grants and contracts under this section there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$20,-

000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$31,000,000 for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975."

WHY I OPPOSE AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not the United States should continue its system of military conscription has received a great deal of public attention in recent years. Considerable agitation, both vocal and violent, has been directed against the military draft. What had virtually come to be accepted as the normal way of life in post-World War II America has now been called into question. This stems primarily from the discontent of many of our youth with the Vietnamese war. It is due also to the increasingly apparent discrepancy between the burden which is placed on a relatively few young men and the freedom enjoyed by the majority who escape military service. A great deal of disenchantment with the administration of the Selective Service System and opposition to the whole concept of a military draft have been widely expressed by many segments of American society. Discontent with the draft has led to proposals that it be abolished altogether. As a result, the feasibility of eliminating conscription in favor of a completely voluntary military force is now receiving serious consideration at both the presidential and congressional levels of Government.

I consider the subject of the draft's continuation to be one of the most important issues facing this Nation today. I have given a good deal of thought and study to this matter. After careful consideration of both the pro's and con's of the issue, I have concluded that, as long as the United States needs to maintain large armed forces—in-being to protect its security, the wiser course of action at the present time is to retain the draft.

My primary reason for advocating retention of the draft is a philosophic one which is related to the preservation of our democratic freedoms. I refer to the importance of the maintenance of civilian control of the military. This is a fundamental principle of American government. I feel that civilian control over the Armed Forces would be seriously undermined and weakened by an all-voluntary professional military force.

The record of large professional armies throughout history is not a commendable one. I think it might be well to refresh our memories of the bitter experience of the American colonists with a large standing army composed entirely of professional mercenary soldiers. An army so constituted was the instrument by which British tyranny was imposed upon the Colonies. Based upon its record and conduct, the colonials developed a well-founded suspicion and distrust of professional armies. Many of the colonists and their ancestors had come to America to escape military tyranny. Many had sought freedom from feudal lords and kings who possessed mercenary

armies to which they were forced to supply food, shelter, and money. Quite naturally, the early settlers were alarmed to find the hated trappings of militarism transplanted by agents of the British Crown to American soil.

The American colonists' resentment of the abuses of military power and their strong belief in the necessity of civilian control of the military found expression in their catalog of grievances against the British Crown. In the Declaration of Independence, King George III was charged with having "kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislatures," and having rendered "the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power."

James Madison, writing in the *Federalist Papers*, expressed a common American fear of the potential dangers to a free people from a large military force. He reminded the men who were drafting the Constitution "that the liberties of Rome proved the final victim to her military triumphs; and that the liberties of Europe, as far as they ever existed, have, with few exceptions, been the price of her military establishment."

The wise Mr. Madison further pointed out that "on an extensive scale," the consequences of a large standing army could be "fatal."

Some States, in ratifying the Constitution, went so far as to suggest that the Constitution should contain a clause enunciating the principle "that standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty, and therefore ought to be avoided, as far as circumstances and protection of the community will admit; and that in all cases, the military should be under strict subordination to, and governed by the civil power."

So distasteful was the memory of British rule that many men proposed that the United States keep no army in peacetime at all.

Nevertheless, the greatest majority of the Founding Fathers fully recognized the necessity of the army and navy to the self-preservation of the newly-formed Nation. However, to guard against the possibility that the Armed Forces might attain overwhelming military power, they included appropriate civilian controls in the Constitution. For example, the Congress was given power over the purse strings and a 2-year limitation was placed on appropriations that could be made at any one time for military expenditures. To further safeguard against the possibility of the abuse of military power, civilian authority over the military was divided between the President and the Congress. This division of responsibility was considered by the Constitution-makers to be the best way to prevent the concentration of armed might in the hands of the Federal Government. In part, it reflected the States' lingering fears of an overly powerful central government and of the possibility that a future President might entertain kingly ambitions.

Furthermore, by deciding to place their major reliance for defense on the States' militias, or citizen-soldiers, the framers of the Constitution took another step in the direction of preventing the

evolution of a distinct military entity in the United States. The Minutemen of Lexington and Concord were considered to be the prototypes of the soldiers whom the populace could trust with the responsibility of arms. The Nation would rely primarily upon such men for protection in an emergency. In fact, throughout the greater part of our history, the citizen-soldiers of Massachusetts who left their plows and workbenches to defeat a column of British regulars in 1775, were the American soldier-ideal.

The militia principle was given very explicit expression by the second amendment to the Constitution which states that:

A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

It may be argued by proponents of a voluntary Army, that the volunteer tradition is also a strong component of the American military heritage. They may further object that the fears of the Founding Fathers with respect to potential military tyranny have never been even remotely realized although the United States has maintained a completely voluntary or professional army during the greater portion of its existence. At no time did it constitute a threat to our liberties.

I should like to point out that, during the periods of time when a totally voluntary army was maintained by the United States, it was a comparatively small force in proportion to the total population. In all of our wars which have involved mass mobilization—that is, the employment of millions of men by the military service—conscription has been adopted. Thus, conscript armies were used in the Civil War, the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean war. Only in relatively minor conflicts, such as the Mexican War and the Spanish-American War, have purely volunteer armies been employed.

To further illustrate, the peak strength of the Armed Forces employed during World War I was 4,560,000; during World War II, 12,276,000; in the Korean war, 3,500,000. Since the Second World War, we have been obliged to maintain a standing army of between 2 and 3 million men. We will probably continue to do so until world tension subsides enough to allow substantial reductions in force.

By contrast, the peak strength of men employed in the Mexican War was 133,500; and in the Spanish-American War, 307,000.

Thus, since colonial times, the United States has never had experience with what Madison termed an army "on an extensive scale" in which the draftee, or nonprofessional, was not utilized. We have, in other words, no historical basis for optimism that a large voluntary army would not prove a threat to civilian control over the military. I, for one, do not wish to risk the possibility of such a threat developing as long as we are compelled to maintain massive Armed Forces. I believe that the draftee in the ranks is our best insurance against its potential occurrence.

A totally professional army would be largely composed of men whose habits, goals, and attitudes would tend to be predominantly military. A professional military force is potentially dangerous because it tends to become devoted to its own self-interest and perpetuation. Removed as he is from other sectors of society, there is the danger that the military man may become too parochial in his interests.

It is in the nature of military life that the individual owes primary allegiance to the service with which he is associated. The individual is subordinated to the group to a greater degree than in any other occupation or association in civilian life. The military assumes control over all areas of an individual's life to an extent unknown in the remainder of society. The man who chooses to make his future in the Armed Forces accepts the fact that the interest of his particular service will come foremost in his life.

I do not mean to sound critical of the military services per se. My remarks are merely statements of the facts of life. Individual subordination and dedication to duty are absolutely essential if the Armed Forces are to perform their assigned mission.

However, when the military services number in the millions, as they do today, the draftee can act as an essential counterbalance to any excessive professionalization. The conscript system guarantees the constant introduction into the Military Establishment of persons who are primarily oriented to civilian life. The draftee, although he receives training in military habits and attitudes, is generally a man who intends to spend only the prescribed amount of time in service before resuming his civilian pursuits. The influx of draftees into the services means that a healthy civilian influence is maintained. Furthermore, as draftees are drawn from all socioeconomic levels of society, they are more broadly representative of American society than a purely voluntary force would probably prove to be in practice.

The draft is often legitimately criticized on grounds that, despite its egalitarian principles, it is discriminatory in practice. Although the draft draws men from all social strata, it nevertheless favors the more affluent young men who can afford to go to college and obtain student deferments. It is true that men from our less privileged citizenry bear a disproportionate share of the Nation's military burden. However, I believe that an all-voluntary Army, whose recruitment depended upon monetary incentives, would inevitably contain an even greater proportion of the disadvantaged. They would be obliged to carry an even greater share of the weight of the Nation's defense than they do at present. The affluent could escape military service altogether and be free to attend to their own careers while their less fortunate contemporaries protected the welfare of all. The man who joins the service because he has little economic choice may feel considerably more discriminated against under a totally voluntary system than he does with the draft, however imperfect its operation.

Without doubt, an army recruited through the use of incentives such as increased pay would tend to become an army of the poor and underprivileged. In all probability it would also contain a large element of young men who cannot compete successfully in civilian life. To many, the wearing of a uniform provides symbolic status which they cannot attain elsewhere.

In support of the foregoing contention, is the fact that the highest military retention rates are among men who are derived from our lower economic classes. The greatest number of volunteers for the Armed Forces already come from lower income groups and from the poorer regions of the Nation in which the chances of obtaining a high paying job are scarce. Furthermore, during times past, when the United States had an all-volunteer force, the Army historically provided a haven from economic insecurity.

The disadvantaged or disposers who would become the mainstay of an all-volunteer force will be strongly inclined to identify with the services which give them status, material security, and a steady income. This, in turn, would serve to reinforce natural tendencies among such men to place primary emphasis on the perpetuation and advancement of the Armed Forces in which they acquire a vested interest.

Another dimension to the problem of the poor and their relation to military service is the fact that many of our underprivileged citizens are Negroes. An all-volunteer force might well contain a disproportionate segment, or even preponderance, of blacks. This could lead to further inflammation of racial tensions in the United States because it might easily result in charges that black men were being used to fight white men's wars or to defend white institutions. The explosive content of such an issue cannot be overstated.

My opposition to an all-volunteer army rests also on more pragmatic grounds. A voluntary army would lack the flexibility to adjust to changing manpower requirements. With its reliance on personal choice, there is no guarantee that a voluntary system could provide large quantities of manpower that might be needed in a hurry.

The circumstances of modern warfare no longer allow us a long time to prepare for combat after the instigation of a conflict. Forces have to be moved on short notice and large reservoirs of trained men often must be available immediately. The days are over when the United States will have a safe margin of time in which to mobilize and train its manpower while its allies carry on the initial fighting as they did in two world wars. In today's world, and for the foreseeable future, trained forces in-being count a great deal more than potential forces. I do not believe we should gamble our national security on a purely voluntary system that might or might not meet our manpower requirements.

If we are to follow the scheme of those who advocate complete recruitment of servicemen through the aid of monetary incentives, we would find ourselves in a

rather untenable position if a sudden expansion of our Armed Forces should prove necessary. In order to make upward adjustments in military force levels, the Congress would presumably have to make corresponding adjustments in military pay levels and bonuses. This would be awkward, impractical, and time-consuming.

In addition, in time of hostilities, I believe that increased pay would surely prove futile as a means of recruiting sufficient manpower. The United States has always suffered difficulty in raising armies by voluntary means in wartime. Volunteers for service in Vietnam, for example, have not been sufficient to preclude resort to the draft. Moreover, recruitment difficulties are undoubtedly increased by the fact that civilian employment is generally high during periods of armed conflict.

Even in the absence of conflict, I seriously doubt that the services could obtain enough volunteers to supply their anticipated manpower needs. Added enlistment incentives would probably not close the gap between actual military requirements and the force levels obtainable by purely voluntary means.

Some significant relevant statistics were produced as a result of a career motivation survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Department of Defense in 1966. This study revealed that, among nonveterans, aged 16 to 34, fringe benefits ranked eighth in a list of nine factors which might influence an individual's choice of career or job. In fact, less than 3 percent of those interviewed placed fringe benefits first in their considerations. In the matter of increased pay, it was found that only 4 percent of the 16 to 19-year olds interviewed regarded equalizing military with civilian pay scales to be a significant inducement to enlistment. It is also interesting to note that, of the same group, only 17 percent thought that raising military pay levels above those of civilians for comparable work would prove attractive.

The stimulus which the draft now provides to voluntary service enlistments is commonly acknowledged, even by the draft's opponents. On the basis of an internal survey of military personnel, the Department of Defense came to the conclusion that only about 50 to 60 percent of the present number of volunteers might be procured in the future if there were no draft. The anticipated drop in officer and reserve enlistments would be especially sharp. On an overall basis the Department of Defense estimated that, in the absence of conscription, it could meet only about two-thirds of its anticipated military requirements in the 1970's.

Without the draft, the services would probably also suffer from serious qualitative deficiencies in manpower. The draft brings into the Armed Forces many well-educated, intelligent individuals who would never enter the service at all if a totally voluntary system were in effect. Above average mentality and education are required to master technical skills, handle modern weapon systems, and understand the management of large

organizational units. It is highly doubtful that the men who would be most responsive to financial incentives to enlistment would be people of superior aptitudes so sorely needed by the services.

These foregoing conclusions as to quantitative and qualitative deficiencies of an all-volunteer force are supported by the studies made by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service and the Civilian Advisory Panel of the House Armed Services Committee in 1967. Both groups concluded that a totally voluntary military establishment is not feasible at this time.

The anticipated costs of attempting to provide for a purely voluntary army are enormous. Defense Department estimates in 1966 of the amount of money required to stimulate volunteer enlistments range from about four to as high as \$17 billion annually, depending upon the employment levels prevailing in the civilian economy. Therefore, adoption of an all-volunteer army does not seem prudent at a time when we are trying to find ways in which to reduce inflationary Federal expenditures.

In conclusion, I would like to say that military manpower problems will continue to be complex and difficult. It is always easier to point out the inadequacies of procurement systems than to provide feasible solutions. No perfect or completely satisfactory answers will be found to the problems which the military draft presents to this country as long as world conditions remain unstable. I do believe, however, that we can improve the administration of the Selective Service System and find ways to make the draft more acceptable to all sectors of society. I shall continue to make every possible endeavor to attain those goals.

POSTAL SERVICE ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the first section provides a short title for the act: the "Postal Service Act of 1969."

OUTLINE OF THE POSTAL SERVICE ACT OF 1969

Section 2 is the bulk of the bill. It completely revises title 39 of the United States Code. Provisions in the present title 39 which are not included in the sections set out in the bill are repealed or superseded. A summary analysis of the revised title 39 follows my remarks.

Section 3 is a usual provision in legislative modifications precluding an inference of legislative construction of sections by their captions or by the chapters in which they are placed.

Section 4 provides that cross references appearing in other titles in the United States Code to existing sections of title 39 shall be deemed to refer to the corresponding sections, if any, in the revised title 39 and that references made in law to the "Postmaster General" and "Post Office Department" shall be deemed to be references to the "U.S. Postal Service" established in the revised title 39.

Section 5 provides that the repealed provisions of title 39 automatically became regulations of the Postal Service to the extent these provisions are within the power of the Postal Service to make, until changed by the Postal Service.

Section 6 similarly continues in effect the outstanding orders, rules, and regulations issued by the Postmaster General and the Post Office Department until they are repealed or revised by the Postal Service.

Section 7 directs the Postal Service to prepare proposals for modification of the so-called Private Express Statutes which confer a limited monopoly of the business of carrying letters for hire on the Post Office Department, and, under the bill, on the Postal Service. The Postal Service is directed to submit its recommendations to the Congress within 2 years after enactment of the act.

Section 8 makes changes in title 18 of the United States Code to conform the provisions of the criminal laws to the changes made in the revision of title 39.

Section 9 makes conforming changes in laws not modified in titles 18 or 39.

Section 10 is the usual separability provision in legislation.

Section 11 provides for the payment of expenses of the Postal Service until commencement of Postal Service operation out of appropriations available to the Post Office Department.

Section 12 provides effective dates for the legislation.

The summary referred to follows:

CHAPTER-BY-CHAPTER SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF REVISED TITLE 39

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

This chapter includes Congressional findings that change is needed in the postal establishment, that a Government-owned corporation is the most effective organization for the postal system, that the system should be self-supporting, and that working conditions and career opportunities should be improved.

CHAPTER 2—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

This chapter provides the basic organization for a new corporate structure of the postal establishment under the name "United States Postal Service." A period up to one year after enactment is provided for preparation for commencement of operations. The Postal Service is to be controlled by a nine-man board of directors: seven appointed by the President (with Senate confirmation) with rotating seven-year terms; the eighth appointed as Chief Executive Officer by the seven Presidentially-appointed directors; and the ninth—the Chief Operating Officer—appointed by the eight. The Presidentially-appointed directors are to serve part time; the eighth and ninth directors serve full time and their compensation and tenure are fixed by the seven. No officer or employee of the Postal Service may be paid in excess of the compensation for Level I of the Executive Schedule.

The chapter contains customary provisions for quorums and board procedures, including power to delegate any function of the board.

The Postal Service is empowered to sue and to be sued in its corporate name, to adopt by-laws and regulations, to enter into and perform contracts, to keep its own system of accounts, to acquire and dispose of property, to settle claims, and so forth. (These corporate powers are like those of the Tennessee Valley Authority.)

This chapter also makes inapplicable to the Postal Service federal laws dealing with public contracts, property, works, employees, or funds, *except* as otherwise provided. There are, however, carried forward the provisions of the criminal code applicable to postal matters; existing laws relating to condemnation procedures; current provisions of title 5 regarding postal employees' rights to organize, anti-discrimination in employment, loyalty oaths, ban on strikes by federal employees, and "Hatch Act" ban on political activities; Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; and existing contractor labor standards statutes (e.g., Davis-Bacon Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Service Contract Act).

This chapter requires an annual report from the Postal Service to the Congress and explicitly reserves to the Congress the power to alter, amend, or repeal any or all sections of the new title 39.

CHAPTER 4—SERVICES

This chapter prescribes the general duties of the Postal Service—to develop and provide adequate and efficient postal service at fair and reasonable rates and to serve as nearly as practicable the entire population of the United States. It specifically empowers the Postal Service to provide for collection and delivery of the mails, establish necessary post offices, sell stamps, provide philatelic services, investigate postal offenses, and the like.

This chapter retains in substance existing maximum limits on the size and weight of packages that the Postal Service may handle.

This chapter provides for the continuance of APO and FPO service and service to military installations and for the continuance of existing authority to negotiate international postal arrangements.

CHAPTER 6—MAIL MATTER

This chapter substantially continues existing law in respect to "non-mailable matter" (e.g., lottery mail, mail involving false representations for obtaining money, obscene mail) and in respect to "penalty mail" and franking privileges.

CHAPTER 8—PERSONNEL

This chapter provides that the Postal Service may appoint and promote officers and employees without regard to the provisions of the Civil Service laws, with two very important exceptions. First, subject to collective bargaining procedures described below, the Postal Service must establish procedures to assure its employees of opportunities for promotion and career development and an opportunity to be heard before adverse actions are taken. Second, pending the establishment of such procedures, the "adverse action" procedures of the existing Civil Service laws will continue to apply.

No political test or qualification is permitted and all personnel actions must be taken on the basis of merit and fitness. The provisions of the Veterans Preference Act apply to the Postal Service.

This chapter provides that employees of the Post Office Department shall become employees of the Postal Service, except that any employee of the Post Office Department is eligible, at his election, to transfer to the same or a higher grade elsewhere in the Government if a position for which he is qualified is open. Compensation, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment applicable to employees immediately before they become employees of the Postal Service will continue to apply until changed by the Postal Service.

Employees of the Postal Service will be covered by the Civil Service Retirement Program.

Labor-management relations are generally subject to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, except as otherwise provided in the new title 39. Labor-management disputes arising during the life of a collective bargaining agreement will be

settled in accordance with procedures agreed to by the parties. Disputes arising outside of a collective bargaining agreement will likewise be settled under any procedures that the parties may agree to; but if no procedures are agreed to, either party may cause the matter to be referred to a permanent "Postal Disputes Panel." (The Postal Disputes Panel has nine members: three named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, three named by the American Arbitration Association, and the last three named by the first six.) The Postal Disputes Panel may apply any of a wide range of settlement techniques to resolve the dispute, including mediation, fact-finding, and recommendations. In the Panel's discretion, it may refer any issue in dispute to final and binding arbitration by an impartial three-man board of arbitration which is to be set up on a "this dispute only" basis. In the alternative, the Postal Disputes Panel may decide that the status quo shall be maintained with respect to any issue in dispute. The statute specifically expresses the intent of Congress that the parties adopt their own procedures for resolving negotiating impasses; the statutory machinery would be available, however, as a last resort.

CHAPTER 10—FINANCE

This chapter provides that the initial capital of the Postal Service shall be the equity of the United States in the present Post Office Department as reflected in the President's budget; that the Postal Service and the General Services Administration will work out exactly which properties shall be transferred to the Postal Service and which will remain in the United States, subject to approval by the Bureau of the Budget; and that there shall be established in the Treasury a Postal Service fund to be credited with all revenues and receipts of the Postal Service and to be available for the payment of any and all expenses incurred by the Postal Service. Transitional appropriations are authorized.

The Postal Service is authorized to borrow money and issue obligations up to 10 billion dollars, but the net increase in obligations for capital improvements may not exceed 1.5 billion dollars in any one fiscal year. The terms and conditions of the Postal Service's obligations shall be the subject of consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, and he may elect to purchase any or all Postal Service obligations. However, the maximum mandatory exposure of the Treasury is limited to 2 billion dollars. Obligations sold to the public would not be guaranteed by the United States.

The Comptroller General is required to audit the transactions of the Postal Service, but the Postal Service is authorized to allow credit for any expenditure which its Board determines to have been necessary.

CHAPTER 12—RATES AND RATEMAKING

Subchapter I establishes the rate policies that the Postal Service is to follow. The Service is to become self-sufficient within five years of the commencement of operations. Rates are to be set so that each class of service pays at least its own identifiable costs and so that the revenues of the Postal Service as a whole meet its expenses, taking into account appropriations that the Congress may choose to make to cover the loss of revenues on free and subsidized mail. Existing postal rates stay unchanged until modified pursuant to subchapter II.

The same groups that enjoy the benefits of free or reduced rate mail today will continue to enjoy these benefits until changed by law, if and to the extent that Congress appropriates to the Postal Service the revenue foregone from the free or reduced rates.

Subchapter II provides a comprehensive procedure for rate setting and service changes. Rate changes and significant serv-

ice changes are initiated by the Postal Service management but cannot become effective until after public notice and hearing before a three-man panel of Rate Commissioners, who are independent of the management and who are responsible only to the Presidentially-appointed members of the board of directors. (Minor service changes may be made only under procedures that have been subject to the public-notice-and-hearing process.) After making a record, the Rate Commissioners render an initial decision which the Presidentially-appointed members of the board may either reject, adopt, or modify. Except for special services (c.o.d., special delivery, etc.), decisions of the board on rate changes are transmitted to the Congress and become final unless disapproved by concurrent resolution within 60 days.

CHAPTER 14—PRIVATE CARRIAGE OF LETTERS

This chapter substantially continues existing law in respect to the so-called Private Express Statutes. Similarly, existing law is substantially carried forward in respect to searches of mailable matter apparently being transported in violation of law, seizures of letters being carried contrary to law, and disposition of seized mail.

CHAPTER 16—TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

Subchapter I generally authorizes the Postal Service to provide for the transportation of the mails and to contract for such transportation.

Subchapter II covers transportation of mail by railroads, motor carriers, and freight forwarders. Regulated motor carriers and freight forwarders would have the same statutory obligation to transport mail and provide related services as now applies to the railroads—that is, carriers and forwarders are required to transport mail tendered by the Postal Service, subject to fair and reasonable compensation and to I.C.C. rate making. Additionally, the Postal Service may enter into contracts with carriers at rates different from those set by the I.C.C.

Subchapter III would give the Postal Service the same authority to negotiate with air carriers for mail transportation as the Post Office Department now has in regard to mail carried by railroads.

CHAPTER 18—MISCELLANEOUS

Chapter 18 substantially carries forward existing statutory provisions regarding convict labor, uniforms, special delivery messengers, collection of debts, administration of accounts for international mail, informers' fees, delivery of stolen money to the owner, substitute checks, filing of information for 2nd-class publications, and printing illustrations of stamps.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 1

Section 101, Definitions: This section defines the terms "Postal Service," "Board," and "Board of Directors."

Section 102, Findings of the Congress and Declaration of Policy. This section outlines Congressional findings and states the purposes of the bill.

Subsection (a) states the importance of the postal service to the Nation's activities in language derived largely from the existing Postal Policy Act. In addition, this subsection indicates the handicaps imposed on postal operations by outmoded policies and procedures, and states that an effective solution to these problems is establishment of a government-owned postal service corporation.

Subsection (b) states the purposes of the bill: to provide fairly-priced and dependable postal service on a self-supporting basis, and to improve the lot of the postal employee.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 2

Section 201, Definitions: This section defines the terms "Presidentially-appointed Directors" and "Chief Executive Officer."

Section 202, The United States Postal Service: This section establishes the "United States Postal Service" as a body corporate and an instrumentality of the United States, to own and operate the postal system. The Postal Service is to commence operations within one year.

Section 203, The Board of Directors: This section details the selection and voting procedures of the Board of Directors.

Subsection (a) establishes a nine-man Board.

Subsection (b) states that the President with the advice and consent of the Senate shall name seven of the nine members, to serve for rotating seven-year terms. Appointments are to be representative of the public generally, without regard to political affiliations and without regard to specific interests connected with the postal service. The President may at any time designate which of the seven shall serve as Chairman and may remove directors for cause.

Subsection (c) states that the seven Presidentially-appointed directors appoint the eighth director, to serve as Chief Executive Officer at their pleasure.

Subsection (d) states that the Presidentially-appointed directors and the Chief Executive Officer appoint the ninth director, to serve as Chief Operating Officer at their pleasure.

Subsection (e) sets the compensation of the Presidentially-appointed directors at \$5,000 annually plus \$300 for each meeting attended, subject to adjustment in accordance with the Executive Pay Act.

Subsection (f). Gives authority to the Presidentially-appointed directors to fix compensation of the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Operating Officer. Section 806 of the title sets a ceiling for compensation at a salary paid for Level I of the Executive Schedule.

Subsection (g). Allows the Board to act as long as sufficient members are in office to form a quorum.

Subsection (h). Establishes the usual rule for action by a Board: majority vote of the quorum of five members. Three exceptions to this rule are specified:

(1) Appointment and removal of the Chief Executive Officer, and fixing of compensation for the Chief Executive and Chief Operating Officers, are by absolute majority of the Presidentially-appointed directors in office.

(2) Appointment and removal of the Chief Operating Officer is by absolute majority of the Chief Executive and the Presidentially-appointed directors in office.

(3) Certain other actions specified in the title, such as rate-making decisions of the Board, are exclusively by the Presidentially-appointed directors.

Subsection (i). Indicates that the Presidentially-appointed directors serve part-time—consistent with industry practice on "outside" members of boards of directors—provided that their other employment is non-federal and not inconsistent with their duties to the Postal Service. All other employees, except as otherwise provided, are appointed by the Board, subject to the succeeding section.

Section 204, Procedures of the Board of Directors: This section gives the Board general authority, consistent with the title, to delegate its powers to committees, officers, and employees. The Board retains full responsibility for operations, and retains power to revoke all delegations of powers.

Section 205, General Powers: This section grants general powers to the Postal Service:

- (1) to perpetual corporate life;
- (2) to sue and be sued in its own name, as provided in Section 208;
- (3) to adopt a corporate seal;
- (4) to adopt bylaws and regulations;
- (5) to enter into contracts, execute instruments, and determine the character of, and necessity for, its expenditures. (Under section 1008, audit by the Comptroller General

is retained, but the GAO may not disallow Postal Service expenditures.)

(6) to determine its own accounting system and use its own contract forms;

(7) to have the debt priority of the United States;

(8) to acquire, use, and dispose of real and personal property;

(9) to construct, use and lease buildings, facilities and other improvements on property;

(10) to accept gifts of property or service;

(11) to settle and compromise claims;

(12) to exercise the right of eminent domain;

(13) to have all other powers incidental, necessary or appropriate to its functions.

These powers, broad and general in style, are essentially the same as the powers of TVA. They are exercised in the carrying on of the duties and specific powers of chapter 4 (sections 401, 402) and are broad enough to allow such things as programs for research, experimentation and development.

Section 206, Judicial Officer: This section carries over with conforming changes existing provisions which authorize a judicial officer for such functions as hearing appeals from hearing examiners.

Section 207, Cooperation with other Government Agencies: This section authorizes provision of property and services by the Postal Service to other Government agencies and by those agencies to the Postal Service. Terms, including reimbursement, are to be set by agreement of the Board of the Postal Service and the head of the agency involved. The kinds of services that may be furnished are not limited. Contracting services, for example, are included in this authorization.

Section 208, Suits by and against the Postal Service: This section details procedures for suits to which the Postal Service is a party.

Subsection (a) suits may be brought in state courts, federal district courts, or the Court of Claims, and may be removed from the state to the federal courts.

Subsection (b) service of process, venue, and limitations shall be as provided in title 28 for the United States, its officers or employees.

Subsection (c) the Federal Tort Claims Act applies to the Postal Service.

Subsection (d) the Department of Justice will conduct litigation for the Postal Service, but the Postal Service has authority, upon consent of the Attorney General, to hire or retain counsel of conduct litigation.

Section 209, Application of other laws: This section excludes the operation of federal laws dealing with contracts, property, works, officers, employees or funds except as provided in the title or in the bylaws of the Postal Service. The following provisions are made specifically applicable:

(1) The employee policies and suitability, security, and conduct provisions of the Civil Service laws;

(2) The provisions of the criminal laws applicable to the mails and Government employees;

(3) The Government Corporation Control Act, except as expressly provided otherwise;

(4), (5) Contractor labor standards provisions applicable to Government contracts;

(6) Equal opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Section 210, Annual Reports: This section requires an annual report to the President and Congress.

Section 211, Reservation of Powers: This section reserves the power of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal the sections of the title, subject only to contracts made by the Postal Service pursuant to its powers.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 4

Section 401, General Duties:

Subsection (a) outlines the service policy of the Postal Service. It is to plan, develop,

promote, and provide adequate and efficient postal service at fair and reasonable rates and fees. The service is defined as the receipt, transmission, and delivery of written and printed matter, parcels, and similar materials, and services incidental thereto. The service is to be provided as nearly as practicable to the entire United States population (except for the Canal Zone, which is otherwise provided for. The service is to reach, pursuant to international arrangements, the entire world.

Subsection (b) outlines service objectives: provide an efficient sorting, collection and delivery system; provide service responsive to the needs of the mail users; and maintain facilities located to provide ready access to essential postal services.

Subsection (c) enjoins the Postal Service from unduly or unreasonably discriminating among users or granting undue or unreasonable preferences in providing services or establishing classifications, rates, or fees.

Section 402, Specific Powers: This section catalogues the specific powers of the Postal Service which, in conjunction with the general powers granted in section 205, are to be used in carrying out postal service duties. The Postal Service is to have the power to provide for the collection, handling, transportation, delivery, forwarding, returning, and holding of mail, and for the disposition of undeliverable mail; to prescribe, as provided in Chapter 12 and elsewhere, the amount of postage and the manner in which it is to be paid; to determine the need for and provide postal facilities, offices, and equipment and training facilities and equipment; to provide and sell stamps, stamped paper, cards, envelopes, and other evidences of payment of postage and fees; to provide philatelic services and special, non-postal, or similar services; and to investigate postal offenses and matters concerning the Postal Service and to pay rewards. This last power authorizes, among other things, the continuation of the Postal Inspection Service.

Section 403, Service Classification and Mailable Matter: This section authorizes the Postal Service to promulgate rules and regulations concerning mailing, subject to the provisions of Chapter 12. The Postal Service may not refuse to accept any mailable matter meeting minimum size and weight limitations, but may levy special charges for carrying such matter if it is not mailed in accordance with the rules so promulgated. Existing maximum size and weight limitations are preserved.

Section 404, Postal Services at Armed Forces Installations: This section carries over in a simplified form existing provisions of law concerning military post offices and military mail clerks.

Section 405, International Postal Arrangements: This section carries over with minor modifications existing provisions of law concerning international postal arrangements.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 3

This chapter continues substantially unchanged the existing provisions of chapter 51 of title 39 concerning nonmailable matter. It also continues the existing provisions of chapter 57 of title 39 concerning Penalty and Franked Mail. It also continues those existing provisions of that part of section 4303 which relate to air lifting of soldier mail with an improved provision for reimbursement.

Section 601, Nonmailable matter: This section continues § 4001 of the present title 39 with the addition of (d) pertaining to matters exceeding limitations and perishables.

Section 602, Nonmailable motor vehicle master keys: This section continues § 4010 of the present title 39.

Section 603, Mail bearing a fictitious name or address: This section continues § 4003 of the present title 39.

Section 604, Delivery of mail to persons not residents of the place of address: This section continues § 4004 of the present title 39.

Section 605, False representations; lotteries: This section continues § 4005 of the present title 39.

Section 606, "Unlawful" matter: This section continues § 4006 of the present title 39.

Section 607, Detention of mail for temporary periods: This section continues § 4007 of the present title 39.

Section 608, Prohibition of pandering advertisements in the mails: This section continues § 4009 of the present title 39.

Section 651, Definitions: This section continues § 4151 of the present title 39 defining terms pertinent to penalty and franked mail.

Section 652, Penalty mail: This section continues § 4152 of the present title 39.

Section 653, Endorsements on penalty covers: This section continues § 4153 of the present title 39.

Section 654, Restrictions on use of penalty mail: This section continues § 4154 of the present title 39.

Section 655, Accounting for penalty covers: This section continues § 4155 of the present title 39.

Section 656, Reimbursement for penalty mail service: This section § 4156 of the present title 39.

Section 657, Limit of weight of penalty mail; postage on overweight matter: This section continues § 4158 of the present title 39.

Section 658, Shipment by most economical means: This section continues § 4159 of the present title 39.

Section 659, Executive departments to supply information: This section continues § 4160 of the present title 39.

Section 660, Official correspondence of Vice President and Members of Congress: This section continues § 4161 of the present title 39.

Section 661, Public documents: This section continues § 4162 of the title 39.

Section 662, Congressional Record under frank of Members of Congress: This section continues § 4163 of the present title 39.

Section 663, Seeds and reports from Department of Agriculture: This section continues § 4164 of the present title 39.

Section 664, Mailing privilege of former Presidents: This section continues § 4165 of the present title 39.

Section 665, Lending or permitting use of frank unlawful: This section continues § 4166 of the present title 39.

Section 666, Reimbursement for franked mailings: This section continues § 4167 of the present title 39.

Section 667, Correspondence of members of diplomatic corps and consuls of countries of Postal Union of Americas and Spain: This section continues § 4168 of the present title 39.

Section 668, Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations. This section continues § 4169 of the present title 39.

Section 669, Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations in the Canal Zone: This section continues § 4170 of the present title 39.

Section 670, Franked mail for surviving spouses of Members of Congress: This section continues § 4171 of the present title 39.

Section 671, Armed forces mailing privileges: This section continues § 4303(d)(5), (6) and (f), of the present title 39, except that subsection (c) clarifies provision for reimbursement.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 8

Section 801, Appointments and Promotions:

Subsection (a) establishes a merit system of employment, promotion and adverse action outside the Civil Service System and

subject to collective bargaining agreements. The adverse action provisions of the Civil Service laws continue to apply, however, until new procedures are established by the Postal Service.

Subsection (b) authorizes long-term employment contracts, necessary in many instances to obtain top executives, but leaves the Board free to remove any appointee on payment of contract damages.

Subsection (c) prohibits political tests or qualifications in personnel actions, and prescribes penalties for violation of this prohibition.

Subsection (d) makes the veterans' preference applicable to the Postal Service. Though Postal Service employees will not be within the classified Civil Service, effective personnel policies for carrying out the veterans' preference will be instituted, as in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Also applicable, in the same manner as to private employers, are the provisions governing reemployment rights of former military personnel. The Postal Service is directed to follow an enlightened policy designed to extend opportunity to the disadvantaged and the handicapped. Existing Government-wide policy to assure equal employment opportunity (Section 7151 of title 5) applies to the Postal Service by specific cross-reference in section 209 of the title.

Subsection (e) permits dual employment and dual compensation to deal with such problems as providing fourth-class postmasters in Alaska, who often serve part-time while holding positions as resident commissioners. This is a carry-forward, in substantially more general terms, of existing law.

Section 802, Oath of Office: This section requires of Postal Service employees the same oath required of all employees of the United States except the President. It is modeled on section 3331 of title 5.

Section 803, Employees of the Post Office Department: This section details transitional rules and the rights of existing employees of the Post Office Department upon commencement of operations by the Postal Service.

Subsection (a) states that Post Office Department employees except the Postmaster General, the Deputy Postmaster General, the Assistant Postmasters General, and the General Counsel of the Post Office will become employees of the Postal Service.

Subsection (b) states that obligations for sick and annual leave and compensatory time are assumed by the Postal Service.

Subsection (c) states that compensation, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment are carried over to the Postal Service, subject to change in accordance with other provisions of this chapter. Medical, health, and life insurance and unemployment compensation under existing programs continue to apply until changed; and any changed programs must be no less favorable than existing programs.

Subsection (d) states that Post Office Department employees, if they so desire, shall be eligible to transfer, at the same or higher grades, to other positions for which they are qualified in the United States Government.

Section 804, Retirement Rights: This section provides that Postal Service employees shall be covered by the Civil Service Retirement Program, and that the Postal Service shall remit to the fund as do other Government agencies. The section does not preclude bargaining for additional benefits outside the Civil Service Retirement Program, nor does it make the Postal Service liable for the unfunded liabilities of the Civil Service Retirement Program related to postal employees.

Section 805, Policy on Compensation and Benefits: This section states that compensation and benefits shall be comparable to the non-federal sectors of the economy for comparable levels of work.

Section 806, Terms of Employment:

Subsection (a) vests authority in the Board to set compensation, benefits and other terms of employment subject, where applicable, to collective bargaining. Existing collective bargaining agreements remain in effect. Compensation of any Postal Service employee may not exceed the rate for Level I of the Executive Schedule in effect at the time the compensation is paid.

Subsection (b) is a standard form of management rights clause, drawn from Executive Order 10988 and made subject to collective bargaining agreements.

Section 807, Applicability of Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947: This section makes applicable to the Postal Service the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, including the Landrum-Griffin Act. The prohibitions on strikes of Government employees (section 7311 of title 5) and the related affidavit requirements and penal provisions are made specifically applicable by cross references in section 209 of the title.

Section 808, Resolution of Labor-Management Disputes: This section provides comprehensive procedures for resolution of disputes.

Subsection (a) provides that disputes arising under collective bargaining agreements shall be resolved by the procedures set out in the agreements or subsequently agreed to by the parties.

Subsection (b) states the Congressional intention that the parties adopt procedures of their own for resolving disputes arising in negotiation of collective bargaining agreements; such procedures will be enforced.

Subsection (c) provides for review of disputes by the Postal Disputes Panel if procedures are not adopted under (b), or if they do not resolve a dispute. The Panel may act or refrain from acting pending further negotiation by the parties. It has at its disposal the "arsenal of weapons" advocated by authorities on public employee unionism: mediations, fact-finding, recommendations, and arbitration.

Subsection (d) provides that if the first three of these approaches do not bring agreement, the Panel may take jurisdiction to refer issues to arbitration. Refusal to take jurisdiction over an issue will preserve the practice in effect prior to negotiation.

Subsection (e) provides that on these issues over which jurisdiction is taken the Panel shall frame the issues and determine whether to arbitrate by separate issues, combination of issues, or total package.

Subsection (f) provides that the Panel refer arbitration to a three-man arbitration board, chosen one by the Postal Service, one by the bargaining agent, and one by the two thus selected. If the two cannot agree, a third member is named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director. Decisions of the arbitration board are conclusive and binding upon the parties.

Section 809, Postal Disputes Panel: This section establishes the permanent Postal Disputes Panel required by Section 808.

Subsection (a) states that the Panel shall consist of nine members, three named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director, three by the American Arbitration Association, and three by the six so selected.

Subsection (b) establishes rotating six-year terms for the Panel members.

Subsection (c) grants the Panel power to establish its own rules and select its own Chairman. Members of the Panel other than the Chairman may serve full- or part-time, as their rules may specify; this flexibility is afforded to allow for variations in workload not yet predictable.

Subsection (d) provides that members are paid at Level V of the Executive Schedule.

Subsection (e) provides that three members of the nine-man Panel are to be designated to act on each dispute referred under section 808. The three are to be selected in

such manner as to preclude advance knowledge by the Postal Service and the bargaining agent. This procedure is designed to maintain the unpredictability to the parties of the "arsenal of weapons" approach, and thus to carry out the policy of section 808(b) to maximize dispute-settlement by the parties without resort to the Panel.

Subsection (f) grants the Panel powers to carry out its functions.

Subsection (g) grants discovery and subpoena power to the Panel.

Subsection (h) requires that all expenses of the Panel be borne by the Postal Service.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 10

Section 1001, Definitions: This section defines the term "fund" and "obligations" as used in Chapter 10.

Section 1002, Capital of the Postal Service: This section provides for the transfer of the Government's equity to the Postal Service.

Subsection (a) defines the initial capital of the Postal Service as the assets of the Post Office Department less the liabilities transferred to the Postal Service. Evaluation of assets shall be on the basis of original cost less depreciation. Liabilities of the Post Office Department shall remain in the United States to the extent that they are not chargeable to the unexpended balances of the Post Office Department appropriations transferred to the Postal Service. The Board will value the initial capital of the Postal Service subject to approval by the Comptroller General.

Subsection (b) provides that the capital of the Postal Service at any time shall consist of its assets less its liabilities.

Subsection (c) provides for the physical transfer, at a time as near as possible to the commencement of Postal Service operations, of assets from the Post Office Department to the Postal Service by the Board and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, where appropriate, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Included in such transfer will be all properties commonly regarded as "belonging" to the Post Office Department.

Subsection (d) authorizes, after commencement of Postal Service operations, transfers of federal property to the Postal Service and transfers of Postal Service property to the United States when such transfer is in the public interest.

Section 1003, The Postal Service Fund: This section establishes the Postal Service Fund as a cash revolving fund in the Treasury.

Subsection (a) establishes the fund.

Subsection (b) provides that the fund is credited with all Postal Service revenues and receipts, moneys raised by issuance of debt, appropriations, interest, and the balance in the Post Office Department Fund upon commencement of Postal Service operations, and continues the disbursing authority of the Post Office Department in the Postal Service.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Postal Service to request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest the excess cash balances of the fund in interest-bearing obligations or securities.

Subsection (d) provides for the safe-keeping of the moneys of the fund as the Postal Service and the Secretary of the Treasury may agree.

Subsection (e) makes the fund available for the payment of Postal Service expenses and not subject to apportionment.

Section 1004, Transitional Appropriations: This section authorizes appropriations to provide for a sound transition to a self-sustaining Postal Service.

Section 1005, Obligations: This section authorizes the Postal Service to borrow money.

Subsection (a) authorizes the Postal Service to issue and sell obligations in an aggregate amount not exceeding \$10 billion out-

standing at any one time. The increase in outstanding obligations may not exceed \$1.5 billion per year for capital improvements.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Postal Service to enter into normal commercial indentures and agreements with regard to the sale of such obligations.

Subsection (c) provides that the Postal Service shall make the initial determinations as to the rates of interest, amounts, and terms and conditions of its obligations.

Subsection (d) provides that Postal Service obligations shall be negotiable, or bearer or registered instruments as specified; presumed regular; lawful investments for "legal list" purposes; and tax-exempt.

Section 1006, The Treasury and the Postal Service's Obligations:

Subsection (a) requires the Postal Service to inform the Treasury of its proposed obligations and the terms and conditions thereof and, prior to selling such obligations to other parties, to give the Treasury the right to purchase such obligations at a yield no less than that of outstanding marketable Treasury obligations of comparable maturities.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Postal Service to require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase Postal Service obligations in an amount not to exceed \$2 billion outstanding at any one time.

Section 1007, Public Debt Character of Postal Service Obligations: This section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to treat the purchase and sale of Postal Service obligations as public debt transactions.

Section 1008, Audit:

Subsection (a) requires the Comptroller General to audit the Postal Service annually and to report to the President, the Board, the Congress and the public on such audit.

Subsection (b) requires the Comptroller General to give the Postal Service a reasonable opportunity to examine the exceptions and criticisms in his audit; and provides for the payment of the expenses of the audit by the Postal Service as required in the Government Corporation Control Act and for the annual rendition of Postal Service accounts for adjustment and settlement pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Postal Service to determine the character and necessity of its expenditures without disallowance by the Comptroller General.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Postal Service to obtain outside audit of its accounts in addition to the audit provided for in the foregoing subsections.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 12

Section 1201, Rate Policy:

Subsection (a) states the broad policy that postal rates should be reasonable, equitable, and sufficient to permit the Postal Service to develop postal services in accordance with public needs.

Subsection (b) states the policy for revenues as a whole. Within five years Congress intends that revenues, as a whole, plus the appropriations for free and reduced rate mail, will equal costs, as a whole. The term "costs" is taken in its broad economic sense and includes operating expenses, depreciation, debt service, and a reasonable provision for contingencies.

Subsection (c) outlines the policy for the cost coverage of individual classes except for those afforded special rates by the Congress. Each class is to bear as a minimum the costs demonstrably related to providing service to that class.

Subsection (d) outlines the policy for making rate changes to achieve the goals outlined in the previous subsections. During the transitional period mentioned in subsection (b) the Board is enjoined to take into account the financial impact of rate changes on the users of the mail. To the extent that such impact requires, in the view of the Board, less than full cost coverage

overall, the President is authorized to seek transitional appropriations under section 1004.

Section 1202, Free and Reduced Rate Mail:

Subsection (a) stresses the general policy that Congress retains the authority to determine which users, if any, are entitled to mail free or at a specified percentage below standard rates and provides a formula, the difference between such rates and standard rates, called the "revenue foregone", which measures the amount to be appropriated to cover the loss to the Postal Service from carrying such free and reduced rate mails and which determines how the specific rates are to be set.

Subsection (b) authorizes appropriations of the revenue foregone.

Subsection (c) provides for adjustment of the special rates in the light of the amount appropriated.

Subsection (d) requires a report to the Congress at least every two years showing the volumes, rates, revenues, costs, and percentage of regular rates of each category of free and reduced rate mail. The Board may include recommendations for legislation in such reports and may utilize the Rate Commissioners in preparing such reports. The first such report shall provide a vehicle for re-examination of the special rate provisions which are carried over unchanged under the succeeding subsection of this section. It is intended that there be no significant change until the first report is submitted.

Subsection (e) preserves the Postal Policy Act categories of free and reduced rate mail and the rates for such categories.

Section 1203, Parcel Post: This section provides that the Postal Service shall not compete unfairly with private parcel carriers by requiring it to charge rates for parcels which include imputed carrying charges on capital and imputed charges for federal, state and local taxes.

Section 1251, Rate Commissioners and Staff: This section charters an independent Panel of Rate Commissioners within the Postal Service.

Subsection (a) provides for appointment of three Rate Commissioners by the Presidentially-appointed members of the Board and for payment of the Commissioners' salaries on Level V of the Executive Schedule, except that the Chief Commissioner shall be paid an additional \$500.

Subsection (b) establishes rotating terms of six years for the Commissioners. The Commissioners may be removed only in accord with the procedures provided for the removal of hearing examiners in section 752 of title 5.

Subsection (c) requires the Board to provide the Commissioners with reasonable and appropriate facilities and staff.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Commissioners to establish rules and regulations for the conduct of their proceedings, which rules and regulations are to provide for expeditious, fair proceedings in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. The Commissioners are specifically authorized to adopt rules which provide for advance written submission of testimony, prehearing conferences, discovery, limitation of testimony, and off-the-record proceedings.

Section 1252, Proposed Changes in Rates and Classifications: This section deals with the initiation of changes in rates and classification.

Subsection (a) levies upon the Postal Service the general requirement of 30 days' advance public notice of all changes in rates, classification or the rate structure and of filing such proposed changes with the Rate Commissioners. The public notice is to state briefly the nature of the proposed change and the procedures to be followed for filing objection to it.

Subsection (b) provides that if no party at interest files a timely objection, the rate change will be forwarded to the Board with-

out opinion by the Commissioners unless the Presidentially-appointed members of the Board desire such opinion.

Subsection (c) exempts from the requirements of Chapter 12 international rates and fees which will continue to be set pursuant to international agreements.

Section 1253, Proceedings and Recommended Decisions by Commissioners: This section applies to rate change cases.

Subsection (a) provides for a hearing by the Commissioners pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act in all rate change cases in which a party at interest files a timely notice requesting such hearing.

Subsection (b) defines the record of the rate change proceeding to include the proposed change and supporting material, all oral testimony and written submissions, and any other material the Commissioners deem appropriate.

Subsection (c) provides for an initial decision by the Commissioners to the Presidentially-appointed members of the Board.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Postal Service to put into effect, upon 30 days' notice, interim rate changes in the event that the Commissioners' proceedings take longer than 90 days. The Presidentially-appointed members of the Board must render their final decisions within 30 days of receiving the Commissioners' decision or the interim change ceases to be effective. Interim changes are also authorized in the event that judicial proceedings are instituted under section 1257, and under that section the institution of such proceedings extends the period for which such interim changes may be in effect.

Section 1254, Final Decisions: This section provides for final decisions by the Presidentially-appointed members and for review of rate change cases by the Congress.

Subsection (a) authorizes the Presidentially-appointed Board members to make final decisions and requires the publication of such decisions. The Presidentially-appointed Board members may reject the change, adopt it as initially proposed or as recommended by the Commissioners, or may modify it in the light of the record.

Subsection (b) provides that the Board shall transmit its final decision to the Congress together with the record and recommended decision of the Commissioners. In a contested case, of course, the Board would wait 15 days after publication of the decision to determine if a petition for judicial review will be filed under section 1257. Such transmittal shall not occur if the rate change involves a fee for a special or non-postal service.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Congress to veto the Board's decision by concurrent resolution of both Houses within 60 days of transmittal with the usual extensions.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Board to make a rate change effective later than the expiration of the 60-day period if it so desires.

Subsection (e) excludes from transmittal to the Congress increases required by section 1202(c) and the fees for special and nonpostal services (which the Postmaster General is currently authorized unilaterally to set).

Section 1255, Service Changes:

Subsection (a) requires the Postal Service to give public notice of proposed service changes of nationwide or nearly nationwide effect similar to the notice required in section 1252(a) for rate changes.

Subsection (b) provides for proceedings before the Rate Commissioners generally similar to those required by the Administrative Procedure Act for proposed rule-making. The Commissioners are to compile a record similar to that provided for in section 1253(b).

Subsection (c) provides for an initial decision of the Rate Commissioners which is to become effective unless modified by the

Presidentially-appointed members of the Board.

Subsection (c) provides that petitions for review, absent reasonable grounds, be filed within 15 days of notice of final decision, that the action be against the Postal Service, and that the rules concerning litigation by the Postal Service (set forth in section 208) apply.

Subsection (d) concerns suspension of proceedings pending judicial review, which review is to be expedited in every way. Rate changes are not to be submitted to the Congress pending judicial review. Temporary rate changes, emergency service changes, and final rate decisions may not otherwise be affected by the court pending review.

Subsection (e) makes judicial review under this section exclusive except for review of the Commissioners' rules under section 1251 (d) (1), which review would proceed substantially in accordance with this section.

Subsection (d) provides that service changes which substantially and adversely affect postal users on a less than nationwide basis are to be made only after the proceedings described in the foregoing subsections or in accordance with procedures adopted pursuant to the requirements of the foregoing subsections. Such procedures are to provide, as a minimum, for notice and opportunity for the affected users to present objections.

Subsection (e) authorizes the Postal Service to make emergency service changes before completion of the procedures prescribed in this section. Such changes may be in effect no longer than the length of time that it takes to complete proceedings.

Section 1256, Rate and Service Complaints: This section provides that any interested party may file a rate or service complaint. The Commissioners may hold hearings and render a public opinion to the Presidentially-appointed members of the Board if they find the complaint to be justified. If a rate matter is involved, the Postal Service must then institute proceedings under section 1252. If a service matter is involved the Presidentially-appointed Board members are to take appropriate action.

Section 1257, Judicial Review: This section provides for judicial review of Postal Service rate and service proceedings pursuant to the Administrative Procedure and Judicial Review Acts.

Subsection (a) authorizes judicial review of rate and service change and complaint proceedings. The review is confined to constitutional, statutory and procedural questions which were raised before the Postal Service, absent some reasonable ground for failure so to raise.

Subsection (b) requires that the party seeking review have fully participated in the proceedings in the Postal Service.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 14

This chapter continues without substantial change the portion of the private express statutes found in existing chapter 9 of title 39.

Section 1401, Letters Carried Out of the Mail: This section continues section 901 of the present title 39.

Section 1402, Foreign Letters Out of the Mails: This section continues section 902 of the present title 39.

Section 1403, Searches Authorized: This section continues section 903 of the present title 39.

Section 1404, Seizing and Detaining Letters: This section continues section 904 of the present title 39.

Section 1405, Searching Vessels for Letters: This section continues section 905 of the present title 39.

Section 1406, Disposition of Seized Mail: This section continues section 906 of the present title 39.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 16

Subchapter I, General: This subchapter generally authorizes the Postal Service to provide for the transportation of the mails and to contract for such transportation.

Section 1601, Provision for Carrying Mail: This section contains the basic mandate of section 6101(a) of present title 39 that the Postal Service provide for the transportation of the mails. Provisions of the present section setting forth where the mails shall be transported have been omitted as being covered in a more general fashion by new section 401.

Section 1602, Transportation of Mail of Adjoining Countries through the United States: This section continues the provisions of section 6103 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1603, Establishment of Post Roads: This section continues the provisions of section 6105 of present title 39 without change.

Section 1604, Discontinuance of Service on Post Roads: This section continues the provisions of section 6106 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1605, Authority to Contract for Mail Transportation: This section continues the authority of section 6402 of present title 39 but eliminates the existing restrictions on star route contracts.

Section 1606, Combinations to Prevent Bids for Carrying the Mails: This section continues the provision of section 6421 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1607, Lien on Compensation of Contractor: This section continues the provision of section 6432 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1608, Free Transportation of Postal Officials: This section continues the provision of section 6433 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1609, Liability of Contractor for Breach: This section continues the provisions of section 6434 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Subchapter II, Transportation of Mail by Railroads, Motor Carriers, and Freight Forwarders: Under this subchapter regulated motor carriers and freight forwarders would have the same statutory obligation to transport mail and provide related services as now applies to the railroads—that is, carriers and forwarders are required to transport mail tendered by the Postal Service, subject to fair and reasonable compensation and to ICC rate making. Additionally, the Postal Service may enter into such contracts with carriers at rates different from those set by the ICC.

Section 1625, Definitions: This section provides definitions for subchapter II. Since this subchapter will cover freight forwarders, regulated motor carriers and express companies appropriate definitions for these carriers have been included. The definition of "railroad" in section 6201 of present title 39 has been retained.

Section 1626, Applicability: This section states the coverage of subchapter II, to cover transportation by the carriers defined in section 1625. Thus, the provisions concerning transportation of mail by railroad (chapter 95 of present title 39) are expanded to cover the other classes of carriers defined in section 1625.

Section 1627, Authorization of Service by Carrier:

Subsections (a) through (e) continue the provision of section 6203 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Subsection (f) authorizes the Postal Service to publish a statement of service to be required of carriers and the tentative compensation to be paid for such service. This statement is similar to the comprehensive plan of section 1633(c) in the bill (section 6209 of present title 39). It will form a predicate for proceedings under the latter section.

Section 1628, Facilities Provided by Carrier: This section continues the provision of section 6204 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1629, Changes in Service: This section continues the provision of section 6205 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1630, Evidence of Service: This section continues the provision of section 6206 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1631, Fines and Deductions: This section continues the provision of section 6207 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter. The maximum fine for refusal to perform mail transportation under subsection (a) is lowered from \$1,000 to \$500.

Section 1632, Interstate Commerce Commission to Fix Rates: This section continues the provision of section 6208 of present title 39, modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1633, Procedures: This section continues the provision of section 6209 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1634, Special Rates: This section continues the provision of section 6210 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1635, Intermodal Transportation: This section continues the provision of section 6213 of present title 39 but applies it to all classes of carriers of transportation covered by the subchapter.

Section 1636, Statistical Studies: This subsection continues the provision of section 6214 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Section 1637, Special Contracts: This section continues the provision of section 6215 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter. The limitation on the terms of contractors has been omitted. In addition the section authorizes contracts to be made before the ICC has fixed rates for the carriers in question or before the ICC has fixed rates for the service in question.

Section 1638, Carrier Operation, Receipts and Expenditures: This section continues the provision of section 6216 of present title 39 modified to reflect the expanded coverage of the subchapter.

Subchapter III, Transportation of Mail by Air: This subchapter supplements the mail transportation provision of the Federal Aviation Act in a manner similar to chapter 97 of the present title 39.

Section 1651, Rules and Regulations: This section continues the provisions of section 6301 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1652, Fines on Air Carriers Transporting the Mails: This section continues the provision of section 6304 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1653, Contract for Transportation of Mail by Air: This section authorizes special arrangements with air carriers similar to those authorized for surface carriers and in lieu of the existing air star route and other special provisions of law.

Subsection (a) authorizes special arrangements with certified carriers for transportation along their routes similar to those authorized with surface carriers pursuant to section 1637 in the bill (section 6215 of present title 39).

Subsection (b) authorizes contracts for air transportation along routes over which there is no certified carrier. Such contracts are to be cancelled, in whole or in part, as appropriate, when the Civil Aeronautics Board certifies a carrier for the route in question. This subsection replaces the present star route law, section 6303 of present title 39.

Subsection (c) authorizes contracts with

other than the certified carrier for routes over which certified carriers are not providing service adequate for the Postal Service. Such contracts are subject to disapproval by the Civil Aeronautics Board and, if new carriers are certified over the route in question, to cancellation by the Postal Service.

Subchapter IV, Transportation of Mail by Vessel: This subchapter continues a number of provisions of existing present law relating to water transportation.

Section 1676, Sea Post Service: This section continues the provision of section 6404 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1677, Termination of Contracts for Foreign Transportation: This section continues the provision of section 6406 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1678, Transportation of Mail as Freight or Express: This section continues the provision of section 6410 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

Section 1679, Fines on Ocean Carriers: This section continues the provision of section 6435 of present title 39 with conforming changes.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 18

This chapter continues without substantive change existing provisions of miscellaneous sections of title 39.

Section 1801, No Postal Material or Supplies Manufactured by Convict Labor: This section continues section 2010 of the present title 39.

Section 1802, Uniforms and Badges: This section continues section 3116(a) of the present title 39, but contemplates uniforms for employees in addition to letter carriers.

Section 1803, Special Delivery Messengers as Employees or Carriers: This section continues section 3115 of the present title 39.

Section 1804, Collection of Debts: This section continues section 2401 (a) and (b) of the present title 39, with structure and language changes in subsection (b) to reflect the full responsibility of the Postal Service for its own financial management.

Section 1805, Transportation of International Mail by Air Carriers of the United States: This section continues section 2402 of the present title 39.

Section 1806, Penalties and Forfeitures Imposed for Violations: This section continues section 2407 of the present title 39.

Section 1807, Delivery of Stolen Money to Owner: This section continues section 2410 of the present title 39.

Section 1808, Substitute Checks: This section continues section 2411 of the present title 39.

Section 1809, Filing of Information Relating to Publications of the Second Class: This section continues section 4369 of the present title 39.

Section 1810, Printing of Illustrations of United States Postage Stamps: This section continues section 2506 of the present title 39.

HOW MUCH CAN WE BOOST IQ AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, because of the significant findings of Dr. Arthur L. Jensen of the Institute for Human Learning at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., in the field of environment, heredity, and behavior, I include his work, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement," which appeared in the Harvard Educational Review, volume 39, No. 1, winter edition, 1969:

HOW MUCH CAN WE BOOST IQ AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

(NOTE.—Arthur Jensen argues that the failure of recent compensatory education efforts to produce lasting effects on children's IQ and achievement suggests that the premises on which these efforts have been based should be reexamined.)

(He begins by questioning a central notion upon which these and other educational programs have recently been based: that IQ differences are almost entirely a result of environmental differences and the cultural bias of IQ tests. After tracing the history of IQ tests, Jensen carefully defines the concept of IQ, pointing out that it appears as a common factor in all tests that have been devised thus far to tap higher mental processes.)

(Having defined the concept of intelligence and related it to other forms of mental ability, Jensen employs an analysis of variance model to explain how IQ can be separated into genetic and environmental components. He then discusses the concept of "heritability," a statistical tool for assessing the degree to which individual differences in a trait like the intelligence can be accounted for by genetic factors. He analyzes several lines of evidence which suggest that the heritability of intelligence is quite high (i.e., genetic factors are much more important than environmental factors in producing IQ differences).)

(After arguing that environmental factors are not nearly as important in determining IQ as are genetic factors, Jensen proceeds to analyze the environmental influences which may be most critical in determining IQ. He concludes that prenatal influences may well contribute the largest environmental influence on IQ. He then discusses evidence which suggests that social class and racial variations in intelligence cannot be accounted for by differences in environment but must be attributed partially to genetic differences.)

(After he has discussed the influence of the distribution of IQ in a society on its functioning, Jensen examines in detail the results of educational programs for young children, and finds that the changes in IQ produced by these programs are generally small. A basic conclusion of Jensen's discussion of the influence of environment on IQ is that environment acts as a "threshold variable." Extreme environmental deprivation can keep the child from performing up to his genetic potential, but an enriched educational program cannot push the child above that potential.)

(Finally, Jensen examines other mental abilities that might be capitalized on in an educational program, discussing recent findings on diverse patterns of mental abilities between ethnic groups and his own studies of associative learning abilities that are independent of social class. He concludes that educational attempts to boost IQ have been misdirected and that the educational process should focus on teaching much more specific skills. He argues that this will be accomplished most effectively if educational methods are developed which are based on other mental abilities besides IQ.)

(Because of the controversial nature of Dr. Jensen's article, the Spring Issue of the Review will feature a discussion of the article by five psychologists: Carl Bereiter, Lee Cronbach, James Crow, David Elkind, and J. McVicker Hunt. Readers are also invited to react.)

THE FAILURE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Compensatory education has been tried and it apparently has failed.

Compensatory education has been practiced on a massive scale for several years in many cities across the nation. It began with auspicious enthusiasm and high hopes of educators. It had unprecedented support

from Federal funds. It had theoretical sanction from social scientists espousing the major underpinning of its rationale; the "deprivation hypothesis," according to which academic lag is mainly the result of social, economic, and educational deprivation and discrimination—an hypothesis that has met with wide, uncritical acceptance in the atmosphere of society's growing concern about the plight of minority groups and the economically disadvantaged.

The chief goal of compensatory education—to remedy the educational lag of disadvantaged children and thereby narrow the achievement gap between "minority" and "majority" pupils—has been utterly unrealized in any of the large compensatory education programs that have been evaluated so far. On the basis of a nationwide survey and evaluation of compensatory education programs, the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1967) came to the following conclusion:

"The Commission's analysis does not suggest that compensatory education is incapable of remedying the effects of poverty on the academic achievement of individual children. There is little question that school programs involving expenditures for cultural enrichment, better teaching, and other needed educational services can be helpful to disadvantaged children. The fact remains, however, that none of the programs appear to have raised significantly the achievement of participating pupils, as a group, within the period evaluated by the Commission." (p. 138)

The Commission's review gave special attention to compensatory education in majority-Negro schools whose programs "were among the most prominent and included some that have served as models for others." The Commission states: "A principal objective of each was to raise the academic achievement of disadvantaged children. Judged by this standard the programs did not show evidence of much success" (p. 138).¹

Why has there been such uniform failure of compensatory programs wherever they have been tried? What has gone wrong? In other fields, when bridges do not stand, when aircraft do not fly, when machines do not work, when treatments do not cure, despite all conscientious efforts on the part of many persons to make them do so, one begins to question the basic assumptions, principles, theories, and hypotheses that guide one's efforts. Is it time to follow suit in education?

The theory that has guided most of these compensatory education programs, sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly, has two main complementary facets: one might be called the "average children concept," the other the "social deprivation hypothesis."

¹ Some of the largest and most highly publicized programs of compensatory education that have been held up as models but which produced absolutely no significant improvement in the scholastic achievement of disadvantaged students are: the *Banneker Project* in St. Louis (8 years), *Higher Horizons* in New York (5 years), *More Effective Schools* in New York (3 years), and large-scale programs in Syracuse, Seattle, Philadelphia, Berkeley, and a score of other cities (for detailed reports see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967, pp. 115-140).

Reports on Project Head Start indicate that initial gains of 5 to 10 points in IQ on conventional intelligence tests are a common finding, but this gain usually does not hold up through the first year of regular schooling. More positive claims for the efficacy of Head Start involve evidence of the detection and correction of medical disabilities in disadvantaged preschool children and the reportedly favorable effects of the program on children's self-confidence, motivation, and attitudes toward school.

The "average children" concept is essentially the belief that all children, except for a rare few born with severe neurological defects, are basically very much alike in their mental development and capabilities, and that their apparent differences in these characteristics as manifested in school are due to rather superficial differences in children's upbringing at home, their preschool and out-of-school experiences, motivations and interests, and the educational influences of their family background. All children are viewed as basically more or less homogeneous, but are seen to differ in school performance because when they are out of school they learn or fail to learn certain things that may either help them or hinder them in their school work. If all children could be treated more alike early enough, long before they come to school, then they could all learn from the teacher's instruction at about the same pace and would all achieve at much the same level, presumably at the "average" or above on the usual grade norms.

The "social deprivation hypothesis" is the allied belief that those children of ethnic minorities and the economically poor who achieve "below average" in school do so mainly because they begin school lacking certain crucial experiences which are prerequisites for school learning—perceptual, attentional, and verbal skills, as well as the self-confidence, self-direction, and teacher-oriented attitudes conducive to achievement in the classroom. And they lack the parental help and encouragement needed to promote academic achievement throughout their schooling. The chief aim of preschool and compensatory programs, therefore, is to make up for these environmental lacks as quickly and intensively as possible by providing the assumedly appropriate experiences, cultural enrichment, and training in basic skills of the kind presumably possessed by middle-class "majority" children of the same age.

The success of the effort is usually assessed in one or both of two ways: by gains in IQ and in scholastic achievement. The common emphasis on gains in IQ is probably attributable to the fact that it can be more efficiently "measured" than scholastic achievement, especially if there is no specific "achievement" to begin with. The IQ test can be used at the very beginning of Headstart, kindergarten, or first grade as a "pre-test" against which to assess "post-test" gains. IQ gains, if they occur at all, usually occur rapidly, while achievement is a long-term affair. And probably most important, the IQ is commonly interpreted as indicative of a more general kind of intellectual ability than is reflected by the acquisition of specific scholastic knowledge and skills. Since the IQ is known to predict scholastic performance better than any other single measurable attribute of the child, it is believed, whether rightly or wrongly, that if the child's IQ can be appreciably raised, academic achievement by and large will take care of itself, given normal motivation and standard instruction. Children with average or above-average IQs generally do well in school without much special attention. So the remedy deemed logical for children who would do poorly in school is to boost their IQs up to where they can perform like the majority—in short to make them all at least "average children." Stated so bluntly, the remedy may sound rather grim, but this is in fact essentially what we are attempting in our special programs of pre-school enrichment and compensatory education. This simple theme, with only slight embellishments, can be found repeated over and over again in the vast recent literature on the psychology and education of children called culturally disadvantaged.

So here is where our diagnosis should begin—with the concept of the IQ: how it came to be what it is; what it "really" is; what makes it vary from one individual to another.

other; what can change it, and by what amount.

THE NATURE OF INTELLIGENCE

The nature of intelligence is one of the vast topics in psychology. It would be quite impossible to attempt to review here the main theoretical issues and currents of thought in this field. Large volumes have been written on the subject (e.g., Guilford, 1967; Stoddard, 1943), to say nothing of the countless articles. An enlightening brief account of the history of the concept of intelligence has been presented by Sir Cyril Burt (1968). The term "intelligence," as used by psychologists, is itself of fairly recent origin. Having been introduced as a technical term in psychology near the turn of the century, it has since filtered down into common parlance, and therefore some restriction and clarification of the term as it will be used in the following discussion is called for.

Disagreements and arguments can perhaps be forestalled if we take an operational stance. First of all, this means that probably the most important fact about intelligence is that we can measure it. Intelligence, like electricity, is easier to measure than to define. And if the measurements bear some systematic relationships to other data, it means we can make meaningful statements about the phenomenon we are measuring. There is no point in arguing the question to which there is no answer, the question of what intelligence *really* is. The best we can do is to obtain measurements of certain kinds of behavior and look at their relationships to other phenomena and see if these relationships make any kind of sense and order. It is from these orderly relationships that we can gain some understanding of the phenomena.

But how did the instruments which we measure intelligence come about in the first place? The first really useful test of intelligence and the progenitor of nearly all present-day intelligence tests was the Metrical Scale of Intelligence devised in 1905 by Binet and Simon. A fact of great but often unrealized implications is that the Binet-Simon test was commissioned by the Minister of Public Instruction in Paris for the explicit purpose of identifying children who were likely to fall in school. It was decided they should be placed in special schools or classes before losing too much ground or receiving too much discouragement. To the credit of Binet and Simon, the test served this purpose quite well, and it is now regarded as one of the major "breakthroughs" in the history of psychology. Numerous earlier attempts to devise intelligence tests were much less successful from a practical standpoint, mainly because the kinds of functions tested were decided upon in terms of early theoretical notions about the basic elements of "mind" and the "brass instrument" laboratory techniques for measuring these elemental functions of consciousness, which were then thought to consist of the capacity for making fine sensory discriminations in the various sensory modalities. Although these measurements were sufficiently reliable, they bore little relationship to any "real life" or "common sense" criteria of behavior ranging along a "dull"—"bright" continuum. The psychological sagacity of Binet and Simon as test constructors derived largely from their intimate knowledge and observation of the behavior of young children and of what, precisely, teachers expected of them in school. Binet and Simon noted the characteristics distinguishing those children described by their teachers as "bright" from those described as "dull," and, from these observations and considerable trial-and-error, they were finally able to make up a graded series of test items that not only agreed with teachers' judgments of children's scholastic capabilities but could make the discrimina-

tions more finely and more accurately than any single teacher could do without prolonged observation of the child in class. The Binet-Simon scale has since undergone many revisions and improvements, and today, in the form developed by Terman, known as the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, it is generally regarded as the standard for the measurement of intelligence.

But the important point I wish to emphasize here is that these Binet tests, and in effect all their descendants, had their origin in the educational setting of the Paris schools of 1900, and the various modifications and refinements they have undergone since then have been implicitly shaped by the educational traditions of Europe and North America. The content and methods of instruction represented in this tradition, it should be remembered, are a rather narrow and select sample of all the various forms of human learning and of the ways of imparting knowledge and skills. The instructional methods of the traditional classroom were not invented all in one stroke, but evolved within an upper-class segment of the European population, and thus were naturally shaped by the capacities, culture, and needs of those children whom the schools were primarily intended to serve. At least implicit in the system as it originally developed was the expectation that not all children would succeed. These methods of schooling have remained essentially unchanged for many generations. We have accepted traditional instruction so completely that it is extremely difficult even to imagine, much less to put into practice, any radically different forms that the education of children could take. Our thinking almost always takes as granted such features as beginning formal instruction at the same age for all children (universally between ages five and six), instruction of children in groups, keeping the same groups together in lock step fashion through the first several years of schooling, and an active-passive, showing-seeing, telling-listening relationship between teacher and pupils. Satisfactory learning occurs under these conditions only when children come to school with certain prerequisite abilities and skills: an attention span long enough to encompass the teacher's utterances and demonstrations, the ability voluntarily to focus one's attention where it is called for, the ability to comprehend verbal utterances and to grasp relationships between things and their symbolic representations, the ability to inhibit large-muscle activity and engage in covert "mental" activity, to repeat instruction to oneself, to persist in a task until a self-determined standard is attained—in short, the ability to engage in what might be called self-instructional activities, without which group instruction alone remains ineffectual.

The interesting fact is that, despite all the criticisms that can easily be leveled at the educational system, the traditional forms of instruction have actually worked quite well for the majority of children. And the tests that were specifically devised to distinguish those children least apt to succeed in this system have also proved to do their job quite well. The Stanford-Binet and similar intelligence tests predict various measures of scholastic achievement with an average validity coefficient of about 5 to 6, and in longitudinal data comprising intelligence test and achievement measures on the same children over a number of years, the multiple correlation between intelligence and scholastic achievement is almost as high as the reliability of the measures will permit.

The generality and limitations of intelligence

If the content and instructional techniques of education had been markedly different from what they were in the beginning and, for the most part, continue to be, it is very likely that the instruments we call intelligence tests would also have assumed a quite

different character. They might have developed in such a way as to measure a quite different constellation of abilities, and our conception of the nature of intelligence, assuming we still called it by that name, would be correspondingly different. This is why I think it so important to draw attention to the origins of intelligence testing.

But in granting that the measurement and operational definitions of intelligence had their origins in a school setting and were intended primarily for scholastic purposes, one should not assume that intelligence tests measure *only* school learning or cultural advantages making for scholastic success and fail to tap anything of fundamental psychological importance. The notion is sometimes expressed that psychologists have mis-aimed with their intelligence tests. Although the tests may predict scholastic performance, it is said, they do not *really* measure intelligence—as if somehow the "real thing" has eluded measurement and perhaps always will. But this is a misconception. We *can* measure intelligence. As the late Professor Edwin G. Boring pointed out, intelligence, by definition, is what intelligence tests measure. The trouble comes only when we attribute more to "intelligence" and to our measurements of it than do the psychologists who use the concept in its proper sense.

The idea of intelligence has justifiably grown considerably beyond its scholastic connotations. Techniques of measurement not at all resembling the tasks of the Binet scale and in no way devised with the idea of predicting scholastic performance can also measure approximately the same intelligence as measured by the Binet scale. The English psychologist Spearman devoted most of his distinguished career to studying the important finding that almost any and every test involving any kind of complex mental activity correlates positively and substantially with any and every other test involving complex mental activity, regardless of the specific content or sensory modality of the test. Spearman noted that if the tests called for the operation of "higher mental processes," as opposed to sheer sensory acuity, reflex behavior, or the execution of established habits, they showed positive intercorrelation, although the tests bore no superficial resemblance to one another. They might consist of abstract figures involving various spatial relationships, or numerical problems, or vocabulary, or verbal analogies. For example, a vocabulary test shows correlations in the range of .50 to .60 with a test that consists of copying sets of designs with colored blocks; and a test of general information correlates about .50 with a test that involves wending through a printed maze with a pencil. Countless examples of such positive correlations between seemingly quite different tests can be found in the literature on psychological tests. Spearman made them the main object of his study. To account for the intercorrelations of "mental" tests, he hypothesized the existence of a single factor common to all tests involving complex mental processes. All such tests measure this common factor to some degree, which accounts for the intercorrelations among all the tests. Spearman called the common factor "general intelligence" or simply *g*. And he invented the method known as factor analysis to determine the amount of *g* in any particular test. He and his students later developed tests, like Raven's Progressive Matrices and Cattell's Culture Fair Tests of *g*, which measure *g* in nearly pure form. We should not reify *g* as an entity, of course, since it is only a hypothetical construct intended to explain covariation among tests. It is a hypothetical source of variance (individual differences) in test scores. It can be regarded as the nuclear operational definition of intelligence, and when the term intelligence is used it should refer to *g*, the factor common to all tests of complex problem solving.

In examining those tests most heavily loaded with *g*, Spearman characterized the mental processes which they seemed to involve as "the ability to educe relations and correlates"—that is, to be able to see the general from the particular and the particular as an instance of the general. A similar definition of intelligence was expressed by Aquinas, as "the ability to combine and separate"—to see the difference between things which seem similar and to see the similarities between things which seem different. These are essentially the processes of abstraction and conceptualization. Tasks which call for problem solving requiring these processes are usually the best measures of *g*. Despite numerous theoretical attacks on Spearman's basic notion of a general factor, *g* has stood like a rock of Gibraltar in psychometrics, defying any attempt to construct a test of complex problem solving which excludes it.

Standard intelligence scales such as the Binet and the Wechsler are composed of a dozen or so subtests which differ obviously in their superficial appearance: vocabulary, general information, memory span for digits, block designs, figure copying, mazes, form boards, and so on. When the intercorrelations among a dozen or more such tests are subjected to a factor analysis or principal components analysis, some 50 percent or more of the total individual differences variance in all the tests is usually found to be attributable to a general factor common to all the tests. Thus, when we speak of intelligence it is this general factor, rather than any single test, that we should keep in mind.

Attempts to assess age differences in intelligence or mental development which rely on complex techniques that bear little formal resemblance to the usual intelligence tests still manage to measure *g* more than anything else. Piaget's techniques for studying mental growth, for example, are based largely on the child's development of the concepts of invariance and conservation of certain properties—number, area, and volume. When a large variety of Piaget tasks are factor analyzed along with standard psychometric tests, including the Stanford-Binet and Raven's Progressive Matrices, is it found that the Piaget tasks are loaded on the general factor to about the same extent as the psychometric tests (Vernon, 1965). That is to say, children fall into much the same rank order of ability on all these cognitive tests. Tudenharn (1968) has developed a psychometric scale of intelligence based entirely upon Piaget's theory of cognitive development. The test makes use of ten of the techniques developed by Piaget for studying conservation, seriation, reversal of perspective, and so on. Performance on these tasks shows about the same relationship to social class and race differences as is generally found with the Stanford-Binet and Wechsler scales. It seems evident that what we call general intelligence can be manifested in many different forms and thus permits measurement by a wide variety of techniques. The common feature of all such intercorrelated tests seems to be their requirement of some form of "reasoning" on the part of the subject—some active, but usually covert, transformation or manipulation of the "input" (the problem) in order to arrive at the "output" (the answer).

The conceptually most pure and simple instance of this key aspect of intelligence is displayed in the phenomenon known as cross-modal transfer. This occurs when a person to whom some particular stimulus is exposed in one sensory modality can then recognize the same stimulus (or its essential features) in a different sensory modality. For example, show a person a number of differently shaped wooden blocks, then point to one, blindfold the person, shuffle the blocks, and let the person find the indicated block by using his sense of touch, or "write" in

bold strokes any letter of the alphabet between a child's shoulder blades. It will be a completely unique stimulus input for the child, never encountered before and never directly conditioned to any verbal response. Yet, most children, provided they already know the alphabet, will be able to name the letter. There are no direct neural connections between the visual and the tactile impressions of the stimulus, and, although the child's naming of the letter has been conditioned to the visual stimulus, the tactile stimulus has been associated with neither the visual stimulus nor the verbal response. How does the child manage to show the cross modal transfer? Some central symbolic or "cognitive" processing mechanism is involved, which can abstract and compare properties of "new" experiences with "old" experiences and thereby invest the "new" with meaning and relevance. Intelligence is essentially characterized by this process.

Is g unitary or divisible?

It is only when the concept of *g* is attributed meaning above and beyond that derived from the factor analytic procedures from which it gains its strict technical meaning that we run into the needless argument over whether *g* is a unitary ability or a conglomerate of many subabilities, each of which could be measured independently. We should think of *g* as a "source" of individual differences in scores which is common to a number of different tests. As the tests change, the nature of *g* will also change, and a test which is loaded, say, .50 on *g* when factor analyzed among one set of tests may have a loading of .20 or .80, or some other value, when factor analyzed among other sets of tests. Also, a test which, in one factor analysis, measures only *g* and nothing else, may show that it measures *g* and one or more other factors when factor analyzed in connection with a new set of tests. In other words, *g* gains its meaning from the tests which have it in common. Furthermore, no matter how simple or "unitary" a test may appear to be, it is almost always possible to further fractionate the individual differences variance into smaller subfactors. I have been doing this in my laboratory with respect to a very simple and seemingly "unitary" ability, namely, digit span (Jensen, 1967b). Changing the rate of digit presentation changes the rank order of subjects in their ability to recall the digits. So, too, does interposing a 10-second delay between presentation and recall, and interpolating various distractions ("retroactive inhibition") between presentation and recall, and many other procedural variations of the digit span paradigm. Many—but, significantly, not all—of these kinds of manipulations introduce new dimensions or factors of individual differences. It is likely that when we finally get down to the irreducible "atoms" of memory span ability, so to speak, if we ever do get there, the elements that make up memory span ability will not themselves even resemble what we think of as abilities in the usual sense of the term. And so probably the same would be true not only for digit span, but for any of the subtests or items that make up intelligence tests.

A simple analogy in the physical realm may help to make this clear. If we are interested in measuring general athletic ability, we can devise a test consisting of running, ball throwing, matting, jumping, weight lifting, and so on. We can obtain a "score" on each one of these and the total for any individual is his "general athletic ability" score. This score would correspond to the general intelligence score yielded by tests like the Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler scales.

Or we can go a step further in the refinement of our test procedure and intercorrelate the scores on all these physical tasks, factor analyze the intercorrelations, and examine the general factor, if indeed there is one.

Assuming there is, we would call it "general athletic ability." It would mean that on all of the tasks, persons who excelled on one also tended to be superior on the others. And we would note that some tasks were more "loaded" with this general factor than others. We could then weight the subtest scores in proportion to their loading on *g* and then add them up. The total, in effect, is a "factor score," and gives us a somewhat more justifiable measure of "general athletic ability," since it represents the one source of variation that all the athletic skills in our test battery share in common.

To go still further, let us imagine that the running test has the highest loading on *g* in this analysis. To make the issue clear-cut, let us say that all its variance is attributable to the *g* factor. Does this mean that running ability is not further analyzable into other components? No, it simply means that the components into which running can be analyzed are not separately or independently manifested in either the running test or the other tests in the battery. But we can measure these components of running ability independently, if we wish to: total leg length, the ratio of upper to lower leg length, strength of leg muscles, physical endurance, "wind" or vital capacity, ratio of body height to weight, degree of mesomorphic body build, specific skills such as starting speed—all are positively correlated with running speed. And if we intercorrelate these measures and factor analyze the correlations, we would probably find a substantial general factor common to all these physical attributes, name it what you will. We could combine the measures on these various physical traits into a weighted composite score which would predict running ability as measured by the time the person takes to cross the finish line. The situation seems very similar to the analysis of the psychological processes that make up "general intelligence."

Fluid and crystallized intelligence

Raymond B. Cattell (1963) has made a conceptually valid distinction between two aspects of intelligence, *fluid* and *crystallized*. Standard intelligence tests generally measure both the fluid and crystallized components of *g*, and, since the two are usually highly correlated in a population whose members to a large extent share a common background of experience, culture, and education, the fluid and crystallized components may not always be clearly discernible as distinct factors. Conceptually, however, the distinction is useful and can be supported empirically under certain conditions. *Fluid* intelligence is the capacity for new conceptual learning and problem solving, a general "brightness" and adaptability, relatively independent of education and experience, which can be invested in the particular opportunities for learning encountered by the individual in accord with his motivations and interests. Tests that measure mostly fluid intelligence are those that minimize cultural and scholastic content. Cattell's Culture Fair Tests and Raven's Progressive Matrices are good examples. *Crystallized* intelligence, in contrast, is a precipitate out of experience, consisting of acquired knowledge and developed intellectual skills. Fluid and crystallized intelligence are naturally correlated in a population sharing a common culture, because the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the first place depends upon fluid intelligence. While fluid intelligence attains its maximum level in the late teens and may even begin to decline gradually shortly thereafter, crystallized intelligence continues to increase gradually with the individual's learning and experience all the way up to old age.

Occupational correlates of intelligence

Intelligence, as we are using the term, has relevance considerably beyond the scholastic setting. This is so partly because there is an

intimate relationship between a society's occupational structure and its educational system. Whether we like it or not, the educational system is one of society's most powerful mechanisms for sorting out children to assume different roles in the occupational hierarchy.

The evidence for a hierarchy of occupational prestige and desirability is unambiguous. Let us consider three sets of numbers.² First, the Barr scale of occupations, devised in the early 1920s, provides one set of data. Lists of 120 representative occupations, each definitely and concretely described, were given to 30 psychological judges who were asked to rate the occupations on a scale from 0 to 100 according to the grade of intelligence each occupation was believed to require for ordinary success. Second, in 1964, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), by taking a large public opinion poll, obtained ratings of the *prestige* of a great number of occupations; these prestige ratings represent the average standing of each occupation relative to all the others in the eyes of the general public. Third, a rating of socioeconomic status (SES) is provided by the 1960 *Census of Population: Classified Index of Occupations and Industries*, which assigns to each of the hundreds of listed occupations a score ranging from 0 to 96 as a composite index of the average income and educational level prevailing in the occupation.

The interesting point is the set of correlations among these three independently derived occupational ratings.

The Barr scale and the NORC ratings are correlated .91.

The Barr scale and the SES index are correlated .81.

The NORC ratings and the SES index are correlated .90.

In other words, psychologists' concept of the "intelligence demands" of an occupation (Barr scale) is very much like the general public's concept of the prestige or "social standing" of an occupation (NORC ratings), and both are closely related to an independent measure of the educational and economic status of the persons pursuing an occupation (SES index). As O. D. Duncan (1968, pp. 90-91) concludes, "... 'intelligence' is a socially defined quality in this social definition is not essentially different from that of achievement or status in the occupational sphere. . . . When psychologists came to propose operational counterparts to the notion of intelligence, or to devise measures thereof, they wittingly or unwittingly looked for indicators of capability to function in the system of key roles in the society." Duncan goes on to note, "Our argument tends to imply that a correlation between IQ and occupational achievement was more or less built into IQ tests, by virtue of the psychologists' implicit acceptance of the social standards of the general populace. Had the first IQ tests been devised in a hunting culture, 'general intelligence' might well have turned out to involve visual acuity and running speed, rather than vocabulary and symbol manipulation. As it was, the concept of intelligence arose in a society where high status accrued to occupations involving the latter in large measure, so that what we now mean by intelligence is something like the probability of acceptable performance (given the opportunity) in occupations varying in social status."

So we see that the prestige hierarchy of occupations is a reliable objective reality in our society. To this should be added the fact that there is undoubtedly some relationship between the levels of the hierarchy and the

occupations' intrinsic interest, desirability, or gratification to the individuals engaged in them. Even if all occupations paid alike and received equal respect and acclaim, some occupations will still be viewed as more desirable than others, which would make for competition, selection, and, again, a kind of prestige hierarchy. Most persons would agree that painting pictures is more satisfying than painting barns, and conducting a symphony orchestra is more exciting than directing traffic. We have to face it: the assortment of persons into occupational roles simply is not "fair" in any absolute sense. The best we can ever hope for is that true merit, given equality of opportunity, act as the basis for the natural assorting process.

Correlation between intelligence and occupational achievement

Because intelligence is only one of a number of qualities making for merit in any given occupation, and since most occupations will tolerate a considerable range of abilities and criteria of passable performance, it would be surprising to find a very high correlation between occupational level and IQ. Although the rank order of the mean IQs of occupational groups is about as highly correlated with the occupations' standing on the three "prestige" ratings mentioned above as the ratings are correlated among themselves, there is a considerable dispersion of IQs within occupations. The IQ spread increases as one moves down the scale from more to less skilled occupations (Tyler, 1965, pp. 338-339). Thus, the correlation, for example, between scores on the Army General Classification Test, a kind of general intelligence test, and status ratings of the civilian occupations of 18,782 white enlisted men in World War II was only .42. Since these were mostly young men, many of whom had not yet completed their education or established their career lines, the correlation of .42 is lower than one would expect in the civilian population. Data obtained by the U.S. Employment Service in a civilian population shows a correlation of .55 between intelligence and occupational status, a value which, not surprisingly, is close to the average correlation between intelligence and scholastic achievement (Duncan, et al., 1968, pp. 98-101). Although these figures are based on the largest samples reported in the literature and are therefore probably the most reliable statistics, they are not as high as the correlations found in some other studies. Two studies found, for example, that IQs of school boys correlated .57 and .71 with their occupational status 14 and 19 years later, respectively (Tyler, 1965, p. 343). It is noteworthy that the longer interval showed the higher correlation.

Duncan's (1968) detailed analysis of the nature of the relationship between intelligence and occupational status led him to the conclusion that "the bulk of the influence of intelligence on occupation is indirect, via education." If the correlation of intelligence with education and of education with occupation is, in effect, "partialled out," the remaining "direct" correlation between intelligence and occupation is almost negligible. But Duncan points out that this same type of analysis (technically known as "path coefficients analysis") also reveals the interesting and significant finding that intelligence plays a relatively important part as a cause of differential earnings. Duncan concludes: "... men with the same schooling and in the same line of work are differentially rewarded in terms of mental ability" (1968, p. 118).

Correlations between intelligence and job performance within occupations

Intelligence, via education, has its greatest effect in the assorting of individuals into occupational roles. Once they are in those roles, the importance of intelligence per se is less marked. Ghiselli (1955) found that intelligence tests correlate on the average in the range of .20 to .25 with ratings of actual pro-

ficiency on the job. The speed and ease of training for various occupational skills, however, show correlations with intelligence averaging about .50, which is four to five times the predictive power that the same tests have in relation to work proficiency after training. This means that, once the training hurdle has been surmounted, many factors besides intelligence are largely involved in success on the job. This is an important fact to keep in mind at later points in this article.

Is intelligence "fixed"?

Since the publication of J. McV. Hunt's well-known and influential book, *Intelligence and Experience* (1961), the notion of "fixed intelligence" has assumed the status of a popular cliché among many speakers and writers on intelligence, mental retardation, cultural disadvantage, and the like, who state often with an evident sense of virtue and relief, that modern psychology has overthrown the "belief in fixed intelligence." This particular bugaboo seems to have loomed up largely in the imaginations of those who find such great satisfaction in the idea that "fixed intelligence" has been demolished once and for all.

Actually, there has been nothing much to demolish. When we look behind the rather misleading term "fixed intelligence," what we find are principally two real and separate issues, each calling for empirical study rather than moral philosophizing. Both issues lend themselves to empirical investigation and have long been subjects of intensive study. The first issue concerns the genetic basis of individual differences in intelligence; the second concerns the stability or constancy of the IQ throughout the individual's lifetime.

Genotype and Phenotype. Geneticists have avoided confusion and polemics about the issue of whether or not a given trait is "fixed" by asking the right question in the first place: how much of the variation (i.e., individual differences) in a particular trait or characteristic that we observe or measure (i.e., the *phenotype*) in a given population can we account for in terms of variation in the genetic factors (i.e., the *genotype*) affecting the development of the characteristic?

The genetic factors are completely laid down when the parental sperm and ovum unite. Thus the individual's genotype, by definition, is "fixed" at the moment of conception. Of course, different potentials of the genotype may be expressed at different times in the course of the individual's development. But beyond conception, whatever we observe or measure of the organism is a phenotype, and this, by definition, is not "fixed." The phenotype is a result of the organism's internal genetic mechanisms established at conception and all the physical and social influences that impinge on the organism throughout the course of its development. Intelligence is a phenotype, not a genotype, so the argument about whether or not intelligence is "fixed" is seen to be spurious.

The really interesting and important question, which can be empirically answered by the methods of quantitative genetics, is: what is the correlation between genotypes and phenotypes at any given point in development? For continuous or metrical characteristics such as height and intelligence, the correlation, of course, can assume any value between 0 and 1. The square of the correlation between genotype and phenotype is technically known as the *heritability* of the characteristic, a concept which is discussed more fully in a later section.

The Stability of Intelligence Measures. The second aspect of the issue of "fixed intelligence" concerns the stability of intelligence measurements throughout the course of the individual's development. Since intelligence test scores are not points on an absolute scale of measurement like height and weight, but

² I am indebted to Professor Otis Dudley Duncan (1968, pp. 80-100) for providing this information.

only indicate the individual's relative standing with reference to a normative population, the question we must ask is: To what extent do individuals maintain their standing relative to one another in measured intelligence over the course of time? The answer is to be found in the correlation between intelligence test scores on a group of persons at two points in time. Bloom (1964) has reviewed the major studies of this question and the evidence shows considerable consistency.

In surveying all the correlations reported in the literature between intelligence measured on the same individuals at two points in time, I have worked out a simple formula that gives a "best fit" to all these data. The formula has the virtue of a simple mnemonic, being much easier to remember than all the tables of correlations reported in the literature and yet being capable of reproducing the correlations with a fair degree of accuracy.

$$\hat{r}_{12} = r_{11} \sqrt{\frac{CA_1}{CA_2}}$$

where \hat{r}_{12} = the estimated correlation between tests given at times 1 and 2.
 r_{11} = the equivalent-forms or immediate test-retest reliability of the test.
 CA_1 = the subject's chronological age at the time of the first test.
 CA_2 = the subject's chronological age at the time of the second test.

Limitation: The formula holds only up to the point where CA_1 is age 10, at which time the empirical value of r_{11} approaches an asymptote, showing no appreciable increase thereafter. Beyond age 10, regardless of the interval between tests, the obtained test-retest correlations fall in the range between the test's reliability and the square of the reliability (i.e., $r_{11} > r_{12} > r_{11}^2$). These simple generalizations are intended simply as a means of summarizing the mass of empirical findings. They accord with Bloom's conclusion, based on his thorough survey of the published evidence, that beyond age 8, correlations between repeated tests of general intelligence, corrected for unreliability of measurement, are between +.90 and unity (Bloom, 1964, p. 61).

What these findings mean is that the IQ is not constant, but, like all other developmental characteristics, is quite variable early in life and becomes increasingly stable throughout childhood. By age 4 or 5, the IQ correlates about .70 with IQ at age 17, which means that approximately half (i.e., the square of the correlation) of the variance in adult intelligence can be predicted as early as age 4 or 5. This fact that half the variance in adult intelligence can be accounted for by age 4 has led to the amazing and widespread, but unwarranted and fallacious, conclusion that persons develop 50 percent of their mature intelligence by age 4! This conclusion, of course, does not at all logically follow from just knowing the magnitude of the correlation. The correlation between height at age 4 and at age 17 is also about .70, but who would claim that the square of the correlation indicated the proportion of adult height attained by age 4? The absurdity of this non sequitur is displayed in the prediction it yields: the average 4 years old boy should grow up to be 6 ft. 7 in. tall by age 17!

Intelligence has about the same degree of stability as other developmental characteristics. For example, up to age 5 or 6, height is somewhat more stable than intelligence, and thereafter the development rates of height and intelligence are about equally stable, except for a period of 3 or 4 years immediately after the onset of puberty, during which height is markedly less stable than intelligence. Intelligence is somewhat more stable than total body weight over the age range from 2 to 18 years. Intelligence has a considerably more stable growth rate than measures of physical strength (Bloom, 1964,

pp. 46-47). Thus, although the IQ is certainly not "constant," it seems safe to say that under normal environmental conditions it is at least as stable as developmental characteristics of a strictly physical nature.

Intelligence as a component of mental ability

The term "intelligence" should be reserved for the rather specific meaning I have assigned to it, namely, the general factor common to standard tests of intelligence. Any one verbal definition of this factor is really inadequate, but, if we must define it in so many words, it is probably best thought of as a capacity for abstract reasoning and problem solving.

What I want to emphasize most, however, is that intelligence should not be regarded as completely synonymous with what I shall call *mental ability*, a term which refers to the totality of a person's mental capabilities. Psychologists know full well that what they mean by intelligence in the technical sense is only a part of the whole spectrum of human abilities. The notion that a person's intelligence, or some test measurement thereof, reflects the totality of all that he can possibly do with his "brains" has long caused much misunderstanding and needless dispute. As I have already indicated, the particular constellation of abilities we now call "intelligence," and which we can measure by means of "intelligence" tests, has been singled out from the total galaxy of mental abilities as being especially important in our society mainly because of the nature of our traditional system of formal education and the occupational structure with which it is coordinated. Thus, the predominant importance of intelligence is derived, not from any absolute criteria or God-given desiderata, but from societal demands. But neither does this mean, as some persons would like to believe, that intelligence exists only "by definition" or is merely an insubstantial figment of psychological theory and test construction. Intelligence fully meets the usual scientific criteria for being regarded as an aspect of objective reality, just as much as do atoms, genes, and electromagnetic fields. Intelligence has indeed been singled out as especially important by the educational and occupational demands prevailing in all industrial societies, but it is nevertheless a biological reality and not just a figment of social convention. Where educators and society in general are most apt to go wrong is in failing fully to recognize and fully to utilize a broader spectrum of abilities than just that portion which psychologists have technically designated as "intelligence." But keep in mind that it is this technical meaning of "intelligence" to which the term specifically refers throughout the present article.

The distribution of intelligence

Intelligence tests yield numerical scores or IQs (intelligence quotients) which are assumed to be, and in fact nearly are, "normally" distributed in the population. That is, the distribution of IQs conforms to the normal or so-called Gaussian distribution, the familiar "bell-shaped curve." The IQ, which is now the most universal "unit" in the measurement of intelligence, was originally defined as the ratio of the individual's mental age (MA) to his chronological age (CA): $IQ = (MA/CA) \times 100$. (Beyond about 16 years of age, the formula ceases to make sense.) Mental age was simply defined as the typical or average score obtained on a test by children of a given age, and thus the average child by definition has an IQ of 100. Because of certain difficulties with the mental age concept, which we need not go into here, modern test constructors no longer attempt to measure mental age but instead convert raw scores (i.e., the number of test items gotten "right") directly into IQs for each chronological age group. The average IQ at each age is arbitrarily set at 100, and the IQ is defined as a normally

distributed variable with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 points. (The standard deviation is an index of the amount of dispersion of scores; in the normal distribution 99.7 percent of the scores fall within ± 3 standard deviations [i.e., ± 45 IQ points] of the mean.)

There is really nothing mysterious about the fact that IQs are "normally" distributed, but it is not quite sufficient, either, to say that the normality of the distribution is just an artifact of test construction. There is a bit more to it than that.

Toss a hundred or so pennies into the air and record the number of heads that come "up" when they fall. Do this several thousand times and plot a frequency distribution of the number of heads that come up on each of the thousands of throws. You will have a distribution that very closely approximates the normal curve, and the more times you toss the hundred pennies the closer you will approximate the normal distribution.

Now, a psychological test made up of 100 or so items would behave in the same manner as the pennies, and produce a perfectly normal distribution of scores, if (a) the items have an average difficulty level of $\frac{1}{2}$ [i.e., exactly half of the number of persons taking the test would get the item "right"], and (b) the items are independent, that is, all the intercorrelations are zero. Needless to say, no psychological test that has ever been constructed meets these "ideal" criteria, and is just as well, for if we succeeded in devising such a test it would "measure" absolutely nothing but chance variation. If the test is intended to measure some trait, such as general intelligence, it will be impossible for all the test items to be completely uncorrelated. They will necessarily have some degree of positive correlation among them. Then, if the items are correlated, and if we still want the test to spread people out over a considerable range of scores, we can achieve this only if the items vary in level of difficulty; they cannot all have a difficulty level of $\frac{1}{2}$. (Imagine the extreme case in which all item intercorrelations were perfect and the difficulty level of all items was $\frac{1}{2}$. Then the "distribution" of scores would have only two points: half the testees would obtain a score of zero and half would obtain a perfect score.) So we need to have test items which have an average difficulty level of $\frac{1}{2}$ in the test overall, but which cover a considerable range of difficulty levels, say, from .1 to .9. Thus, test constructors make up their tests of items which have rather low average intercorrelations (usually between .1 and .2) and a considerable range of difficulty levels. These two sets of conditions working together, then, yield a distribution of test scores in the population which is very close to "normal." So far it appears as though we have simply made our tests in such a way as to force the scores to assume a normal distribution. And that is exactly true.

But the important question still remains to be answered: is intelligence itself—not just our measurements of it—really normally distributed? In this form the question is operationally meaningless, since, in order to find the form of the distribution of intelligence, we first have to measure it, and we have constructed our measuring instruments in such a way as to yield a normal distribution. The argument about the distribution of intelligence thus appears to be circular, is there any way out? The only way I know of is to look for evidence that our intelligence scales or IQs behave like an "interval scale." On an interval scale, the interval between any two points is equal to the interval between any other two points the same numerical distance apart. Thus, intervals on the scale are equal and additive. If we assume that intelligence is "really" normally distributed in the population, and then measure it in

such a way that we obtain a normal distribution of scores, our measurements (IQs) can be regarded as constituting an interval scale. If, then, the scale in fact behaves like an interval scale, there is some justification for saying that intelligence itself (not just IQ) is normally distributed. What evidence is there of the IQ's behaving like an interval scale? The most compelling evidence, I believe, comes from studies of the inheritance of intelligence, in which we examine the pattern of intercorrelations among relatives of varying degrees of kinship.

But, first, to understand what is meant by "behaving" like an interval scale, let us look at two well-known interval scales, the Fahrenheit and centigrade thermometers. We can prove that these are true interval scales by showing that they "behave" like interval scales in the following manner: Mix a pint of ice water at 0° C with a pint of boiling water at 100° C. The resultant temperature of the mixture will be 50° C. Mix 3 pints of ice water with 1 pint of boiling water and the temperature of the mix will be 25° C. And we can continue in this way, mixing various proportions of water at different temperatures and predicting the resultant temperatures on the assumption of an interval scale. To the extent that the thermometer readings fit the predictions, they can be considered an interval scale.

Physical stature (height) is measured on an interval scale (more than that, it is also a ratio scale) in units which are independent of height, so the normal distribution of height in the population is clearly a fact of nature and not an artifact of the scale of measurement. A rather simple genetic model "explains" the distribution of height by hypothesizing that individual variations in height are the result of a large number of independent factors each having a small effect in determining stature. (Recall the penny-tossing analogy.) This model predicts quite precisely the amount of "regression to the population mean" of the children's average height from the parent's average height, a phenomenon first noted by Sir Francis Galton in 1885. The amount of "regression to the mean" from grandparent to grandchild is exactly double that from parent to child. These regression lines for various degrees of kinship are perfectly rectilinear throughout the entire range, except at the very lower end of the scale of height, where one finds midgets and dwarfs. The slope of the regression line changes in discrete jumps according to the remoteness of kinship of the groups being compared. All this could happen only if height were measured on an interval scale. The regression lines would not be rectilinear if the trait (height) were not measured in equal intervals.

Now, it is interesting that intelligence measurements show about the same degree of "filial regression," as Galton called it, that we find for height. The simple polygenic model for the inheritance of height fits the kinship correlations obtained for intelligence almost as precisely as it does for height. And the kinship regression lines are as rectilinear for intelligence as for height, throughout the IQ scale, except at the very lower end, where we find pathological types of mental deficiency analogous to midgets and dwarfs on the scale of physical stature. In brief; IQs behave just about as much like an interval scale as do measurements of height, which we know for sure is an interval scale. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to treat the IQ as an interval scale.

Although standardized tests such as the Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler Scales were each constructed by somewhat different approaches to achieving interval scales, they both agree in revealing certain systematic discrepancies from a perfectly normal distribution of IQs when the tests are administered to a very large and truly random sample of the population. These slight deviations

of the distribution of IQs from perfect normality have shown up in many studies using a variety of tests. The most thorough studies and sophisticated discussions of their significance can be found in articles by Sir Cyril Burt (1957, 1963). The evidence, in short, indicates that intelligence is *not* distributed quite normally in the population. The distribution of IQs approximates normality quite closely in the IQ range from about 70 to 130. But outside this range there are slight, although very significant, departures from normality. From a scientific standpoint, these discrepancies are of considerable interest as genuine phenomena needing explanation.

Figure 1 shows an idealized distribution of IQs if they were distributed perfectly normally. Between IQ 70 and IQ 130, the percentage of cases falling between different IQ intervals, as indicated in Figure 1, are very close to the actual percentages estimated from large samples of the population and the departures are hardly enough to matter from any practical standpoint.

Examination of this normal curve can be instructive if one notes the consequences of shifting the total distribution curve up or down the IQ scale. The consequences of a given shift become more extreme out toward the "tails" of the distribution. For example, shifting the mean of the distribution from 100 down to 90 would put 50 percent instead of only 25 percent of the population below IQ 90; and it would put 9 percent instead of 2 percent below IQ 70. And in the upper tail of the distribution, of course, the consequences would be the reverse; instead of 25 percent above IQ 110, there would be only 9 percent, and so on. The point is that relatively small shifts in the mean of the IQ distribution can result in very large differences in the proportions of the population that fall into the very low or the very high ranges of intelligence. A 10 point downward shift in the mean, for example, would more than triple the percentage of mentally retarded (IQs below 70) in the population and would reduce the percentage of intellectually "gifted" (IQs above 130) to less than one-sixth of their present number. It is in these tails of the normal distribution that differences become most conspicuous between various groups in the population that show mean IQ differences, for whatever reason, of only a few IQ points. From a knowledge of relatively slight mean differences between various social class and ethnic groups, for example, one can estimate quite closely the relatively large differences in their proportions in special classes for the educationally retarded and for the "gifted" and in the percentages of different groups receiving scholastic honors at graduation. It is simply a property of the normal distribution that the effects of group differences in the mean are greatly magnified in the different proportions of each group that we find as we move further out toward the upper or lower extremes of the distribution.

I indicated previously that the distribution of intelligence is really not quite "normal," but shows certain systematic departures from "normality." These departures from the normal distribution are shown in Figure 2 in a slightly exaggerated form to make them clear. The shaded area is the normal distribution, and also there is an exact actual distribution of IQs in the population. We note that there are more very low IQs than would be expected in a truly normal distribution, and also there is an excess of IQs at the upper end of the scale. Note, too, the slight excess in the IQ range between about 70 and 90.

The very lowest IQs, below 55 or 60, we now know, really represent a different distribution from that of the rest of the intelligence distribution (Roberts, 1952; Zigler, 1967). Whatever factors are responsible for individual differences in the IQ range above

60 are not sufficient to account for IQs below this level, and especially below IQ 50. Practically all IQs below this level represent severe mental deficiency due to pathological conditions, massive brain damage, or rare genetic and chromosomal abnormalities. Only about $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 percent of the total population falls into the IQ range below 50; this is fewer than $\frac{1}{2}$ of all individuals classified as mentally retarded (IQs below 70). These severe grades of mental defect are not just the lower extreme of normal variation. Often they are due to a single recessive or mutant gene whose effects completely override all the other genetic factors involved in intelligence; thus they have been called "major gene" defects. In this respect, the distribution of intelligence is directly analogous to the distribution of stature. Short persons are no more abnormal than are average or tall persons; all are instances of normal variation. But extremely short persons at the very lower end of the distribution are really part of another, abnormal distribution, generally consisting of midgets and dwarfs. They are clearly not a part of normal variation. One of the commonest types of dwarfism, for example, is known to be caused by a single recessive gene.

Persons with low IQs caused by major gene defects or chromosomal abnormalities, like mongolism, are also usually abnormal in physical appearance. Persons with moderately low IQs that represent a part of normal variation, the so-called "familial mentally retarded," on the other hand, are physically indistinguishable from persons in the higher ranges of IQ. But probably the strongest evidence we have that IQs below 50 are a group apart from the mildly retarded, who represent the lower end of normal variation, comes from comparisons of the siblings of the severely retarded with siblings of the mildly retarded. In England, where this has been studied intensively, these two retardate groups are called imbecile (IQs below 50) and feeble-minded (IQs 50 to 75). Figure 3 shows the IQ distributions of the siblings of imbecile and feeble-minded children (Roberts, 1952). Note that the siblings of imbeciles have a much higher average level of intelligence than the siblings of the feeble-minded. The latter group, furthermore, shows a distribution of IQs that would be predicted from a genetic model intended to account for the normal variation of IQ in the population. This model does not at all predict the IQ distribution for the imbecile siblings. To explain the results shown in Figure 3 one must postulate some additional factors (gene or chromosome defects, pathological conditions, etc.) that cause imbecile and idiot grades of mental deficiency.

Another interesting point of contrast between severe mental deficiency and mild retardation is the fact noted by Kushlick (1966, p. 130), in surveying numerous studies, that "The parents of severely subnormal children are evenly distributed among all the social strata of industrial society, while those of mildly subnormal subjects come predominantly from the lower social classes. There is now evidence which suggests that mild subnormality in the absence of abnormal neurological signs (epilepsy, electroencephalographic abnormalities, biochemical abnormalities, chromosomal abnormalities or sensory defects) is virtually confined to the lower social classes. Indeed, there is evidence that almost no children of higher social class parents have IQ scores of less than 80, unless they have one of the pathological processes mentioned above."

In the remainder of this article we shall not be further concerned with these exceptionally low IQs below 50 or 60, which largely constitute a distribution of abnormal conditions superimposed on the factors that make for normal variation in intelligence. We shall be mainly concerned with the factors involved in the normal distribution.

Returning to Figure 2, the best explanation we have for the "bulge" between 70 and 90 is the combined effects of severe environmental disadvantages and of emotional disturbances that depress test scores. Burt (1963) has found that when, independent of the subjects' test performance there is evidence for the existence of factors that depress performance, and these exceptional subjects' scores are removed from the distribution, this "bulge" in the 70-90 range is diminished or erased. Also, on retest under more favorable conditions, the IQs of many of these exceptional subjects are redistributed at various higher points on the scale, thereby making the IQ distribution more normal.

The "excess" of IQs at the high end of the scale is certainly a substantial phenomenon, but it has not yet been adequately accounted for. In his multifactorial theory of the inheritance of intelligence, Burt (1958) has postulated major gene effects that make for exceptional intellectual abilities represented at the upper end of the scale, just as other major gene effects make for the subnormality found at the extreme lower end of the scale. One might also hypothesize that superior genotypes for intellectual development are pushed to still greater superiority in their phenotypic expression through interaction with the environment. Early recognition of superiority leads to its greater cultivation and encouragement by the individual's social environment. This influence is keenly evident in the developmental histories of persons who have achieved exceptional eminence (Goertzel & Goertzel, 1962). Still another possible explanation of the upper-end "excess" lies in the effects of assortative mating in the population, meaning the tendency for "like to marry like." If the degree of resemblance in intelligence between parents in the upper half of the IQ distribution were significantly greater than the degree of resemblance of parents in the below average range, genetic theory would predict the relative elongation of the upper tail of the distribution. This explanation, however, must remain speculative until we have more definite evidence of whether there is differential assortative mating in different regions of the IQ distribution.

The Concept of Variance. Before going on to discuss the factors that account for normal variation in intelligence among individuals in the population, a word of explanation is in order concerning the quantification of variation. The amount of dispersion of scores depicted by the distributions in Figures 1 and 2 is technically expressed as the *variance*, which is the square of the standard deviation of the scores in the distribution. (Since the standard deviation of IQs in the population is 15, the total variance is 225.) *Variance* is a basic concept in all discussions of individual differences and population genetics. If you take the difference between every score and the mean of that total distribution, square each of these differences, sum them up, and divide the sum by the total number of scores, you have a quantity called the *variance*. It is an index of the total amount of variation among scores. Since variance represents variation on an additive scale, the total variance of a distribution of scores can be partitioned into a number of components, each one due to some factor which contributes a certain specifiable proportion of the variance, and all these variance components add up to the total variance. The mathematical technique for doing this, called "the analysis of variance," was invented by Sir Ronald Fisher, the British geneticist and statistician. It is one of the great achievements in the development of statistical methodology.

THE INHERITANCE OF INTELLIGENCE

"In the actual race of life, which is not to get ahead, but to get ahead of somebody,

the chief determining factor is heredity." So said Edward L. Thorndike in 1905. Since then, the preponderance of evidence has proved him right, certainly as concerns those aspects of life in which intelligence plays an important part.

But one would get a quite different impression from reading most of the recent popular textbooks of psychology and education. Genetic factors in individual differences have usually been belittled, obscured, or denigrated, probably for reasons of interest mainly on historical, political, and ideological grounds which we need not go into here. Some of the following quotations, each from different widely used texts in our field, give some indication of the basis for my complaint. "We can attribute no particular portion of intelligence to heredity and no particular portion to the environment." "The relative influence of heredity and environment upon intelligence has been the topic of considerable investigations over the last half century. Actually the problem is incapable of solution since studies do not touch upon the problem of heredity and environment but simply upon the susceptibility of the content of a particular test to environmental influences." "Among people considered normal, the range of genetic variations is not very great." "Although at the present time practically all responsible workers in the field recognize that conclusive proof of the heritability of mental ability (where no organic or metabolic pathology is involved) is still lacking, the assumption that subnormality has a genetic basis continues to crop up in scientific studies." "There is no evidence that nature is more important than nurture. The two forces always operate together to determine the course of intellectual development." The import of such statements apparently filters up to high levels of policy-making, for we find a Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education stating in a published speech that children "... all have similar potential at birth. The differences occur shortly thereafter." These quotations typify much of the current attitude toward heredity and environment that has prevailed in education in recent years. The belief in the almost infinite plasticity of intellect, the ostrich-like denial of biological factors in individual differences, and the slighting of the role of genetics in the study of intelligence can only hinder investigation and understanding of the conditions, processes, and limits through which the social environment influences human behavior.

But fortunately we are beginning to see some definite signs that this mistreatment of the genetic basis of intelligence by social scientists may be on the wane, and that a biosocial view of intellectual development more in accord with the evidence is gaining greater recognition. As Yale psychologist Edward Zigler (1968) has so well stated:

"Not only do I insist that we take the biological integrity of the organism seriously, but it is also my considered opinion that our nation has more to fear from unbridled environmentalists than they do from those who point to such integrity as one factor in the determination of development. It is the environmentalists who have been writing review after review in which genetics are ignored and the concept of capacity is treated as a dirty word. It is the environmentalists who have placed on the defensive any thinker who, perhaps impressed by the revolution in biological thought stemming from discoveries involving RNA-DNA phenomena, has had the temerity to suggest that certain behaviors may be in part the product of read-out mechanisms residing within the programmed organism. It is the unbridled environmentalist who emphasizes the plasticity of the intellect, that tells us one can change both the general rate of development and the configuration of intellectual processes

which can be referred to as the intellect, if we could only subject human beings to the proper technologies. In the educational realm, this has spelled itself out in the use of panaceas, gadgets, and gimmicks of the most questionable sort. It is the environmentalist who suggests to parents how easy it is to raise the child's IQ and who has prematurely led many to believe that the retarded could be made normal, and the normal made geniuses. It is the environmentalist who has argued for pressure-cooker schools, at what psychological cost, we do not yet know."

Most geneticists and students of human evolution have fully recognized the role of culture in shaping "human nature," but also they do not minimize the biological basis of diversity in human behavioral characteristics. Geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky (1968, p. 554) has expressed this viewpoint in the broadest terms: "The trend of cultural evolution has been not toward making everybody have identical occupations but toward a more and more differentiated occupational structure. What would be the most adaptive response to this trend? Certainly nothing that would encourage genetic uniformity. . . . To argue that only environmental circumstances and training determine a person's behavior makes a travesty of democratic notions of individual choice, responsibility, and freedom."

EVIDENCE FROM STUDIES OF SELECTIVE BREEDING

The many studies of selective breeding in various species of mammals provide conclusive evidence that many behavioral characteristics, just as most physical characteristics, can be manipulated by genetic selection (see Fuller & Thompson, 1962; Scott and Fuller, 1965). Rats, for example, have been bred for maze learning ability in many different laboratories. It makes little difference whether one refers to this ability as rat "intelligence," "learning ability" or some other term—we know that it is possible to breed selectively for whatever the factors are that make for speed of maze learning. To be sure, individual variation in this complex ability may be due to any combination of a number of characteristics involving sensory acuity, drive level, emotional stability, strength of innate turning preferences, brain chemistry, brain size, structure of neural connections, speed of synaptic transmission, or whatever. The point is that the molar behavior of learning to get through a maze efficiently without making errors (i.e., going up blind alleys) can be markedly influenced in later generations by selective breeding of the parent generations of rats who are either fast or slow ("maze bright" or "maze dull," to use the prevailing terminology in this research) in learning to get through the maze. Figure 4 shows the results of one such genetic selection experiment. They are quite typical; within only six generations of selection the offspring of the "dull" strain make 100 percent more errors in learning the maze than do the offspring of the "bright" strain (Thompson, 1954). In most experiments of this type, of course, the behaviors that respond so dramatically to selection are relatively simple as compared with human intelligence, and the experimental selection pressure is severe, so the implications of such findings for the study of human variation should not be overdrawn. Yet geneticists seem to express little doubt that many behavioral traits in humans would respond similarly to genetic selection. Three eminent geneticists (James F. Crow, James V. Neel, and Curt Stern) of the National Academy of Sciences recently prepared a "position statement," which was generally hedged by extreme caution and understatement, that asserted: "Animal experiments have shown that almost any trait can be changed by selection. . . . A selection program to increase human intelligence (or whatever is measured by various kinds of 'intelligence'

tests) would almost certainly be successful in some measure. The same is probably true for other behavioral traits. The rate of increase would be somewhat unpredictable, but there is little doubt that there would be progress" (National Academy of Sciences, 1967, p. 893).

Direct evidence of genetic influences on human abilities

One of the most striking pieces of evidence for the genetic control of mental abilities is a chromosomal anomaly called Turner's syndrome. Normal persons have 46 chromosomes. Persons with Turner's syndrome have only 45. When their chromosomes are stained and viewed under the microscope, it is seen that the sex-chromatin is missing from one of the two chromosomes that determine the individual's sex. In normal persons this pair of chromosomes is conventionally designated XY for males and XX for females. The anomaly of Turner's syndrome is characterized as XO. These persons always have the morphologic appearance of females but are always sterile, and they show certain physical characteristics such as diminutive stature, averaging about five feet tall as adults. The interesting point about Turner's cases from our standpoint is that although their IQs on most verbal tests of intelligence show a perfectly normal distribution, their performance on tests involving spatial ability or perceptual organization is abnormally low (Money, 1964). Their peculiar deficiency in spatial-perceptual ability is sometimes so severe as to be popularly characterized as "space-form blindness." It is also interesting that Turner's cases seem to be more or less uniformly low on spatial ability regardless of their level of performance on other tests of mental ability. These rare persons also report unusual difficulty with arithmetic and mathematics in school despite otherwise normal or superior intelligence. So here is a genetic aberration, clearly identifiable under the microscope, which has quite specific consequences on cognitive processes. Such specific intellectual deficiencies are thus entirely possible without there being any specific environmental deprivations needed to account for them.

There are probably other more subtle cognitive effects associated with the sex chromosomes in normal persons. It has long been suspected that males have greater environmental vulnerability than females, and Nancy Bayley's important longitudinal research on children's mental development clearly shows both a higher degree and a greater variety of environmental and personality correlates of mental abilities in boys than in girls (Bayley, 1965b, 1966, 1968).

Polygenic inheritance

Since intelligence is basically dependent on the structural and biochemical properties of the brain, it should not be surprising that differences in intellectual capacity are partly the result of genetic factors which conform to the same principles involved in the inheritance of physical characteristics. The general model that geneticists have devised to account for the facts of inheritance of continuous or metrical physical traits, such as stature, cephalic index, and fingerprint ridges, also applies to intelligence. The mechanism of inheritance for such traits is called polygenic, since normal variation in the characteristic is the result of multiple genes whose effects are small, similar, and cumulative. The genes can be thought of as the pennies in the coin-tossing analogy described previously. Some genes add a positive increment to the metric value of the characteristic ("heads") and some genes add nothing ("tails"). The random segregation of the parental genes in the process of gametogenesis (formation of the sex cells) and their chance combination in the zygote (fertilized egg) may be likened to the tossing of a large number of pennies, with each "head" adding a positive increment to

the trait, thereby producing the normal bell-shaped distribution of trait values in a large number of tosses. The actual number of genes involved in intelligence is not known. In fact, the total number of genes in the human chromosomes is unknown. The simplest possible model would require between ten and twenty gene pairs (alleles) to account for the normal distribution of intelligence, but many more genes than this are most likely involved (Gottesman, 1963, pp. 290-291).

The concept of heritability

The study of the genetic basis of individual differences in intelligence in humans has evolved in the traditions and methods of that branch of genetics called quantitative genetics or population genetics, the foundations of which were laid down by British geneticists and statisticians such as Galton, Pearson, Fisher, Haldane, and Mather, and, in the United States, by J. L. Lush and Sewall Wright. Probably the most distinguished exponent of the application of these methods to the study of intelligence is Sir Cyril Burt, whose major writings on this subject are a "must" for students of individual differences (Burt, 1955, 1958, 1959, 1961, 1966; Burt & Howard, 1956, 1957).

One aim of this approach to the study of individual differences in intelligence is to account for the total variance in the population (excluding pathological cases at the bottom of the distribution) in terms of the proportions of the variance attributable to various genetic and environmental components. It will pay to be quite explicit about just what this actually means.

Individual differences in such measurements of intelligence as the IQ are represented as population variance in a phenotype V_P , and are distributed approximately as shown in Figure 1. Conceptually, this total variance of the phenotypes can be partitioned into a number of variance components, each of which represents a source of variance. The components, of course, all add up to the total variance. Thus,

$$V_P = \frac{(V_G + V_{AM}) + V_D + V_I + V_E + 2Cov_{HE}}{V_H} + \frac{V_1 + V_2}{V_E} \quad (2)$$

where: V_P = phenotypic variance in the population

V_G = genetic (or additive) variance

V_{AM} = variance due to assortative mating. $V_{AM} = 0$ under random mating (panmixia).

V_D = dominance deviation variance

V_I = epistasis (interaction among genes at 2 or more loci)

V_E = environmental variance

Cov_{HE} = covariance of heredity and environment

V_1 = true statistical interaction of genetic and environmental factors

V_2 = error of measurement (unreliability).

Here are a few words of explanation about each of these variance components.

Phenotypic Variance. V_P is already clear; it is total variance of the trait measurements in the population.

Genic Variance. V_G , the genic (or additive) variance, is attributable to gene effects which are additive; that is, each gene adds an equal increment to the metric value of the trait. Sir Ronald Fisher referred to this component as "the essential genotypes," since it is the part of the genetic inheritance which "breeds true"—it accounts for the resemblance between parents and offspring. If trait variance involved nothing but additive genic effects, the average value of all the offspring that could theoretically be born to a pair of parents would be exactly equal to the average value of the parents (called the midparent value). It is thus the genic aspect which is most important to agriculturalists and breeders of livestock, since it is the genic component of the phenotypic variance that responds to selection according to the simple rule of "like begets like." The larger the proportion of genic variance involved in a given characteristic, the fewer is the number of

generations of selective breeding required to effect a change of some specified magnitude in the characteristic.

Assortative Mating. V_{AM} , the variance due to assortative mating, is conventionally not separated from V_G , since assortative mating actually affects the proportion of V_G directly. I have separated these components here for explanatory reasons, and it is, in fact, possible to obtain independent estimates of the two components. If mating were completely random in the population with respect to a given characteristic—that is, if the correlation between parents were zero (a state of affairs known as *panmixia*)—the V_{AM} component would also be equal to zero and the population variance on the trait in question would therefore be reduced.

Assortative mating has the effect of increasing the resemblance among siblings and also of increasing the differences between families in the population. (In the terminology of analysis of variance, assortative mating decreases the *Within Families* variance and increases the *Between Families* variance.)

For some human characteristics the degree of assortative mating is effectively zero. This is true of fingerprint ridges, for example. Men and women are obviously not attracted to one another on the basis of their fingerprints. Height, however, has an assortative mating coefficient (i.e., the correlation between mates) of about .30. The IQ, interestingly enough, shows a higher degree of assortative mating in our society than any other measurable human characteristic. I have surveyed the literature on this point, based on studies in Europe and North America, and find that the correlation between spouses' intelligence test scores averages close to +.60. Thus, spouses are more alike in intelligence than brothers and sisters, who are correlated about .50.

As Eckland (1967) has pointed out, this high correlation between marriage partners does not come about solely because men and women are such excellent judges of one another's intelligence, but because mate selection is greatly aided by the highly visible selective processes of the educational system and the occupational hierarchy. Here is a striking instance of how educational and social factors can have far-reaching genetic consequences in the population. One would predict, for example, that in preliterate or preindustrial societies assortative mating with respect to intelligence would be markedly less than it is in modern industrial societies. The educational screening mechanisms and socio-economic stratification by which intelligence becomes more readily visible would not exist, and other traits of more visible importance to the society would take precedence over intelligence as a basis for assortative mating. Even in our own society, there may well be differential degrees as assortative mating in different segments of the population, probably related to their opportunities for educational and occupational selection. When any large and socially insulated group is not subject to the social and educational circumstances that lead to a high degree of assortative mating for intelligence, there should be important genetic consequences. One possible consequence is some reduction of the group's ability, not as individuals but as a group, to compete intellectually. Thus probably one of the most cogent arguments for society's promoting full equality of educational, occupational, and economic opportunity lies in the possible genetic consequences of these social institutions.

The reason is simply that assortative mating increases the genetic variance in the population. By itself this will not affect the mean of the trait in the population, but it will have a great effect on the proportion of the population falling in the upper and lower tails of the distribution. Under present

conditions, with an assortative mating coefficient of about .60, the standard deviation of IQs is 15 points. If assortative mating for intelligence were reduced to zero, the standard deviation of IQs would fall to 12.9. The consequences of this reduction in the standard deviation would be most evident at the extremes of the intelligence distribution. For example, assuming a normal distribution of IQs and the present standard deviation of 15, the frequency (per million) of persons above IQ 130 is 22,750. Without assortative mating the frequency of IQs over 130 would fall to 9,900, or only 43.5 percent of the present frequency. For IQs above 145, the frequency (per million) is 1,350 and with no assortative mating would fall to 241, or 17.9 percent of the present frequency. And there are now approximately 20 times as many persons above an IQ of 160 as we would find if there were no assortative mating for intelligence.³ Thus differences in assortative mating can have a profound effect on a people's intellectual resources, especially at the levels of intelligence required for complex problem solving, invention, and scientific and technological innovation.

But what is the effect of assortative mating on the lower tail of the distribution? On theoretical grounds we should also expect it to increase the proportion of low IQs in the population. It probably does this to some extent, but not as much as it increases the frequency of higher IQs, because there is a longer-term consequence of assortative mating which also must be considered. A number of studies have shown that in populations practicing a high degree of assortative mating, persons below IQ 75 are much less successful in finding marriage partners and, as a group, have relatively fewer offspring than do persons of higher intelligence (Bajema, 1963, 1966; Higgins, Reed & Reed, 1962). Since assortative mating increases variance, it in effect pushes more people into the below IQ 75 group, where they fail to reproduce, thereby resulting in a net selection for genes favoring high intelligence. Thus, in the long run, assortative mating may have a eugenic effect in improving the general level of intelligence in the population.

Dominance Deviation. V_D , the dominance deviation variance, is apparent when we observe a systematic discrepancy between the average value of the parents and the average value of their offspring on a given characteristic. Genes at some of the loci in the chromosome are recessive (r) and their effects are not manifested in the phenotype unless they are paired with another recessive at the same locus. If paired with a dominant gene (D), their effect is overridden or "dominated" by the dominant gene. Thus, in terms of increments which genes add to the metric value of the phenotype, if $r=0$ and $D=1$, then $r+r=0$, and $D+D=2$, but $D+r$ will equal 2, since D dominates r . Because of the presence of some proportion of recessive genes in the genotypes for a particular trait, not all of the parents' phenotypic characteristics will show up in their offspring, and, of course, vice versa: not all of the offspring's characteristics will be seen in the parents. This makes for a less than perfect correlation between midparent and midchild values on the trait in question. V_D , the dominance variance, represents the component of variance in the population which is due to this average discrepancy between parents and offspring. The magnitude of V_D depends upon the proportions of dominant and recessive genes consti-

tuting the genotypes for the characteristic in the population.

Epistasis. V_I is the variance component attributable to epistasis, which means the interaction of the effects among genes at two or more loci. When genes "interact," their effects are not strictly additive; that is to say, their combined effect may be more or less than the sum of their separate effects. Like dominance, epistasis also accounts for some of the lack of resemblance between parents and their offspring. And it increases the population variance by a component designated as V_I .

Environmental Variance. "Environmental" really means all sources of variance not attributable to genetic effects or errors of measurement (i.e., test unreliability). In discussions of intelligence, the environment is often thought of only in terms of the social and cultural influences on the individual. While these are important, they are not the whole of "environment," which includes other more strictly biological influences, such as the prenatal environment and nutritional factors early in life. In most studies of the heritability of intelligence "environment" refers to all variance that is not accounted for by genetic factors [$(V_G + V_{AM} + V_D + V_I)$] and measurement error (V_e).

Covariance of Heredity and Environment. This term can also be expressed as—

$$2r_{HE} \sqrt{V_H \times V_E}$$

where r_{HE} is the correlation between heredity and environment, V_H is the variance due to all genetic factors, and V_E is variance due to all environmental factors. In other words, if there is a positive correlation between genetic and environmental factors, the population variance is increased by a theoretically specifiable amount indicated by the covariance term in Equation 2.

Such covariance undoubtedly exists for intelligence in our society. Children with better than average genetic endowment for intelligence have a greater than chance likelihood of having parents of better than average intelligence who are capable of providing environmental advantages that foster intellectual development. Even among children within the same family, parents and teachers will often give special attention and opportunities to the child who displays exceptional abilities. A genotype for superior ability may cause the social environment to foster the ability, as when parents perceive unusual responsiveness to music in one of their children and therefore provide more opportunities for listening, music lessons, encouragement to practice, and so on. A bright child may also create a more intellectually stimulating environment for himself in terms of the kinds of activities that engage his interest and energy. And the social rewards that come to the individual who excels in some activity reinforce its further development. Thus the covariance term for any given trait will be affected to a significant degree by the kinds of behavioral propensities the culture rewards or punishes, encourages or discourages. For traits viewed as desirable in our culture, such as intelligence, hereditary and environmental factors will be positively correlated. But for some other traits which are generally viewed as socially undesirable, hereditary and environmental influences may be negatively correlated. This means that the social environment tends to discourage certain behavioral propensities when they are out of line with the values of the culture. Then, instead of heredity and environment acting in the same direction, they work in opposite directions, with a consequent reduction in the population variance in the trait. Overt aggressive tendencies may be a good example of behavior involving a negative correlation between genotypic propensities and environmental counter-pressures. An example of negative heredity-environment correlation in the scholastic realm would be found in the

case where a child with a poor genetic endowment for learning some skill which is demanded by societal norms, such as being able to read, causes the child's parents to lavish special tutorial attention on their child in an effort to bring his performance up to par.

In making overall estimates of the proportions of variance attributable to hereditary and environmental factors, there is some question as to whether the covariance component should be included on the side of heredity or environment. But there can be no "correct" answer to this question. To the degree that the individual's genetic propensities cause him to fashion his own environment, given the opportunity, the covariance (or some part of it) can be justifiably regarded as part of the total heritability of the trait. But if one wishes to estimate what the heritability of the trait would be under artificial conditions in which there is absolutely no freedom for variation in individuals' utilization of their environment, then the covariance term should be included on the side of environment. Since most estimates of the heritability of intelligence are intended to reflect the existing state of affairs, they usually include the covariance in the proportion of variance due to heredity.

Interaction of Heredity and Environment. The interaction of genetic and environmental factors (V_I) must be clearly distinguished from the covariance of heredity and environment. There is considerable confusion concerning the meaning of interaction in much of the literature on heredity and intelligence. It is claimed, for example, that nothing can be said about the relative importance of heredity and environment because intelligence is the result of the "interaction" of these influences and therefore their independent effects cannot be estimated. This is simply false. The proportion of the population variance due to genetic \times environment interaction is conceptually and empirically separable from other variance components, and its independent contribution to the total variance can be known. Those who call themselves "interactionists," with the conviction that they have thereby either solved or risen above the whole issue of the relative contributions of heredity and environment to individual differences in intelligence, are apparently unaware that the preponderance of evidence indicates that the interaction variance, V_I , is the smallest component of the total phenotypic variance of intelligence.

What *interaction* really means is that different genotypes respond in different ways to the same environmental factors. For example, genetically different individuals having the same initial weight and the same activity level may gain weight at quite different rates all under exactly the same increase in caloric intake. Their genetically different constitutions cause them to metabolize exactly the same intake quite differently. An example of genotype \times environmental interaction in the behavioral realm is illustrated in Figure 5. Strains of rats selectively bred for "brightness" or "dullness" in maze learning show marked differences in maze performance according to the degree of sensory stimulation in the conditions under which they are reared. For the "bright" strain, the difference between being reared in a "restricted" or in a "normal" environment makes a great difference in maze performance. But for the "dull" strain the big difference is between a "normal" and a "stimulating" environment. While the strains differ greatly when reared under "normal" conditions (presumably the conditions under which they were selectively bred for "dullness" and "brightness"), they do not differ in the least when reared in a "restricted" environment and only slightly in a "stimulating" environment. This is the meaning of the genetic \times environment interaction. Criticisms of the analysis of variance model for the components of phenotypic variance (e.g., Equation 2), put forth

³I am grateful to University of California geneticist Dr. Jack Lester King for making these calculations, which are based on the assumption that the heritability of IQ is .80, a value which is the average of all the major studies of the heritability of intelligence.

first by Loevinger (1943) and then by Hunt (1961, p. 329), are based on the misconception that the model implies that all effects of heredity and environment are strictly additive and there is no "non-additive" or interaction term. The presence of V_i in Equation 2 explicitly shows that the heredity \times environment interaction is included in the analysis of variance model, and the contribution of V_i to the total variance may be estimated independently of the purely additive effects of heredity and environment. The magnitude of V_i for any given characteristic in any specified population is a matter for empirical study, not philosophic debate. If V_i turns out to constitute a relatively small proportion of the total variance, as the evidence shows is the case for human intelligence, this is not a fault of the analysis of variance model. It is simply a fact. If the interaction variance actually exists in any significant amount, the model will reveal it.

Several studies, reviewed by Wiseman (1964, p. 55; 1966, p. 66), provide most of the information we have concerning what may be presumed to be an heredity \times environment interaction with respect to human intelligence. The general finding is that children who are more than one standard deviation (SD) above the mean IQ show greater correlations with environmental factors than do children who are more than one SD below the mean. In other words, if the heritability of IQ were determined in these two groups separately, it would be higher in the low IQ groups. Also, when siblings within the same family are grouped into above and below IQ 100, the scholastic achievement of the above 100 group shows a markedly higher correlation with environmental factors than in the below 100 group. This indicates a true interaction between intelligence and environment in determining educational attainments.

Error Variance. The variance due to errors of measurement (V_e) is, of course, unwanted but unavoidable, since all measurements fall short of perfect reliability. The proportion of test score variance due to error is equal to $1-r_{tt}$ (where r_{tt} is the reliability of the test, that is, its correlation with itself). For most intelligence tests, error accounts for between 5 and 10 percent of the variance.

Definition of heritability

Heritability is a technical term in genetics meaning specifically the proportion of phenotypic variance due to variance in genotypes. When psychologists speak of heritability they almost invariably define it as:

$$H = \frac{(V_G + V_{AM}) + V_D + V_i}{V_P - V_e} \quad (3)$$

Although this formula is technically the definition of H , heritability estimates in psychological studies may also include the covariance term of Equation 2 in the numerator of Equation 3.

Common misconceptions about heritability

Certain misconceptions about heritability have become so widespread and strongly ingrained that it is always necessary to counteract them before presenting the empirical findings on the subject, lest these findings only add to the confusion or provoke the dogmatic acceptance or rejection of notions that are not at all implied by the meaning of heritability.

Heredity versus Environment. Genetic and environmental factors are not properly viewed as being in opposition to each other. Nor are they an "all or none" affair. Any observable characteristic, physical or behavioral, is a phenotype, the very existence of which depends upon both genetic and environmental conditions. The legitimate question is not whether the characteristic is due to heredity or environment, but what proportion of the population variation in the characteristic is attributable to genotypic variation (which is H , the heritability) and

what proportion is attributable to non-genetic or environmental variation in the population (which is $1-H$). For metric characteristics like stature and intelligence, H can have values between 0 and 1.

Individual versus Population. Heritability is a population statistic, describing the relative magnitude of the genetic component (or set of genetic components) in the population variance of the characteristic in question. It has no sensible meaning with reference to a measurement or characteristic in an individual. A single measurement, by definition, has no variance. There is no way of partitioning a given individual's IQ into hereditary and environmental components, as if the person inherited, say, 80 points of IQ and acquired 20 additional points from his environment. This is, of course, nonsense. The square root of the heritability (\sqrt{H}), however, tells us the correlation between genotypes and phenotypes in the population, and this permits a probabilistic inference concerning the average amount of difference between individuals' obtained IQs and the "genotypic value" of their intelligence. (The average correlation between phenotypes and genotypes for IQ is about .90 in European and North American Caucasian populations, as determined from summary data presented later in this paper [Table 2]. The square of this value is known as the heritability—the proportion of phenotypic variance due to genetic variation.) The principle is the same as estimating the "true" scores from obtained scores in test theory. Statements about individuals can be made only on a probabilistic basis and not with absolute certainty. Only if heritability were unity (i.e., $H=1$) would there be a perfect correlation between obtained scores and genotypic values, in which case we could say with assurance that an individual's measured IQ perfectly represented his genotype for intelligence. This still would not mean that the phenotype could have developed without an environment, for without either heredity or environment there simply is no organism and no phenotype. Thus the statement we so often hear in discussions of individual differences—that the individual's intelligence is the product of the interaction of his heredity and his environment—is rather fatuous. It really states nothing more than the fact that the individual exists.

Constancy. From what has already been said about heritability, it must be clear that it is not a constant like π and the speed of light. H is an empirically determined population statistic, and like any statistic, its value is affected by the characteristics of the population. H will be higher in a population in which environmental variation relevant to the trait in question is small, than in a population in which there is great environmental variation. Similarly, when a population is relatively homogeneous in genetic factors but not in the environmental factors relevant to the development of the characteristic, the heritability of the characteristic in question will be lower. In short, the value of H is jointly a function of genetic and environmental variability in the population. Also, like any other statistic, it is an estimate based on a sample of the population and is therefore subject to sampling error—the smaller the sample, the greater the margin of probable error. Values of H reported in the literature do not represent what the heritability might be under any environmental conditions or in all populations or even in the same population at different times. Estimates of H are specific to the population sampled, the point in time, how the measurements were made, and the particular test used to obtain the measurements.

Measurements versus Reality. It is frequently argued that since we cannot really measure intelligence we cannot possibly de-

termine its heritability. Whether we can or cannot measure intelligence, which is a separate issue I have already discussed, let it be emphasized that it makes no difference to the question of heritability. We do not estimate the heritability of some trait that lies hidden behind our measurements. We estimate the heritability of the phenotypes and these are the measurements themselves. Regardless of what it is that our tests measure, the heritability tells us how much of the variance in these measurements is due to genetic factors. If the test scores get at nothing genetic, the result will simply be that estimates of their heritability will not differ significantly from zero. The fact that heritability estimates based on IQs differ very significantly from zero is proof that genetic factors play a part in individual differences in IQ. To the extent that a test is not "culture-free" or "culture-fair," it will result in a lower heritability measurement. It makes no more sense to say that intelligence tests do not really measure intelligence but only developed intelligence than to say that scales do not really measure a person's weight but only the weight he has acquired by eating. An "environment-free" test of intelligence makes as much sense as a "nutrition-free" scale for weight.

Know All versus Know Nothing. This expression describes another confused notion: the idea that unless we can know absolutely everything about the genetics of intelligence we can know nothing! Proponents of this view demand that we be able to spell out in detail every single link in the chain of causality from genes (or DNA molecules) to test scores if we are to say anything about the heritability of intelligence. Determining the heritability of a characteristic does not at all depend upon a knowledge of its physical, biochemical, or physiological basis or of the precise mechanisms through which the characteristic is modified by the environment. Knowledge of these factors is, of course, important in its own right, but we need not have such knowledge to establish the genetic basis of the characteristic. Selective breeding was practiced fruitfully for centuries before anything at all was known of chromosomes and genes, and the science of quantitative genetics upon which the estimation of heritability depends has proven its value independently of advances in biochemical and physiological genetics.

Acquired versus Inherited. How can a socially defined attribute such as intelligence be said to be inherited? Or something that is so obviously acquired from the social environment as vocabulary? Strictly speaking, of course, only genes are inherited. But the brain mechanisms which are involved in learning are genetically conditioned just as are other structures and functions of the organism. What the organism is capable of learning from the environment and its rate of learning thus have a biological basis. Individuals differ markedly in the amount, rate, and kinds of learning they evince even given equal opportunities. Consider the differences that show up when a Mozart and the average run of children are given music lessons! If a test of vocabulary shows high heritability, it only means that persons in the population have had fairly equal opportunity for learning all the words in the test, and the differences in their scores are due mostly to differences in capacity for learning. If members of the population had had very unequal exposures to the words in the vocabulary test, the heritability of the scores would be very low.

Immutability. High heritability by itself does not necessarily imply that the characteristic is immutable. Under greatly changed environmental conditions, the heritability may have some other value, or it may remain the same while the mean of the population changes. At one time tuberculosis had a very high heritability, the reason being that the

tuberculosis bacilli were extremely widespread throughout the population, so that the main factor determining whether an individual contracted tuberculosis was not the probability of exposure but the individual's inherited physical constitution. Now that tuberculosis bacilli are relatively rare, difference in exposure rather than in physical predisposition is a more important determinant of who contracts tuberculosis. In the absence of exposure, individual differences in predisposition are of no consequence.

Heritability also tells us something about the locus of control of a characteristic. The control of highly heritable characteristics is usually in the organism's internal biochemical mechanisms. Traits of low heritability are usually controlled by external environmental factors. No amount of psychotherapy, tutoring, or other psychological intervention will elicit normal performance from a child who is mentally retarded because of phenylketonuria (PKU), a recessive genetic defect of metabolism which results in brain damage. Yet a child who has inherited the genes for PKU can grow up normally if his diet is controlled to eliminate certain proteins which contain phenylalanine. Knowledge of the genetic and metabolic basis of this condition in recent years has saved many children from mental retardation.

Parent-Child Resemblance. The old maxim that "like begets like" is held up as an instance of the workings of heredity. The lack of parent-child resemblance, on the other hand, is often mistakenly interpreted as evidence that a characteristic is not highly heritable. But the principles of genetics also explain the fact that often "like begets unlike." A high degree of parent-offspring resemblance, in fact, is to be expected only in highly inbred (or homozygous) strains, as in certain highly selected breeds of dogs and laboratory strains of mice. The random segregation of the parental genes in the formation of the sex cells means that the child receives a random selection of only half of each parent's genes. This fact that parent and child have only 50 percent of their genes in common, along with the effects of dominance and epistasis, insures considerable genetic dissimilarity between parent and child as well as among siblings, who also have only 50 percent of their genes in common. The fact that one parent and a child have only 50 percent of their genes in common is reflected in the average parent-offspring correlation (r_{po}) of between .50 and .60 (depending on the degree of assortative mating for a given characteristic) which obtains for height, head circumference, fingerprint ridges, intelligence, and other highly heritable characteristics. (The correlation is also between .50 and .60 for siblings on these characteristics; sibling resemblance is generally much higher than this for traits of low heritability.) The genetic correlation between the average of both parents (called the "midparent") and a single offspring (r_{po}) is the square root of the correlation for a single parent (i.e., $r_{po} = \sqrt{r_{po}}$). The correlation between the average of both parents and the average of all the offspring ("midchild") that they could theoretically produce (r_{pc}) is the same value as H_N , i.e., heritability in the narrow sense.⁴ It is noteworthy that empirical determinations of the midparent-midchild correlation (r_{pc}) in fact closely approximate the values of H as estimated by various

⁴ Heritability in the narrow sense is an estimate of the proportion of genic variance without consideration of dominance and epistasis. This contrasts with equation (3), the definition of H , which includes estimates for these two factors. Signified as H_N , heritability in the narrow sense is conceptually defined as:

$$H_N = \frac{(V_G + V_{AM})}{V_P - V_e}$$

methods, such as comparisons of twins, siblings, and unrelated children reared together.

Empirical findings on the heritability of intelligence

It is always preferable, of course, to have estimates of the proportions of variance contributed by each of the components in Equation 2 than to have merely an overall estimate of H . But to obtain reliable estimates of the separate components requires large samples of persons of different kinships, such as identical twins reared together and reared apart, fraternal twins, siblings, half-siblings, parents-children, cousins, and so on. The methods of quantitative genetics by which these variance components, as well as the heritability, can be calculated from such kinship data are technical matters beyond the scope of this article, and the reader must be referred elsewhere for expositions of the methodology of quantitative genetics (Cattell, 1960; Falconer, 1960; Huntley, 1966; Kempthorne, 1957; Loehlin, in press).

The most satisfactory attempt to estimate the separate variance components is the work of Sir Cyril Burt (1955, 1958), based on large samples of many kinships drawn mostly from the school population of London. The IQ test used by Burt was an English adaptation of the Stanford-Binet. Burt's results may be regarded as representative of variance components of intelligence in populations that are similar to the population of London in their degree of genetic heterogeneity and in their range of environmental variation. Table I shows the percentage of variance due to the various components, grouped under "genetic" and "environmental," in Burt's analysis.

TABLE 1.—ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES (BURT, 1958)

Source of variance	Percent ¹	Percent ²
Genetic:		
Genic (additive).....	40.5	(47.9)
Assortative mating.....	19.9	(17.9)
Dominance and epistasis.....	16.7	(21.7)
Environmental:		
Covariance of heredity and environment.....	10.6	(1.4)
Random environmental effects, including HXE interaction (V _r).....	5.9	(5.8)
Unreliability (test error).....	6.4	(5.3)
Total.....	100.0	(100.0)

¹ Figures in parentheses are percentages for adjusted assessments. (See text for explanation.)

When Burt submitted the test scores to the children's teachers for criticism on the basis of their impressions of the child's "brightness," a number of children were identified for whom the IQ was not a fair estimate of the child's ability in the teachers' judgment. These children were retested, often on a number of tests on several occasions, and the result was an "adjusted" assessment of the child's IQ. The results of the analysis of variance after these adjusted assessments were made are shown in paren-

theses in Table 1. Note that the component most affected by the adjustments is the covariance of heredity and environment, which is what we should expect if the test is not perfectly "culture-fair." It means that the adjusted scores reduced systematic environmental sources of variance and thereby came closer to representing the children's innate ability, or, stated more technically, the adjusted scores increased the correlation between genotype and phenotype from .88 for unadjusted scores to .93 for adjusted scores. (Corrected for test unreliability these correlations become .90 and .96, respectively. And the heritabilities (H_N) for the two sets of scores are therefore $(.90)^2 = .81$ and $(.96)^2 = .93$, respectively.)

Kinship Correlations. The basic data from which variance components and heritability coefficients are estimated are correlations among individuals of different degrees of kinship. Nearly all such kinship correlations reported in the literature are summarized in Table 2. The median values of the correlations obtained in the various studies are given here. These represent the most reliable values we have for the correlations among relatives. Most of the values are taken from the survey by Erlenmeyer-Kimling and Jarvik (1963), and I have supplemented these with certain kinship correlations not included in their survey and reported in the literature since their review (e.g., Burt, 1966, p. 150). The Erlenmeyer-Kimling and Jarvik (1963) review was based on 52 independent studies of the correlations of relatives for tested intellectual abilities, involving over 30,000 correlational pairings from 8 countries in 4 continents, obtained over a period of more than two generations. The correlations were based on a wide variety of mental tests, administered under a variety of conditions by numerous investigators with contrasting views regarding the importance of heredity. The authors conclude: "Against this pronounced heterogeneity, which should have clouded the picture, and is reflected by the wide range of correlations, a clearly definite consistency emerges from the data. The composite data are compatible with the polygenic hypothesis which is generally favored in accounting for inherited differences in mental ability" (Erlenmeyer-Kimling & Jarvik, 1963, p. 1479).

The compatibility with the polygenic hypothesis to which the authors (as outlined earlier on p. 53) refer can be appreciated in Table 2 by comparing the median values of the obtained correlations with the sets of theoretical values shown in the last two columns. The first set (Theoretical Value¹) is based on calculations by Burt (1966), using the methods devised by Fisher for estimating kinship correlations for physical characteristics involving assortative mating and some degree of dominance. The second set (Theoretical Value²) of theoretical values is based on the simplest possible polygenic model, assuming random mating and nothing but additive gene effects. So these are the values one would expect if genetic factors alone were operating and the trait variance reflected no environmental influences whatsoever.

TABLE 2.—CORRELATIONS FOR INTELLECTUAL ABILITY: OBTAINED AND THEORETICAL VALUES

Correlations between—	Number of studies	Obtained median ¹	Theoretical value ²	Theoretical value ³
Unrelated persons:				
Children reared apart.....	4	-.01	0	0
Foster parent and child.....	3	+.20	0	0
Children reared together.....	5	+.24	0	0
Collaterals:				
2d cousins.....	1	+.16	+.14	+.063
1st cousins.....	1	+.26	+.18	+.125
Uncle (or aunt) and nephew (or niece).....	1	+.34	+.31	+.25
Siblings, reared apart.....	33	+.47	+.52	+.50
Siblings, reared together.....	36	+.55	+.52	+.50
Dizygotic twins, different sex.....	9	+.49	+.50	+.50
Dizygotic twins, same sex.....	11	+.56	+.54	+.50
Monozygotic twins, reared apart.....	4	+.75	+1.00	+1.00
Monozygotic twins, reared together.....	14	+.87	+1.00	+1.00

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—CORRELATIONS FOR INTELLECTUAL ABILITY: OBTAINED AND THEORETICAL VALUES—Continued

Correlations between—	Number of studies	Obtained median ¹	Theoretical value ²	Theoretical value ³
Direct line:				
Grandparent and grandchild	3	+.27	+.31	+.25
Parent (as adult) and child	13	+.50	+.49	+.50
Parent (as child) and child	1	+.56	+.49	+.50

¹ Correlations not corrected for attenuation (unreliability).² Assuming assortative mating and partial dominance.³ Assuming random mating and only additive genes, i.e., the simplest polygenic model.

First of all, one can note certain systematic departures of the obtained correlations from the theoretical values. These departures are presumably due to nongenetic or environmental influences. The orderly nature of these environmental effects, as reflected in the Erlenmeyer-Kimling and Jarvik median correlations, can be highlighted by graphical presentation, as shown in Figure 6. Note that the condition of being reared together or reared apart has the same effect on the difference in magnitudes of the correlations for the various kinships. (The slightly greater difference for unrelated children is probably due to the fact of selective placement by adoption agencies, that is, the attempt to match the child's intelligence with that of the adopting parents.)

Heritability Estimates. By making certain comparisons among the correlations shown in Table 2 and Figure 6, one can get some insight into how heritability is estimated. For example, we see that the correlation between identical or monozygotic (MZ) twins reared apart is .75. Since MZ twins develop from a single fertilized ovum and thus have exactly the same genes, any difference between the twins must be due to nongenetic factors. And if they are reared apart in uncorrelated environments, the difference between a perfect correlation (1.00) and the obtained correlation (.75) gives an estimate of the proportion of the variance in IQs attributable to environmental differences: $1.00 - .75 = .25$. Thus 75 percent of the variance can be said to be due to genetic variation (this is the heritability) and 25 percent to environmental variation. Now let us go to the other extreme and look at unrelated children reared together. They have no genetic inheritance in common, but they are reared in a common environment. Therefore the correlation between such children will reflect the environment. As seen in Table 2, this correlation is 0.24. Thus, the proportion of IQ variance due to environment is .24; and the remainder, $1.00 - .24 = .76$ is due to heredity. There is quite good agreement between the two estimates of heritability.

Another interesting comparison is between MZ twins reared together ($r = .87$) and reared apart ($r = .75$). If $1.00 - .75 = .25$ (from MZ twins reared apart) estimates the total environmental variance, then $1.00 - .87 = .13$ (from MZ twins reared together) is an estimate of the environmental variance *within families* in which children are reared together. Thus the difference between .25 - .13 = .12 is an estimate of the environmental variance *between families*.

The situation is relatively simple when we deal only with MZ twins, who are genetically identical, or with unrelated children, who have nothing in common genetically. But in order to estimate heritability from any of the other kinship correlations, much more complex formulas are needed which would require much more explanation than is possible in this article. I have presented elsewhere a generalized formula for estimating heritability from any two kinship correlations where one kinship is of a higher degree than the other (Jensen, 1967a). I applied this heritability formula to all the correlations for monozygotic and dizygotic (half their genes in common) twins reported in the literature and found an average heritability of .80 for intelligence test scores. (The correla-

tions from which this heritability estimate was derived were corrected for unreliability.) Environmental differences between families account for .12 of the total variance, and differences within families account for .08. It is possible to derive an overall heritability coefficient from all the kinship correlations given in Table 2. This composite value of H is .77, which becomes .81 after correction for unreliability (assuming an average test reliability of .95). This represents probably the best single overall estimate of the heritability of measured intelligence that we can make. But, as pointed out previously, this is an average value of H about which there is some dispersion of values, depending on such variables as the particular tests used, the population sampled, and sampling error.

Identical Twins Reared Apart. The conceptually simplest estimate of heritability is, of course, the correlation between identical twins reared apart, since, if their environments are uncorrelated, all they have in common are their genes. The correlation (corrected for unreliability) in this case is the same as the heritability as defined in Equation 3. There have been only three major studies of MZ twins separated early in life and reared apart. All three used individually administered intelligence tests. The correlation between Stanford-Binet IQs of 19 pairs of MZ twins reared apart in a study by Newman, Freeman, and Holzinger (1937) was .77 (.81 corrected for unreliability). The correlation between 44 pairs of MZ twins reared apart on a composite score based on a vocabulary test and Raven's Progressive Matrices was .77 (.81 corrected) in a study by Shields (1962). The correlation between 53 pairs on the Stanford-Binet was .86 (.91 corrected) in a study by Burt (1966). Twin correlations in the same group for height and for weight were .94 and .88, respectively.

The Burt study is perhaps the most interesting, for four reasons: (a) it is based on the largest sample; (b) the IQ distribution of the sample had a mean of 97.8 and a standard deviation of 15.3—values very close to those of the general population; (c) all the twin pairs were separated at birth or within their first six months of life; and (d) most important, the separated twins were spread over the entire range of socioeconomic levels (based on classification in terms of the six socioeconomic categories of the English census), and there was a slight, though nonsignificant, negative correlation between the environmental ratings of the separated twin pairs. When the twin pairs were rated for differences in the cultural conditions of their rearing, these differences correlated .26 with the differences in their IQs. Differences between the material conditions of their homes correlated .16 with IQ differences. (The corresponding correlations for a measure of scholastic attainments were .74 and .37, respectively. The correlation between the twins in scholastic attainments was only .62, indicating a much lower heritability than for IQ.)

Foster Parents versus Natural Parents. Children separated from their true parents shortly after birth and reared in adoptive homes show almost the same degree of correlation with the intelligence of their biological parents as do children who are reared by their own parents. The correlations of children with their foster parents' intelligence

range between 0 and .20 and are seldom higher than this even when the adoption agency attempts selective placement (e.g., Honzik, 1957). Parent-child correlations gradually increase from zero at 18 months of age to an asymptotic value close to .50 between ages 5 and 6 (Jones, 1954), and this is true whether the child is reared by his parents or not.

Direct Measurement of the Environment.

Another method for getting at the relative contribution of environmental factors to IQ variance is simply by correlating children's IQs with ratings of their environment. This can be legitimately done only in the case of adopted children and where there is evidence that selective placement by the adoption agencies is negligible. Without these conditions, of course, some of the correlation between the children and their environmental ratings will be due to genetic factors. There are two large-scale studies in the literature which meet these criteria. Also, both studies involved adopting parents who were representative of a broad cross section of the U.S. Caucasian population with respect to education, occupation, and socioeconomic level. It is probably safe to say that not more than five percent of the U.S. Caucasian population falls outside the range of environmental variation represented in the samples in these two studies. The study by Leahy (1935) found an average correlation of .20 between the IQs of adopted children and a number of indices of the "goodness" of their environment, including the IQs and education of both adopting parents, their socioeconomic status, and the cultural amenities in the home. Leahy concluded from this that the environmental ratings accounted for 4 percent (i.e., the square of $r = .20$) of the variance in the adopted children's Stanford-Binet IQs, and that 96 percent of the variance remained to be accounted for by other factors. The main criticisms we can make of this study are, first, that the environmental indices were not sufficiently "fine-grained" to register the subtleties of environmental variation and of the qualities of parent-child relationship that influence intellectual development, and, second, that the study did not make use of the technique of multiple correlation, which would show the total contribution to the variance of all the separate environmental indices simultaneously. A multiple correlation is usually considerably greater than merely the average of all the correlations for the single variables.

A study by Burks (1928) meets both these objections. To the best of my knowledge no study before or since has rated environments in any more detailed and fine-grained manner than did Burks'. Each adoptive home was given 4 to 8 hours of individual investigation. As in Leahy's study, Burks included intelligence measures on the adopting parents as part of the children's environment, an environment which also included such factors as the amount of time the parents spent helping the children with their school work, the amount of time spent reading to the children, and so on. The multiple correlation (corrected for unreliability) between Burks' various environmental ratings and the adopted children's Stanford-Binet IQs was .42. The square of this correlation is .18, which represents the proportion of IQ variance accounted for by Burks' environmental measurements. This value comes very close to the environmental variance estimated in direct heritability analyses based on kinship correlations.

Burks translated her findings into the conclusion that the total effect of environmental factors one standard deviation up or down the environmental scale is only about 6 IQ points. This is an interesting figure, since it is exactly half the 12 point IQ difference found on the average between normal siblings reared together by their own parents. Siblings differ genetically, of course, having only about half their genes in com-

mon. If all the siblings in every family were divided into two groups—those above and those below the family average—the IQ distributions of the two groups would appear as shown in Figure 7. Though the average difference is only 12 IQ points, note the implications in the proportions of each group falling into the upper and lower ranges of the IQ scale. It would be most instructive to study the educational and occupational attainments of these two groups, since presumably they should have about the same environmental advantages.

Another part of Burks' study consisted of a perfectly matched control group of parents rearing their own children, for whom parent-child correlations were obtained. Sewall Wright (1931) performed a heritability analysis on these parent-child and IQ-environment correlations and obtained a heritability coefficient of .81.

Effects of inbreeding on intelligence

One of the most impressive lines of evidence for the involvement of genetic factors in intelligence comes from study of the effects of inbreeding, that is, the mating of relatives. In the case of polygenic characteristics the direction of the effect of inbreeding is predictable from purely genetic considerations. All individuals carry in their chromosomes a number of mutant or defective genes. These genes are almost always recessive, so they have no effect on the phenotype unless by rare chance they match up with another mutant gene at the same locus on a homologous chromosome; in other words, the recessive mutant gene at a given locus must be inherited from both the father and mother in order to affect the phenotype. Since such mutants are usually defective, they do not enhance the phenotypic expression of the characteristic but usually degrade it. And for polygenic characteristics we would expect such mutants to lower the metric value of the characteristics by graded amounts, depending upon the number of paired mutant recessives. If the parents are genetically related, there is a greatly increased probability that the mutant recessives at given loci will be paired in the offspring. The situation is illustrated in Figure 8, which depicts in a simplified way a pair of homologous chromosomes inherited by an individual from a mother (M) and father (F) who are related (Pair A) and a pair of chromosomes inherited from unrelated parents (Pair B). The blackened spaces represent recessive genes. Although both pairs contain equal numbers of recessives, more of them are at the same loci in Pair A than in Pair B. Only the paired genes degrade the characteristics' phenotypic value.

A most valuable study of this genetic phenomenon with respect to intelligence was carried out in Japan after World War II by Schull and Neel (1965). The study illustrates how strictly sociological factors, such as mate selection can have extremely important genetic consequences. In Japan approximately five percent of all marriages are between cousins. Schull and Neel studied the offspring of marriages of first cousins, first cousins once removed, and second cousins. The parents were statistically matched with a control group of unrelated parents for age and socioeconomic factors. Children from the cousin marriages and the control children from unrelated parents (total $N=2,111$) were given the Japanese version of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). The degree of consanguinity represented by the cousin marriages in this study had the effect of depressing WISC IQs by an average of 7.4 percent, making the mean of the inbred group nearly 8 IQ points lower than the mean of the control group. Assuming normal distributions of IQ, the effect is shown in Figure 9, and illustrates the point that the most drastic consequences of group mean differences are to be seen in the tails

of the distributions. In the same study a similar depressing effect was found for other polygenic characteristics such as several anthropometric and dental variables.

The mating of relatives closer than cousins can produce a markedly greater reduction in offspring's IQs. Lindzey (1967) has reported that almost half of a group of children born to so-called nuclear incest matings (brother-sister or father-daughter) could not be placed for adoption because of mental retardation and other severe defects which had a relatively low incidence among the offspring of unrelated parents who were matched with the incestuous parents in intelligence, socioeconomic status, age, weight and stature. In any geographically confined population where social or legal regulations on mating are lax, where individuals' paternity is often dubious, and where the proportion of half-siblings within the same age groups is high, we would expect more inadvertent inbreeding, with its unfavorable genetic consequences, than in a population in which these conditions exist to a lesser degree.

Heritability of Special Mental Abilities. When the general factor, or g , is removed from a variety of mental tests, the remaining variance is attributable to a number of so-called "group factors" or "special abilities." The tests of special abilities that have been studied most thoroughly with respect to their heritability are Thurstone's Primary Mental Abilities: Verbal, Space, Number, Word Fluency, Memory, and Perceptual Speed. Vandenberg (1967) has reviewed the heritability studies of these tests and reports that the H values range from near zero to about .75, with most values of H between .50 and .70. Vandenberg devised a method for estimating the genetic components of these special abilities which are completely independent of g . He concluded that at least four of the Primary Mental Abilities (Number, Verbal, Space, and Word Fluency) independently have significant hereditary components.

There have been few studies of the heritability of noncognitive skills, but a study by McNemar (see Bilodeau, 1966, Ch. 3) of motor skill learning indicates that heritabilities in this sphere may be even higher than for intelligence. The motor skill learning was measured with a pursuit-rotor, a tracking task in which the subject must learn to keep a stylus on a metal disc about the size of a nickel rotating through a circumference of about 36 inches at 60 rpm. The percentage of time "on target" during the course of practice yields a learning measure of high reliability, showing marked individual differences both in rate of acquisition and final asymptote of this perceptual-motor skill. Identical twins correlated .95 and fraternal twins .51 on pursuit-rotor learning, yielding a heritability coefficient of .88, which is very close to the heritability of physical stature.

Heritability of Scholastic Achievement. The heritability of measures of scholastic achievement is much less, on the average, than the heritability of intelligence. In reviewing all the twin studies in the literature containing relevant data, I concluded that individual differences in scholastic performance are determined less than half as much by heredity as are differences in intelligence (Jensen, 1967a).⁵ The analysis of all the twin

studies on a variety of scholastic measures gives an average H of .40. The environmental variance of 60 percent can be partitioned into variance due to environmental difference between families, which is 54 percent, and differences within families of 6 percent. But it should also be noted that the heritability estimates for scholastic achievement vary over a much wider range than do H values for intelligence. In general, H for scholastic achievement increases as we go from the primary grades up to high school and it is somewhat lower for relatively simple forms of learning (e.g., spelling and arithmetic computation) than for more complex learning (e.g., reading comprehension and arithmetic problem solving). Yet large-sample twin data from the National Merit Scholarship Corporation show that the between families environmental component accounts for about 60 percent of the variance in students' rank in their high school graduating class. This must mean that there are strong family influences which cause children to conform to some academic standard set by the family and which reduce variance in scholastic performance among siblings reared in the same family. Unrelated children reared together are also much more alike in school performance than in intelligence. The common finding of a negative correlation between children's IQ and the amount of time parents report spending in helping their children with school work is further evidence that considerable family pressures are exerted to equalize the scholastic performance of siblings. This pressure to conform to a family standard shows up most conspicuously in the small within families environmental variance component on those school subjects which are most susceptible to improvement by extra coaching, such as spelling and arithmetic computation.

The fact that scholastic achievement is considerably less heritable than intelligence also means that many other traits, habits, attitudes, and values enter into a child's performance in school besides just his intelligence, and these non-cognitive factors are largely environmentally determined, mainly through influences within the child's family. This means there is potentially much more we can do to improve school performance through environmental means than we can do to change intelligence per se. Thus it seems likely that if compensatory education programs are to have a beneficial effect on achievement, it will be through their influence on motivation, values, and other environmentally conditioned habits that play

respond more to the separate subscales of the usual intelligence tests, which are known to have somewhat lower heritabilities than the composite scores; and (2) scores on some of the achievement tests are age-related, so that fraternal twin correlations, in relation to other kinship correlations, are unduly inflated by common factor of age. When age is partially out of the MZ and DZ twin correlations, the estimate of heritability based on MZ and DZ twin comparisons is increased. However, an omnibus achievement test (Stanford Achievement) yielding an overall Educational Age score had a heritability of only .46 (as compared with .63 for Stanford-Binet IQ and .70 for Otis IQ based on the same set of MZ and DZ twins), with age partially out of the twin correlations (Newman, Freeman, and Holzinger, 1937, p. 97). Rank in high school graduating class, which is an overall index of scholastic performance and is little affected by age yields heritability coefficients below .40 in a nationwide sample (Nichols & Bilbro, 1968). The issue clearly needs further study, but the best conclusion that can be drawn from the existing evidence, I believe, still is that the heritability of scholastic achievement is less than for intelligence, but the amount of the difference cannot be precisely estimated at present.

⁵ After this article went to press I received a personal communication from Professor Lloyd G. Humphreys who pointed out some arguments that indicate I may have underestimated the heritability of scholastic achievement and that its heritability may actually be considerably closer to the heritability of intelligence. The argument involves two main points: (1) the fact that some of the achievement tests that entered into the average estimate of heritability are tests of specific achievements, rather than omnibus achievement tests, and therefore would cor-

an important part in scholastic performance, rather than through any marked direct influence on intelligence per se. The proper evaluation of such programs should therefore be sought in their effects on actual scholastic performance rather than in how much they raise the child's IQ.

HOW THE ENVIRONMENT WORKS

Environment as a threshold

All the reports I have found of especially large upward shifts in IQ which are explicitly associated with environmental factors have involved young children, usually under six years of age, whose initial social environment was deplorable to a greater extent than can be found among any children who are free to interact with other persons or to run about out-of-doors. There can be no doubt that moving children from an extremely deprived environment to good average environmental circumstances can boost the IQ some 20 to 30 points and in certain extreme rare cases as much as 60 or 70 points. On the other hand, children reared in rather average circumstances do not show an appreciable IQ gain as a result of being placed in a more culturally enriched environment. While there are reports of groups of children going from below average up to average IQs as a result of environmental enrichment, I have found no report of a group of children being given permanently superior IQs by means of environmental manipulations. In brief, it is doubtful that psychologists have found consistent evidence for any social environmental influences short of extreme environmental isolation which have a marked systematic effect on intelligence. This suggests that the influence of the quality of the environment on intellectual development is not a linear function. Below a certain threshold of environmental adequacy, deprivation can have a markedly depressing effect on intelligence. But above this threshold, environmental variations cause relatively small differences in intelligence. The fact that the vast majority of the populations sampled in studies of the heritability of intelligence are above this threshold level of environmental adequacy accounts for the high values of the heritability estimates and the relatively small proportion of IQ variance attributable to environmental influences.

The environment with respect to intelligence is thus analogous to nutrition with respect to stature. If there are great nutritional lacks, growth is stunted, but above a certain level of nutritional adequacy, including minimal daily requirements of minerals, vitamins, and proteins, even great variations in eating habits will have negligible effects on persons' stature, and under such conditions most of the differences in stature among individuals will be due to heredity.

When I speak of subthreshold environmental deprivation, I do not refer to a mere lack of middle-class amenities. I refer to the extreme sensory and motor restrictions in environments such as those described by Skeels and Dye (1939) and Davis (1947), in which the subjects had little sensory stimulation of any kind and little contact with adults. These cases of extreme social isolation early in life showed great deficiencies in IQ. But removal from social deprivation to a good, average social environment resulted in large gains in IQ. The Skeels and Dye orphanage children gained in IQ from an average of 64 at 19 months of age to 96 at age 6 as a result of being given social stimulation and placement in good homes between 2 and 3 years of age. When these children were followed up as adults, they were found to be average citizens in their communities, and their own children had an average IQ of 105 and were doing satisfactorily in school. A far more extreme case was that of Isabel, a child who was confined and reared in an attic up to the age of six by a deaf-mute mother, and who had an IQ of

about 30 at age 6. When Isabel was put into a good environment at that age, her IQ became normal by age 8 and she was able to perform as an average student throughout school (Davis, 1947). Extreme environmental deprivation thus need not permanently result in below average intelligence.

These observations are consistent with studies of the effects of extreme sensory deprivation on primates. Monkeys raised from birth under conditions of total social isolation, for example, show no indication when compared with normally raised controls, of any permanent impairment of ability of complex discrimination learning, delayed response learning, or learning set formation, although the isolated monkeys show severe social impairment in their relationships to normally reared monkeys (Harlow & Griffin, 1965).

Thoughtful scrutiny of all these studies of extreme environmental deprivation leads to two observations which are rarely made by psychologists who cite the studies as illustrative explanations of the low IQs and poor scholastic performance of the many children called culturally disadvantaged. In the first place, typical culturally disadvantaged children are not reared in anything like the degree of sensory and motor deprivation that characterizes, say, the children of the Skeels study. Secondly, the IQs of severely deprived children are markedly depressed even at a very early age, and when they are later exposed to normal environmental stimulation, their IQs rise rapidly, markedly, and permanently. Children called culturally disadvantaged, on the other hand, generally show no early deficit and are usually average and sometimes precocious on perceptual-motor tests administered before two years of age. The orphanage children described in Skeels' study are in striking contrast to typical culturally disadvantaged children of the same age. Also, culturally disadvantaged children usually show a slight initial gain in IQ after their first few months of exposure to the environmental enrichment afforded by school attendance, but, unlike Skeels' orphans, they soon lose this gain, and in a sizeable proportion of children the initial IQ gain is followed by a gradual decline in IQ throughout the subsequent years of schooling. We do not know how much of this decline is related to environmental or hereditary factors. We do know that with increasing age children's IQs increasingly resemble their parents' rank order in intelligence whether they are reared by them or not, and therefore with increasing age we should expect greater and more reliable differentiation among children's IQs as they gravitate toward their genotypic values (Honzik, 1957). Of course, the gravitating effect is compounded by the fact that less intelligent parents are also less apt to provide the environmental conditions conducive to intellectual development in the important period between ages 3 and 7, during which children normally gain increasing verbal control over their environment and their own behavior. (I have described some of these environmental factors in detail elsewhere [Jensen, 1968e].)

Heber, Dever, and Conry (1968) have obtained data which illustrate this phenomenon of children's gravitation toward the parental IQ with increasing age. They studied the families of 88 low economic class Negro mothers residing in Milwaukee in a set of contiguous slum census tract, an area which yields the highest known prevalence of identified retardation in the city's schools. Although these tracts contribute about 5 percent of the schools' population, they account for about one-third of the school children classed as mentally retarded (IQ below 75). The sample of 88 mothers was selected by taking 88 consecutive births in these tracts where the mother already had at least one child of age six. The 88 mothers had a total of 586 children, excluding their newborns.

The percentage of mothers with IQs of 80 or above was 54.6; 45.4 percent were below IQ 80. The IQs of the children of these two groups of mothers were plotted as a function of the children's age. The results are shown in Figure 10. Note that only the children whose mothers' IQ are below 80 show a systematic decline in IQ as well as a short-lived spurt of several points at the age of entrance into school. At six years of age and older, 80.8 percent of the children with IQs below 80 were those whose mothers had IQs below 80.

It is far from certain or even likely that all such decline in IQ is due to environmental influences rather than to genetic factors involved in the growth rate of intelligence. Consistent with this interpretation is the fact that the heritability of intelligence measures increases with age. We should expect just the opposite if environmental factors alone were responsible for the increasing IQ deficit of markedly below average groups. A study by Wheeler (1942) suggests that although IQ may be raised at all age levels by improving the environment, such improvements do not counteract the decline in the IQ of certain below-average groups. In 1940 Wheeler tested over 3000 Tennessee mountain children between the ages of 6 and 16 and compared their IQs with children in the same age range who had been given the same tests in 1930, when the average IQ and standard of living in this area would characterize the majority of the inhabitants as "culturally deprived." During the intervening 10 years state and federal intervention in this area brought about great improvements in economic conditions, standards of health care, and educational and cultural opportunities, and during the same period the average IQ for the region increased 10 points, from 82 to 92. But the decline in IQ from age 6 to age 16 was about the same in 1940 (from 103 to 80) as in 1930 (from 95 to 74).

Reaction Range. Geneticists refer to the concept of reaction range (RR) in discussing the fact that similar genotypes may result in quite different phenotypes depending on the favorableness of the environment for the development of the characteristic in question. Of further interest to geneticists is the fact that different genotypes may have quite different reaction ranges; some genotypes may be much more buffered against environmental influences than others. Different genetic strains can be unequal in their susceptibility to the same range of environmental variation, and when this is the case, the strains will show dissimilar heritabilities on the trait in question, the dissimilarity being accentuated by increasing environmental variation. Both of these aspects of the reaction range concept are illustrated hypothetically with respect to IQ in Figure 11.

The above discussion should serve to counter a common misunderstanding about quantitative estimates of heritability. It is sometimes forgotten that such estimates actually represent average values in the population that has been sampled and they do not necessarily apply either to differences within various subpopulations or to differences between subpopulations. In a population in which an overall H estimate is, say, .80, we may find a certain group for which H is only .70 and another group for which H is .90. All the major heritability studies reported in the literature are based on samples of white European and North American populations, and our knowledge of the heritability of intelligence in different racial and cultural groups within these populations is nil. For example, no adequate heritability studies have been based on samples of the Negro population of the United States. Since some genetic strains may be more buffered from environmental influences than others, it is not sufficient merely to equate

the environments of various subgroups in the population to infer equal heritability of some characteristic in all of them. The question of whether heritability estimates can contribute anything to our understanding of the relative importance of genetic and environmental factors in accounting for average phenotypic differences between racial groups (or any other socially identifiable groups) is too complex to be considered here. I have discussed this problem in detail elsewhere and concluded that heritability estimates could be of value in testing certain specific hypotheses in this area of inquiry, provided certain conditions were met and certain other crucial items of information were also available (Jensen, 1968c).

Before continuing discussion of environmental factors we must guard against one other misunderstanding about heritability that sometimes creeps in at this point. This is the notion that because so many different environmental factors and all their interactions influence the development of intelligence, by the time the child is old enough to be tested, these influences must totally bury or obscure all traces of genetic factors—the genotype must lie hidden and inaccessible under the heavy overlay of environmental influences. If this were so, of course, the obtained values of H would be very close to zero. But the fact that values of H for intelligence are usually quite high (in the region of .70 to .90) means that current intelligence tests, can, so to speak, "read through" the environmental "overlay."

Physical versus social environment

The value $1-H$, which for IQ generally amounts to about .20, can be called E , the proportion of variance due to nongenetic factors. There has been a pronounced tendency to think of E as being wholly associated with individuals' social and interpersonal environment, child rearing practices, and differences in educational and cultural opportunities afforded by socioeconomic status. It is certain, however, that these sociological factors are not responsible for the whole of E and it is not improbable that they contribute only a minor portion of the E variance in the bulk of our population. Certain physical and biological environmental factors may be at least as important as the social factors in determining individual differences in intelligence. If this is true, advances in medicine, nutrition, prenatal care, and obstetrics may contribute as much or more to improving intelligence as will manipulation of the social environment.

Prenatal Environment of Twins. A little known fact about twins is that they average some 4 to 7 points lower in IQ than singletons (Vanderberg, 1968). The difference also shows up in scholastic achievement, as shown in the distribution of reading scores of twin and singleton girls in Sweden (Figure 12).

If this phenomenon were due entirely to differences between twins and singletons in the amount of individual attention they receive from their parents, one might expect the twin-singleton difference to be related to the family's socio-economic status. But there seems to be no systematic relationship of this kind. The largest study of the question, summarized in Figure 13, shows about the same average amount of twin-singleton IQ disparity over a wide range of socio-economic groups.

Three other lines of evidence place the locus of this effect in the prenatal environment. Monozygotic twins are slightly lower in IQ than dizygotic twins (Stott, 1960, p. 98), a fact which is consistent with the finding that MZ twins have a higher mortality rate and greater disparity in birth weights than DZ twins, suggesting that MZ twins enjoy less equal and less optimal intrauterine conditions than DZ twins or singletons. Inequalities in both intrauterine space

and fetal nutrition probably account for this. Also, boy twins are significantly lower in IQ than girl twins, which conforms to the well known greater vulnerability of male infants to prenatal impairment (Stott, 1960). Finally, the birth weight of infants, when matched for gestational age, is slightly but significantly correlated with later IQ, and the effect is independent of sociocultural factors (Churchill, Neff, & Caldwell, 1966). In pairs of identical twins, the twin with the lower birth weight usually has the lower IQ (by 5 to 7 points on the average) at school age. This is true both in white and in Negro twins. The birth-weight differences are reflected in all 11 subtests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children and are slightly greater on the Performance than on the Verbal tests (Willerman & Churchill, 1967). The investigators interpret these findings as suggesting that nutrient supplies may be inadequate for proper body and brain development in twin pregnancies, and that the unequal sharing of nutrients and space stunts one twin more than its mate.

Thus, much of the average difference between MZ twins, whether reared together or reared apart, seems to be due to prenatal environmental factors. The real importance of these findings, of course, lies in their implications for the possible role of prenatal environment in the development of all children. It is not unlikely that there are individual maternal differences in the adequacy of the prenatal environment. If intrauterine conditions can cause several points of IQ difference between twins, it is not hard to imagine that individual differences in prenatal environments could also cause IQ differences in single born children and might therefore account for a substantial proportion of the total environmental variance in IQ.

Abdominal Decompression. There is now evidence that certain manipulations of the intrauterine environment can effect the infant's behavioral development for many months after birth. A technique known as abdominal decompression was invented by a professor of obstetrics (Heyns, 1963), originally for the purpose of making women experience less discomfort in the latter months of their pregnancy and also to facilitate labor and delivery. For about an hour a day during the last three or four months of pregnancy, the woman is placed in a device that creates a partial vacuum around her abdomen, which greatly reduces the intrauterine pressure. The device is used during labor up to the moment of delivery. Heyns has applied this device to more than 400 women. Their infants, as compared with control groups who have not received this treatment, show more rapid development in their first two years and manifest an overall superiority in tests of perceptual-motor development. They sit up earlier, walk earlier, talk earlier, and appear generally more precocious than their own siblings or other children whose mothers were not so treated. At two years of age the children in Heyns' experiment had DQs (developmental quotients) some 30 points higher than the control children (in the general population the mean DQ is 100, with a standard deviation of 15). Heyns explains the effects of maternal abdominal decompression on the child's early development in terms of the reduction of intrauterine pressure, which results in a more optimal blood supply to the fetus and also lessens the chances of brain damage during labor. (The intrauterine pressure on the infant's head is reduced from about 22 pounds to 8 pounds.) Results on children's later IQs have not been published, but correspondence with Professor Heyns and verbal reports from visitors to his laboratory inform me that there is no evidence that the IQ of these children is appreciably higher beyond age 6 than that of control groups. If this observation is confirmed by the proper

methods, it should not be too surprising in view of the negligible correlations normally found between DQs and later IQs. But since abdominal decompression results in infant precocity, one may wonder to what extent differences in intrauterine pressure are responsible for normal individual and group differences in infant precocity. Negro infants, for example, are more precocious in development (as measured on the Bayley Scales) in their first year or two than Caucasian infants (Bayley, 1965a). Infant precocity would seem to be associated with more optimal intrauterine and perinatal conditions. This conjecture is consistent with the finding that infants whose prenatal and perinatal histories would make them suspect of some degree of brain damage show lower DQs on the Bayley Scales than normal infants (Honzik, 1962). Writers who place great emphasis on the hypothesis of inadequate prenatal care and complications of pregnancy to account for the lower average IQ of Negroes (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1967) are also obliged to explain why these unfavorable factors do not also depress the DQ below average in Negro infants, as do such factors as brain damage and prenatal and infant malnutrition (Cravito, 1966). Since all such environmental factors should lower the heritability of intelligence in any segment of the population in which they are hypothesized to play an especially significant role, one way to test the hypothesis would be to compare the heritability of intelligence in that segment of the population for which extra environmental factors are hypothesized with the heritability in other groups for whom environmental factors are supposedly less accountable for IQ variance.

A Continuum of Reproductive Casualty. A host of conditions associated with reproduction which are known to differ greatly across socioeconomic levels have been hypothesized as causal factors in average intellectual differences. There is no doubt about the fact of the greater prevalence in poverty areas of conditions unfavorable to optimal pregnancy and safe delivery. The question that remains unanswered is the amount of IQ variance associated with these conditions predisposing to reproductive casualty. The disadvantageous factors most highly associated with social conditions are: pregnancies at early ages, teenage deliveries, pregnancies in close succession, a large number of pregnancies, and pregnancies that occur late in the woman's reproductive life (Graves, Freeman, & Thompson, 1968). These conditions are related to low birth weight, prematurity, increased infant mortality, prolonged labor, toxemia, anemia, malformations, and mental deficiency in the offspring. Since all of these factors have a higher incidence in low socioeconomic groups and in certain ethnic groups (Negroes, American Indians, and Mexican-Americans) in the United States, they probably account for some proportion of the group differences in IQ and scholastic performance, but just how much of the true differences they may account for no one really knows at present. It is interesting that Jewish immigrants, whose offspring are usually found to have a higher mean IQ than the general population, show fewer disadvantageous reproductive conditions and have the lowest infant mortality rates of all ethnic groups, even when matched with other immigrant and native born groups on general environmental conditions (Graves et al., 1968).

Although disadvantageous reproductive factors occur differentially in different segments of the population, it is not at all certain how much they are responsible for the IQ differences between social classes and races. It is reported by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, for example, that when all cases of mental retardation that can be reasonably explained in terms of known complications of preg-

nancy and delivery, brain damage, or major gene and chromosomal defects are accounted for, there still remain 75 to 80 percent of the cases who show no such specific causes and presumably represent just the lower end of the normal polygenic distribution of intelligence (Research Profile No. 11, 1965). Buck (1968) has argued that it still remains to be proven that a degree of neurological damage is bound to occur among the survivors of all situations which carry a high risk of perinatal mortality and that a high or even a known proportion of mental retardation can be ascribed to the non-lethal grades of reproductive difficulty. A large study reported by Buck (1968) indicates that the most common reproductive difficulties when occurring singly have no significant effect on children's intellectual status after age 5, with the one exception of pre-eclamptic toxemia of pregnancy, which caused some cognitive impairment. Most of the complications of pregnancy, it seems, must occur multiply to impair intellectual ability. It is as if the nervous system is sufficiently homeostatic to withstand certain unfavorable conditions if they occur singly.

Prematurity. The literature on the relationship of premature birth to the child's IQ is confusing and conflicting. Guilford (1967), in his recent book on *The Nature of Intelligence*, for example, concluded, as did Stoddard (1943), that prematurity has no effect on intelligence. Scott (1966), on the other hand, presents impressive evidence of very significant IQ decrements associated with prematurity. Probably the most thorough review of the subject I have found, by Kushlick (1966), helps to resolve these conflicting opinions. There is little question that prematurity has the strongest known relation to brain dysfunction of any reproductive factor, and many of the complications of pregnancy are strongly associated with the production of premature children. The crucial factor in prematurity, however, is not prematurity per se, but low birth-weight. Birth-weight apparently acts as a threshold variable with respect to intellectual impairment. All studies of birth-weight agree in showing that the incidence of babies weighing less than 5½ lbs. increases from higher to lower social classes. But only about 1 percent of the total variance of birth-weight is accounted for by socioeconomic variables. Race (Negro versus white) has an effect on birth-weight independently of socioeconomic variables. Negro babies mature at a lower birth-weight than white babies (Naylor & Myrianthopoulos, 1967). If prematurity is defined as a condition in which birth-weight is under 5½ lbs., the observed relationship between prematurity and depression of the IQ is due to the common factor of low social class. Kushlick (1966, p. 143) concludes that it is only among children having birth-weights under 3 lbs. that the mean IQ is lowered, independently of social class, and more in boys than in girls. The incidence of extreme subnormality is higher for children with birth-weights under 3 or 4 lbs. But when one does not count these extreme cases (IQs below 50), the effects of prematurity or low birth-weight—even as low as 3 lbs.—have a very weak relationship to children's IQs by the time they are of school age. The association between very low birth-weight and extreme mental subnormality raises the question of whether the low birth-weight causes the abnormality or whether the abnormality arises independently and causes the low birth-weight.

Prematurity and low birth-weight have a markedly higher incidence among Negroes than among whites. That birth-weight differences per se are not a predominant factor in Negro-white IQ differences, however, is suggested by the findings of a study which compared Negro and white premature children matched for birth-weight. The Negro children in all weight groups performed signifi-

cantly less well on mental tests at 3 and 5 years of age than the white children of comparable birth-weight (Hardy, 1965, p. 51).

Genetic Predisposition to Prenatal Impairment. Dennis Stott (1960, 1966), a British psychologist, has adduced considerable evidence for the theory that impairments of the central nervous system occurring prenatally as a result of various stresses in pregnancy may not be the direct result of adverse intrauterine factors but may result indirectly from genetically determined mechanisms which are triggered by prenatal stress of one form or another.

Why should there exist a genetic mechanism predisposing to congenital impairments? Would not such genes, if they had ever existed, have been eliminated long ago through natural selection? It can be argued from considerable evidence in lower species of mammals observable by zoologists today that such a genetic mechanism may have had survival value for primitive man, but that the conditions of our present industrial society and advances in medical care have diminished the biological advantage of this mechanism for survival of the human species. The argument is that, because of the need to control population, there is a genetic provision within all species for multiple impairments, which are normally only potentialities, that can be triggered off by prenatal stress associated with high population density, such as malnutrition, fatigue from over-exertion, emotional distress, infections, and the like. The resulting congenital impairment would tend to cut down the infant population, thereby relieving the pressure of population without appreciably reducing the functioning and efficiency of the young adults in the population. Stott (1966) has presented direct evidence of an association between stresses in the mother during pregnancy and later behavioral abnormalities and learning problems of the child in school. The imperfect correlation between such prenatal stress factors and signs of congenital impairment suggests that there are individual differences in genetic predisposition to prenatal impairment. The hypothesis warrants further investigation. The prenatal environment could be a much more important source of later IQ variance for some children than for others.

Mother-Child Rh Incompatibility. The Rh blood factor can involve possible brain damaging effects in a small proportion of pregnancies where the fetus is Rh-positive and the mother is Rh-negative. (Rh-negative has a frequency of 15 percent in the white and 7 percent in the Negro population.) The mother-child Rh incompatibility produces significant physical ill effects in only a fraction of cases and increases in importance in pregnancies beyond the first. The general finding of slightly lower IQs in second and later born children could be related to Rh incompatibility or to similar, but as yet undiscovered, mother-child biological incompatibilities. This is clearly an area greatly in need of pioneering research.

Nutrition. Since the human brain attains 70 percent of its maximum adult weight in the first year after birth, it should not be surprising that prenatal and infant nutrition can have significant effects on brain development. Brain growth is largely a process of protein synthesis. During the prenatal period and the first postnatal year the brain normally absorbs large amounts of protein nutrients and grows at the average rate of 1 to 2 milligrams per minute (Stoch & Smythe, 1963; Cravioto, 1966).

Severe undernutrition before two or three years of age, especially a lack of proteins and the vitamins and minerals essential for their anabolism, results in lowered intelligence. Stoch and Smythe (1963) found, for example, that extremely malnourished South African colored children were some 20 points lower in IQ than children of similar parents who had

not suffered from malnutrition. The difference between the undernourished group and the control group in DQ and IQ over the age range from 1 year to 8 years was practically constant. If undernutrition takes a toll, it takes it early, as shown by the lower DQs at 1 year and the absence of any increase in the decrement at later ages. Undernutrition occurring for the first time in older children seems to have no permanent effect. Severely malnourished war prisoners, for example, function intellectually at their expected level when they are returned to normal living conditions. The study by Stoch and Smythe, like several others (Cravioto, 1966; Scrimshaw, 1968), also revealed that the undernourished children had smaller stature and head circumference than the control children. Although there is no correlation between intelligence and head circumference in normally nourished children, there is a positive correlation between these factors in groups whose numbers suffer varying degrees of undernutrition early in life. Undernutrition also increases the correlation between intelligence and physical stature. These correlations provide us with an index which could aid the study of IQ deficits due to undernutrition in selected populations.

One of the most interesting and pronounced psychological effects of undernutrition is retardation in the development of cross-modal transfer or intersensory integration, which was earlier described as characterizing the essence of *g* (Scrimshaw, 1968).

The earlier the age at which nutritional therapy is instituted, of course, the more beneficial are its effects. But even as late as 2 years of age, a gain of as much as 18 IQ points was produced by nutritional improvements in a group of extremely undernourished children. After 4 years of age, however, nutritional therapy effected no significant change in IQ (Cravioto, 1966, p. 82).

These studies were done in countries where extreme undernutrition is not uncommon. Such gross nutritional deprivation is rare in the United States. But there is at least one study which shows that some undernourished proportion of the urban population in the United States might benefit substantially with respect to intellectual development by improved nutrition. In New York City, women of low socioeconomic status were given vitamin and mineral supplements during pregnancy. These women gave birth to children who, at four years of age, averaged 8 points higher in IQ than a control group of children whose mothers had been given placebos during pregnancy (Harrell, Woodyard, & Gates, 1955). Vitamin and mineral supplements are, of course, beneficial in this way only when they remedy an existing deficiency.

Birth Order. Order of birth contributes a significant proportion of the variance in mental ability. On the average, first-born children are superior in almost every way, mentally and physically. This is the consistent finding of many studies (Altus, 1966) but as yet the phenomenon remains unexplained. (Rimland [1964, pp. 140-143] has put forth some interesting hypotheses to explain the superiority of the first-born.) Since the first-born effect is found throughout all social classes in many countries and has shown up in studies over the past 80 years (it was first noted by Galton), it is probably a biological rather than a social-psychological phenomenon. It is almost certainly not a genetic effect. (It would tend to make for slightly lower estimates of heritability based on sibling comparisons.) It is one of the sources of environmental variance in ability without any significant postnatal environmental correlates. No way is known for giving later-born children the same advantage. The disadvantage of being later-born, however, is very slight and shows up conspicuously only in the extreme upper tail of the distribution of achievements. For example, there is a dispro-

portionate number of first-born individuals whose biographies appear in *Who's Who* and in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Social class differences in intelligence

Social class (or socioeconomic status [SES]) should be considered as a factor separate from race. I have tried to avoid using the terms *social class* and *race* synonymously or interchangeably in my writings, and I observe this distinction here. Social classes completely cut across all racial groups. But different racial groups are disproportionately represented in different SES categories. Social class differences refer to a socioeconomic continuum within racial groups.

It is well known that children's IQ's, by school age, are correlated with the socioeconomic status of their parents. This is a world-wide phenomenon and has an extensive research literature going back 70 years. Half of all the correlations between SES and children's IQ's reported in the literature fall between .25 and .50, with most falling in the region of .35 to .40. When school children are grouped by SES, the mean IQs of the group vary over a range of one to two standard deviations (15 to 30 IQ points), depending on the method of status classification (Eells, et al., 1951). This relationship between SES and IQ constitutes one of the most substantial and least disputed facts in psychology and education.

The fact that intelligence is correlated with occupational status can hardly be surprising in any society that supports universal public education. The educational system and occupational hierarchy act as an intellectual "screening" process, far from perfect, to be sure, but discriminating enough to create correlations of the magnitude just reported. If each generation is roughly sorted out by these "screening" processes along an intelligence continuum, and if, as has already been pointed out, the phenotype-genotype correlation for IQ is of the order of .80 to .90, it is almost inevitable that this sorting process will make for genotypic as well as phenotypic differences among social classes. It is therefore most unlikely that groups differing in SES would not also differ, on the average, in their genetic endowment of intelligence. In reviewing the relevant evidence, the British geneticist, C. O. Carter (1966, p. 192) remarked, "Sociologists who doubt this show more ingenuity than judgment." Sociologist Bruce Eckland (1967) has elaborately spelled out the importance of genetic factors for understanding social class differences.

Few if any students of this field today would regard socioeconomic status *per se* as an environmental variable that primarily causes IQ differences. Intellectual differences between SES groups have hereditary, environmental, and interaction components. Environmental factors associated with SES differences apparently are not a major independent source of variance in intelligence. Identical twins separated in the first months of life and reared in widely differing social classes, for example, still show greater similarity in IQ than unrelated children reared together or than even siblings reared together (Burt, 1966). The IQs of children adopted in infancy show a much lower correlation with the SES of the adopting parents than do the IQs of children reared by their own parents (Leahy, 1935). The IQs of children who were reared in an orphanage from infancy and who had never known their biological parents show approximately the same correlation with their biological father's occupational status as found for children reared by their biological parents (.23 vs .24) (Lawrence, 1931). The correlation between the IQs of children adopted in infancy and the educational level of their biological mothers is close to that of children reared by their own mothers (.44), while the correlation between children's IQs and their adopting parents' educational level is close to

zero (Honzik, 1957). Children of low and high SES show, on the average, an amount of regression from the parental IQ toward the mean of the general population that conforms to expectations from a simple polygenic model of the inheritance of intelligence (Burt, 1961). When siblings reared within the same family differ significantly in intelligence, those who are above the family average tend to move up the SES scale, and those who are below the family average tend to move down (Young & Gibson, 1965). It should be noted that despite intensive efforts by psychologists, educators, and sociologists to devise tests intended to eliminate SES differences in measured intelligence, none of these efforts has succeeded (Jensen 1968c). Theodosius Dobzhansky (1968a, p. 33), a geneticist, states that "There exist some occupations or functions for which only extreme genotypes are suitable." But surely this is not an all-or-nothing affair, and we would expect by the same reasoning that many different occupational skills, and not just those that are the most extreme, would favor some genotypes more than others. To be sure, genetic factors become more important at the extremes. Some minimal level of ability is required for learning most skills. But while you can teach almost anyone to play chess, or the piano, or to conduct an orchestra, or to write prose, you cannot teach everyone to be a Capablanca, a Paderewski, a Toscanini, or a Bernard Shaw. In a society that values and rewards individual talent and merit, genetic factors inevitably take on considerable importance.

SES differences, and race differences as well, are manifested not only as differences between group means, but also as differences in variance and in patterns of correlations among various mental abilities, even on tests which show no mean differences between SES groups (Jensen, 1968b).

Another line of evidence that SES IQ differences are not a superficial phenomenon is the fact of a negative correlation between SES and Developmental Quotient (DQ) (under two years of age) and an increasing positive correlation between SES and IQ (beyond two years of age), as shown in Figure 14 from a study by Nancy Bayley (1966). (All subjects in this study are Caucasian.) This relationship is especially interesting in view of the finding of a number of studies that there is a negative correlation between DQ and later IQ, an effect which is much more pronounced in boys than in girls and involves the motor more than the attentional-cognitive aspects of the DQ (Bayley, 1965b). Figure 14 shows that on infant developmental scales, lower SES children actually have a "head start" over higher SES children. But this trend is increasingly reversed at later ages as the tests become less motoric and are increasingly loaded with a cognitive or *g* factor.

Race differences

The important distinction between the *individual* and the *population* must always be kept clearly in mind in any discussion of racial differences in mental abilities or any other behavioral characteristics. Whenever we select a person for some special educational purpose, whether for special instruction in a grade-school class for children with learning problems, or for a "gifted" class with an advanced curriculum, or for college attendance, or for admission to graduate training or a professional school, we are selecting an *individual*, and we are selecting him and dealing with him as an individual for reasons of his individuality. Similarly, when we employ someone, or promote someone in his occupation, or give some special award or honor to someone for his accomplishments, we are doing this to an individual. The variables of social class, race, and national origin are correlated so imperfectly with any of the valid criteria on which the above decisions should

depend, or, for that matter, with any behavioral characteristic, that these background factors are irrelevant as a basis for dealing with individuals—as students, as employees, as neighbors. Furthermore, since, as far as we know, the full range of human talents is represented in all the major races of man and in all socioeconomic levels, it is unjust to allow the mere fact of an individual's racial or social background to affect the treatment accorded to him. All persons rightfully must be regarded on the basis of their individual qualities and merits, and all social, educational, and economic institutions must have built into them the mechanisms for insuring and maximizing the treatment of persons according to their individual behavior.

If a society completely believed and practiced the ideal of treating every person as an individual, it would be hard to see why there should be any problems about "race" *per se*. There might still be problems concerning poverty, unemployment, crime, and other social ills, and, given the will, they could be tackled just as any other problems that require rational methods for solution. But if this philosophy prevailed in practice, there would not need to be a "race problem."

The question of race differences in intelligence comes up not when we deal with individuals as individuals, but when certain identifiable groups or subcultures within the society are brought into comparison with one another as groups or populations. It is only when the groups are disproportionately represented in what are commonly perceived as the most desirable and the least desirable social and occupational roles in a society that the question arises concerning average differences among groups. Since much of the current thinking behind civil rights, fair employment, and equality of educational opportunity appeals to the fact that there is a disproportionate representation of different racial groups in the various levels of the educational, occupational, and socioeconomic hierarchy, we are forced to examine all the possible reasons for this inequality among racial groups in the attainments and rewards generally valued by all groups within our society. To what extent can such inequalities be attributed to unfairness in society's multiple selection processes? ("Unfair" meaning that selection is influenced by intrinsically irrelevant criteria, such as skin color, racial or national origin, etc.) And to what extent are these inequalities attributable to really relevant selection criteria which apply equally to all individuals but at the same time select disproportionately between some racial groups because there exist, in fact, real average differences among the groups—differences in the population distributions of those characteristics which are indisputably relevant to educational and occupational performance? This is certainly one of the most important questions confronting our nation today. The answer, which can be found only through unfettered research, has enormous consequences for the welfare of all, particularly of minorities whose plight is now in the foreground of public attention. A preordained, doctrinaire stance with regard to this issue hinders the achievement of a scientific understanding of the problem. To rule out of court, so to speak, any reasonable hypotheses on purely ideological grounds is to argue that static ignorance is preferable to increasing our knowledge of reality. I strongly disagree with those who believe in searching for the truth by scientific means only under certain circumstances and eschew this course in favor of ignorance under other circumstances, or who believe that the results of inquiry on some subjects cannot be entrusted to the public but should be kept the guarded possession of a scientific elite. Such attitudes, in my opinion, represent a danger to free inquiry and, consequently, in the long run,

work to the disadvantage of society's general welfare. "No holds barred" is the best formula for scientific inquiry. One does not decree beforehand which phenomena cannot be studied or which questions cannot be answered.

Genetic Aspects of Racial Differences. No one, to my knowledge, questions the role of environmental factors, including influences from past history, in determining at least some of the variance between racial groups in standard measures of intelligence, school performance, and occupational status. The current literature on the culturally disadvantaged abounds with discussion—some of it factual, some of it fanciful—of how a host of environmental factors depresses cognitive development and performance. I recently co-edited a book which is largely concerned with the environmental aspects of disadvantaged minorities (Deutsch, Katz, & Jensen, 1968). But the possible importance of genetic factors in racial behavioral differences has been greatly ignored, almost to the point of being a tabooed subject, just as were the topics of venereal disease and birth control a generation or so ago.

My discussions with a number of geneticists concerning the question of a genetic basis of differences among races in mental abilities have revealed to me a number of rather consistently agreed-upon points which can be summarized in general terms as follows: Any groups which have been geographically or socially isolated from one another for many generations are practically certain to differ in their gene pools, and consequently are likely to show differences in any phenotypic characteristics having high heritability. This is practically axiomatic, according to the geneticists with whom I have spoken. Races are said to be "breeding populations," which is to say that matings within the groups have a much higher probability than matings outside the group. Races are more technically viewed by geneticists as populations having different distributions of gene frequencies. These genetic differences are manifested in virtually every anatomical, physiological, and biochemical comparison one can make between representative samples of identifiable racial groups (Kuttner, 1967). There is no reason to suppose that the brain should be exempt from this generalization. (Racial differences in the relative frequencies of various blood constituents have probably been the most thoroughly studied so far.)

But what about behavior? If it can be measured and shown to have a genetic component, it would be regarded, from a genetic standpoint, as no different from other human characteristics. There seems to be little question that racial differences in genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, such as mental abilities, should exist, just as physical differences. The real questions, geneticists tell me, are not whether there are or are not genetic racial differences that affect behavior, because there undoubtedly are. The proper questions to ask, from a scientific standpoint, are: What is the direction of the difference? What is the magnitude of the difference? And what is the significance of the difference—medically, socially, educationally, or from whatever standpoint that may be relevant to the characteristic in question? A difference is important only within a specific context. For example, one's blood type in the ABO system is unimportant until one needs a transfusion. And some genetic differences are apparently of no importance with respect to any context as far as anyone has been able to discover—for example, differences in the size and shape of ear lobes. The idea that all genetic differences have arisen or persisted only as a result of natural selection, by conferring some survival or adaptive benefit on their possessors, is no longer generally held. There appear to be many genetic differences, or polymorphisms,

which confer no discernible advantages to survival.⁶

Negro Intelligence and Scholastic Performance. Negroes in the United States are disproportionately represented among groups identified as culturally or educationally disadvantaged. This, plus the fact that Negroes constitute by far the largest racial minority in the United States, has for many years focused attention on Negro intelligence. It is a subject with a now vast literature which has been quite recently reviewed by Dreger and Miller (1960, 1968) and by Shuey (1966), whose 578 page review is the most comprehensive, covering 382 studies. The basic data are well known: on the average, Negroes test about 1 standard deviation (15 IQ points) below the average of the white population in IQ, and this finding is fairly uniform across the 81 different tests of intellectual ability used in the studies reviewed by Shuey. This magnitude of difference gives a median overlap of 15 percent, meaning that 15 percent of the Negro population exceeds the white average. In terms of proportions of variance, if the numbers of Negroes and whites were equal, the difference between racial groups would account for 23 percent of the total variance, but—an important point—the differences within groups would account for 77 percent of the total variance. When gross socioeconomic level is controlled, the average difference reduces to about 11 IQ points (Shuey, 1966, p. 519), which, it should be recalled, is about the same spread as the average difference between siblings in the same family. So-called "culture-free" or "culture-fair" tests tend to give Negroes slightly lower scores, on the average, than more conventional IQ tests such as the Stanford-Binet and Wechsler scales. Also, as a group, Negroes perform somewhat more poorly on those subtests which tap abstract abilities. The majority of studies show that Negroes perform relatively better on verbal than on non-verbal intelligence tests.

In tests of scholastic achievement, also, judging from the massive data of the Coleman study (Coleman, et al., 1966), Negroes score about 1 standard deviation (SD) below the average for whites and Orientals and considerably less than 1 SD below other disadvantaged minorities tested in the Coleman study—Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, and American Indian. The 1 SD decrement in Negro performance is fairly constant throughout the period from grades 1 through 12.

Another aspect of the distribution of IQs in the Negro population is their lesser variance in comparison to the white distribution. This shows up in most of the studies reviewed by Shuey. The best single estimate is probably the estimate based on a large normative study of Stanford-Binet IQs of Negro school children in five Southeastern states, by Kennedy, Van De Riet, and White (1963). They found the SD of Negro children's IQs to be 12.4, as compared with 16.4 in the white normative sample. The Negro distribution thus has only about 60 percent as much variance (i.e., SD^2) as the white distribution.

There is an increasing realization among students of the psychology of the disadvantaged that the discrepancy in their average performance cannot be completely or directly attributed to discrimination or inequalities in education. It seems not unreasonable, in view of the fact that intelligence variation has a large genetic component, to hypothesize that genetic factors may play a part in this picture. But such an hypothesis is anathema to many social scientists. The idea that the lower average intelligence and scholastic

performance of Negroes could involve, not only environmental, but also genetic, factors has indeed been strongly denounced (e.g. Pettigrew, 1964). But it has been neither contradicted nor discredited by evidence.

The fact that a reasonable hypothesis has not been rigorously proved does not mean that it should be summarily dismissed. It only means that we need more appropriate research for putting it to the test. I believe such definitive research is entirely possible but has not yet been done. So, all we are left with are various lines of evidence, no one of which is definitive alone, but which, viewed all together, make it a not unreasonable hypothesis that genetic factors are strongly implicated in the average Negro-white intelligence difference. The preponderance of the evidence is, in my opinion, less consistent with a strictly environmental hypothesis than with a genetic hypothesis, which, of course, does not exclude the influence of environment or its interaction with genetic factors.

We can be accused of superficiality in our thinking about this issue, I believe, if we simply dismiss a genetic hypothesis without having seriously thought about the relevance of typical findings such as the following:

Failure to Equate Negroes and Whites in IQ and Scholastic Ability. No one has yet produced any evidence based on a properly controlled study to show that representative samples of Negro and white children can be equalized in intellectual ability through statistical control of environment and education.

Socioeconomic Level and Incidence of Mental Retardation. Since in no category of socioeconomic status (SES) are a majority of children found to be retarded in the technical sense of having an IQ below 75, it would be hard to claim that the degree of environmental deprivation typically associated with lower-class status could be responsible for this degree of mental retardation. An IQ less than 75 reflects more than a lack of cultural amenities. Heber (1968) has estimated on the basis of existing evidence that IQs below 75 have a much higher incidence among Negro than among white children at every level of socioeconomic status, as shown in Table 3. In the two highest SES categories the estimated proportions of Negro and white children with IQs below 75, are in the ratio of 13.6 to 1. If environmental factors were mainly responsible for producing such differences, one should expect a lesser Negro-white discrepancy at the upper SES levels. Other lines of evidence also show this not to be the case. A genetic hypothesis, on the other hand, would predict this effect, since the higher SES Negro offspring would be regressing to a lower population mean than their white counterparts in SES, and consequently a larger proportion of the lower tail of the distribution of genotypes for Negroes would fall below the value that generally results in phenotypic IQs below 75.

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED PREVALENCE OF CHILDREN WITH IQ'S BELOW 75, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) AND RACE GIVEN AS PERCENTAGES (HEBER, 1968)

SES	White	Negro
High 1.....	0.5	3.1
2.....	.8	14.5
3.....	2.1	22.8
4.....	3.1	37.8
Low 5.....	7.8	42.9

A finding reported by Wilson (1967) is also in line with this prediction. He obtained the mean IQs of a large representative sample of Negro and white children in a California school district and compared the two groups within each of four social class categories:

⁶ The most comprehensive and sophisticated discussion of the genetic-behavior analysis of race differences that I have found is by Spuhler and Lindzey (1967).

(1) professional and managerial, (2) white collar, (3) skilled and semiskilled manual, and (4) lower class (unskilled, unemployed, or welfare recipients). The mean IQ of Negro children in the first category was 15.5 points below that of the corresponding white children in SES category 1. But the Negro mean for SES 1 was also 3.9 points below the mean of white children in SES category 4. (The IQs of white children in SES 4 presumably have "regressed" upward toward the mean of the white population.)

Wilson's data are not atypical, for they agree with Shuey's (1966, p. 520) summarization of the total literature up to 1965 on this point. She reports that in all the studies which grouped subjects by SES, upper-status Negro children average 2.6 IQ points below the low-status whites. Shuey comments: "It seems improbable that upper and middle-class colored children would have no more culture opportunities provided them than white children of the lower and lowest class."

Duncan (1968, p. 69) also has presented striking evidence for a much greater "regression-to-the-mean" (from parents to their children) for high status occupations in the case of Negroes than in the case of whites. None of these findings is at all surprising from the standpoint of a genetic hypothesis, of which an intrinsic feature is Galton's "law of filial regression." While the data are not necessarily inconsistent with a possible environmental interpretation, they do seem more puzzling in terms of strictly environmental causation. Such explanations often seem intemperately strained.

Inadequacies of Purely Environmental Explanations. Strictly environmental explanations of group differences tend to have an ad hoc quality. They are usually plausible for the situation they are devised to explain, but often they have little generality across situations, and new ad hoc hypotheses have to be continually devised. Pointing to environmental differences between groups is never sufficient in itself to infer a causal relationship to group differences in intelligence. To take just one example of this tendency of social scientists to attribute lower intelligence and scholastic ability to almost any environmental difference that seems handy, we can look at the evidence regarding the effects of "father absence." Since the father is absent in a significantly larger proportion of Negro than of white families, the factor of "father absence" has been frequently pointed to in the literature on the disadvantaged as one of the causes of Negroes' lower performance on IQ tests and in scholastic achievement. Yet the two largest studies directed at obtaining evidence on this very point—the only studies I have seen that are methodologically adequate—both conclude that the factor of "father absence" versus "father presence" makes no independent contribution to variance in intelligence or scholastic achievement. The sample sizes were so large in both of these studies that even a very slight degree of correlation between father-absence and the measures of cognitive performance would have shown up as statistically significant. Coleman (1966, p. 506) concluded: "Absence of a father in the home did not have the anticipated effect on ability scores. Overall, pupils without fathers performed at approximately the same level as those with fathers—although there was some variation between groups" (groups referring to geographical regions of the U.S.). And Wilson (1957, p. 177) concluded from his survey of a California school district: "Neither our own data nor the preponderance of evidence from other research studies indicate that father presence or absence, *per se*, is related to school achievement. While broken homes reflect the existence of social and personal problems, and have some consequence for the development of personality, broken homes do not have any systematic effect on the overall level of school success."

The nationwide Coleman study (1966) included assessments of a dozen environmental variables and socioeconomic indices which are generally thought to be major sources of environmental influence in determining individual and group differences in scholastic performance—such factors as: reading material in the home, cultural amenities in the home, structural integrity of the home, foreign language in the home, preschool attendance, parents' education, parents' educational desires for child, parents' interest in child's school work, time spent on homework, child's self-concept (self-esteem), and so on. These factors are all correlated—in the expected direction—with scholastic performance within each of the racial or ethnic groups studied by Coleman. Yet, interestingly enough, they are not systematically correlated with differences between groups. For example, by far the most environmentally disadvantaged groups in the Coleman study are the American Indians. On every environmental index they average lower than the Negro samples, and overall their environmental rating is about as far below the Negro average as the Negro rating is below the white average. (As pointed out by Kuttner [1968, p. 707], American Indians are much more disadvantaged than Negroes, or any other minority groups in the United States, on a host of other factors not assessed by Coleman, such as income, unemployment, standards of health care, life expectancy, and infant mortality.) Yet the American Indian ability and achievement test scores average about half a standard deviation higher than the scores of Negroes. The differences were in favor of the Indian children on each of the four tests used by Coleman: non-verbal intelligence, verbal intelligence, reading comprehension, and math achievement. If the environmental factors assessed by Coleman are the major determinants of Negro-white differences that many social scientists have claimed they are, it is hard to see why such factors should act in reverse fashion in determining differences between Negroes and Indians, especially in view of the fact that within each group the factors are significantly correlated in the expected direction with achievement.

Early Developmental Differences. A number of studies of child development have noted the developmental precocity of Negro infants, particularly in motoric behavior. Geber (1958) and Geber and Dean (1957) have reported this precocity also in African infants. It hardly appears to be environmental, since it is evident in nine-hour-old infants. Cravioto (1966, p. 78) has noted that the Gesell tests of infant behavioral development, which are usually considered suitable only for children over four weeks of age, "can be used with younger African, Mexican, and Guatemalan infants, since their development at two or three weeks is similar to that of Western European infants two or three times as old." Bayley's (1965a) study of a representative sample of 600 American Negro infants up to 15 months of age, using the Bayley Infant Scales of Mental and Motor Development, also found Negro infants to have significantly higher scores than white infants in their first year. The difference is largely attributable to the motor items in the Bayley test. For example, about 30 percent of white infants as compared with about 60 percent of Negro infants between 9 and 12 months were able to "pass" such tests as "pat-a-cake" muscular coordination, and ability to walk with help, to stand alone, and to walk alone. The highest scores for any group on the Bayley scales that I have found in my search of the literature were obtained by Negro infants in the poorest sections of Durham, North Carolina. The older siblings of these infants have an average IQ of about 80. The infants up to 6 months of age, however, have a Developmental Motor Quotient (DMQ) nearly one standard deviation above white norms and a Developmental IQ (i.e.,

the non-motor items of the Bayley scale) of about half a standard deviation above white norms (Durham Education Improvement Program, 1966-67, a, b).

The DMQ, as pointed out previously, correlates negatively in the white population with socioeconomic status and with later IQ. Since lower SES Negro and white school children are more alike in IQ than are upper SES children of the two groups (Wilson, 1967), one might expect greater DMQ differences in favor of Negro infants in high socioeconomic Negro and white samples than in low socioeconomic samples. This is just what Walters (1967) found. High SES Negro infants significantly exceeded whites in total score on the Gesell developmental schedules at 12 weeks of age, while low SES Negro and white infants did not differ significantly overall. (The only difference, on a single subscale, favored the white infants.)

It should also be noted that developmental quotients are usually depressed by adverse prenatal, perinatal, and postnatal complications such as lack of oxygen, prematurity, and nutritional deficiency.

Another relationship of interest is the finding that the negative correlation between DMQ and later IQ is higher in boys than in girls (Bayley, 1966, p. 127). Bronfenbrenner (1967, p. 912) cites evidence which shows that Negro boys perform relatively less well in school than Negro girls; the sex difference is much greater than is found in the white population. Bronfenbrenner (1967, p. 913) says, "It is noteworthy that these sex differences in achievement are observed among Southern as well as Northern Negroes, are present at every socioeconomic level, and tend to increase with age."

Physiological Indices. The behavioral precocity of Negro infants is also paralleled by certain physiological indices of development. For example, x-rays show that bone development, as indicated by the rate of ossification of cartilage, is more advanced in Negro as compared with white babies of about the same socioeconomic background, and Negro babies mature at a lower birth-weight than white babies (Naylor & Myrianthopoulos, 1967, p. 81).

It has also been noted that brain wave patterns in African newborn infants show greater maturity than is usually found in the European newborn child (Nilson & Dean, 1959). This finding especially merits further study, since there is evidence that brain waves have some relationship to IQ (Medical World News, 1968), and since at least one aspect of brain waves—the visually evoked potential—has a very significant genetic component, showing a heritability of about .80 (uncorrected for attenuation) (Dustman & Beck, 1965).

Magnitude of Adult Negro-White Differences. The largest sampling of Negro and white intelligence test scores resulted from the administration of the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) to a national sample of over 10 million men between the ages of 18 and 26. As of 1966, the overall failure rate for Negroes was 68 percent as compared with 19 percent for whites (U.S. News and World Report, 1966). (The failure cut-off score that yields these percentages is roughly equivalent to a Stanford-Binet IQ of 86.) Moynihan (1965) has estimated that during the same period in which the AFQT was administered to these large representative samples of Negro and white male youths, approximately one-half of Negro families could be considered as middle-class or above by the usual socioeconomic criteria. So even if we assumed that all of the lower 50 percent of Negroes on the SES scale failed the AFQT, it would still mean that at least 36 percent of the middle SES Negroes failed the test, a failure rate almost twice as high as that of the white population for all levels of SES.

Do such findings raise any question as to the plausibility of theories that postulate exclusively environmental factors as sufficient causes for the observed differences?

WHY RAISE INTELLIGENCE?

If the intelligence of the whole population increased and our IQ tests were standardized anew, the mean IQ would again be made equal to 100, which, by definition, is the average for the population. Thus, in order to speak sensibly of raising intelligence we need an absolute frame of reference, and for simplicity's sake we will use the present distribution of IQ as our reference scale. Then it will not be meaningless to speak of the average IQ of the population shifting to values other than 100.

Would there be any real advantage to shifting the entire distribution of intelligence upward? One way to answer this question is to compare the educational attainments of children in different schools whose IQ distributions center around means of, say, 85, 100, and 115. As pointed out earlier, there is a relationship between educational attainments and the occupations that are open to individuals on leaving school. Perusal of the want-ads in any metropolitan newspaper reveals that there are extremely few jobs advertised which are suitable to the level of education and skills typically found below IQs of 85 or 90, while we see day after day in the want-ads hundreds of jobs which call for a level of education and skills typically found among school graduates with IQs above 110. These jobs go begging to be filled. The fact is, there are not nearly enough minimally qualified persons to fill them.

One may sensibly ask the question whether our collective national intelligence is adequate to meet the growing needs of our increasingly complex industrial society. In a bygone era, when the entire population's work consisted almost completely of gathering or producing food by primitive means, there was little need for a large number of persons with IQs much above 100. Few of the jobs that had to be done at that time required the kind of abstract intelligence and academic training which are now in such seemingly short supply in relation to the demand in our modern society. For many years the criterion for mental retardation was an IQ below 70. In recent years the National Association for Mental Retardation has raised the criterion to an IQ of 85, since an increasing proportion of persons of more than 1 standard deviation below the average in IQ are unable to get along occupationally in today's world. Persons with IQs of 85 or less are finding it increasingly difficult to get jobs, any jobs, because they are unprepared, for whatever reason, to do the jobs that need doing in this industrialized, technological economy. Unless drastic changes occur—in the population, in educational outcomes, or in the whole system of occupational training and selection—it is hard to see how we can avoid any increase in the rate of the so-called "hard-core" unemployed. It takes more knowledge and cleverness to operate, maintain, or repair a tractor than to till a field by hand, and it takes more skill to write computer programs than to operate an adding machine. And apparently the trend will continue.

It has been argued by Harry and Margaret Harlow that "human beings in our world today have no more, or little more, than the absolute minimal intellectual endowment necessary for achieving the civilization we know today" (Harlow & Harlow, 1962, p. 34). They depict where we would probably be if man's average genetic endowment for intelligence had never risen above the level corresponding to IQ 75: "... the geniuses would barely exceed our normal or average level; comparatively few would be equivalent in ability to our average high school graduates. There would be no individuals with the normal intellectual capacities es-

sential for making major discoveries, and there could be no civilization as we know it."

It may well be true that the kind of ability we now call intelligence was needed in a certain percentage of the human population for our civilization to have arisen. But while a small minority—perhaps only one or two percent—of highly gifted individuals were needed to advance civilization, the vast majority were able to assimilate the consequences of these advances. It may take a Leibnitz or a Newton to invent the calculus, but almost any college student can learn it and use it.

Since intelligence (meaning *g*) is not the whole of human abilities, there may be some fallacy and some danger in making it the *sine qua non* of fitness to play a productive role in modern society. We should not assume certain ability requirements for a job without establishing these requirements as a fact. How often do employment tests, Civil Service examinations, the requirement of a high school diploma, and the like, constitute hurdles that are irrelevant to actual performance on the job for which they are intended as a screening device? Before going overboard in deploring the fact that disadvantaged minority groups fail to clear many of the hurdles that are set up for certain jobs, we should determine whether the educational and mental test barriers that stand at the entrance to many of these employment opportunities are actually relevant. They may be relevant only in the correlational sense that the test predicts success on the job, in which case we should also know whether the test measures the ability actually required on the job or measures only characteristics that happen to be correlated with some third factor which is really essential for job performance. Changing people in terms of the really essential requirements of a given job may be much more feasible than trying to increase their abstract intelligence or level of performance in academic subjects so that they can pass irrelevant tests.

IQ gains from environmental improvement

As was pointed out earlier, since the environment acts as a threshold variable with respect to IQ, an overall increase in IQ in a population in which a great majority are above the threshold, such that most of the IQ variance is due to heredity, could not be expected to be very large if it had to depend solely upon improving the environment of the economically disadvantaged. This is not to say that such improvement is not to be desired for its own sake or that it would not boost the educational potential of many disadvantaged children. An unrealistically high upper limit of what one could expect can be estimated from figures given by Schwebel (1968, p. 210). He estimates that 26 percent of the children in the population can be called environmentally deprived. He estimates the frequencies of their IQs in each portion of the IQ scale; their distribution is skewed, with higher frequencies in the lower IQ categories and an overall mean IQ of 90. Next, he assumes we could add 20 points to each deprived child's IQ by giving him an abundant environment. (The figure of 20 IQ points comes from Bloom's [1964, p. 89] estimate that the effect of extreme environments on intelligence is about 20 IQ points.) The net effect of this 20-point boost in the IQ of every deprived child would be an increase in the population's IQ from 100 to 105. But this seems to be an unrealistic fantasy. For if it were true that the IQs of the deprived group could be raised 20 points by a good environment, and if Schwebel's estimate of 26 percent correctly represents the incidence of deprivation, then the deprived children would be boosted to an average IQ of 110, which is 7 points higher than the mean of 103 for the non-deprived popu-

lation! There is no reason to believe that the IQs of deprived children, given an environment of abundance, would rise to a higher level than the already privileged children's IQs. The overall boost in the population IQ would probably be more like 1 or 2 IQ points rather than 5. (Another anomaly of Schwebel's "analysis" is that after a 20-point IQ boost is granted to the deprived segment of the population, the only persons left in the mentally retarded range are the non-deprived, with 7 percent of them below IQ 80 as compared with zero percent of the deprived!)

Fewer persons, however, are seriously concerned about whether or not we could appreciably boost the IQ of the population as a whole. A more feasible and urgent goal is to foster the educational and occupational potential of the disadvantaged segment of the population. The pursuit of this aim, of course, must involve advances not only in education, but in public health, in social services, and in welfare and employment practices. In considering all feasible measures, one must also take inventory of forces that may be working against the accomplishment of amelioration. We should not overlook the fact that social and economic conditions not only have direct environmental effects, but indirectly can have biological consequences as well, consequences that could oppose attempts to improve the chances of the disadvantaged to assume productive roles in society.

Possible dysgenic trends

In one large midwestern city it was found that one-third of all the children in classes for the mentally retarded (IQ less than 75) came from one small area of the city comprising only five percent of the city's population (Heber, 1968). A representative sample of 88 mothers having at least one school-age child in this neighborhood showed an average of 7.6 children per mother. In families of 8 or more, nearly half the children over 12 years of age had IQs below 75 (Heber, Dener, & Conry, 1968). The authors note that not all low SES families contributed equally to the rate of mental retardation in this area; certain specifiable families had a greatly disproportionate number of retarded children. Mothers with IQs below 80, for example, accounted for over 80 percent of the children with IQs under 80. Completely aside from the hereditary implications, what does this mean in view of studies of foster children which show that the single most important factor in the child's environment with respect to his intellectual development is his foster mother's IQ? This variable has been shown to make the largest independent contribution to variance in children's IQs of any environmental factor (Burks, 1928). If the children in the neighborhoods studied by Heber, which are typical of the situation in many of our large cities, have the great disadvantage of deprived environments, is it inappropriate to ask the same question that Florence Goodenough (1940, p. 329) posed regarding causal factors in retarded Tennessee mountain children: "Why are they so deprived?" When a substantial proportion of the children in a community suffer a deplorable environment, one of the questions we need to answer is who creates their environment? Does not the genetic \times environment interaction work both ways, the genotype to some extent making its own environment and that of its progeny?

In reviewing evidence from foster home studies on environmental amelioration of IQs below 75 (the range often designated as indicating cultural-familial retardation) Heber, Dener, and Conry (1968, p. 17) state: "The conclusion that changes in the living environment can cause very large increments in IQ for the cultural-familial retardate is not warranted by these data."

What is probably the largest study ever made of familial influences in mental re-

tardation (defined in this study as IQ less than 70) involved investigation of more than 80,000 relatives of a group of mentally retarded persons by the Dight Institute of Genetics, University of Minnesota (Reed & Reed, 1965). From this large-scale study, Sheldon and Elizabeth Reed estimated that about 80 percent of mentally retarded (IQ less than 70) persons in the United States have a retarded parent or a normal parent who has a retarded sibling. The Reeds state: "One inescapable conclusion is that the transmission of mental retardation from parent to child is by far the most important single factor in the persistence of this social misfortune" (p. 48). "The transmission of mental retardation from one generation to the next, should, therefore, receive much more critical attention than it has in the past. It seems fair to state that this problem has been largely ignored on the assumption that if our social agencies function better, that if everyone's environment were improved sufficiently, then mental retardation would cease to be a major problem" (p. 77).

An interesting sidelight of the Reeds' study is the finding that in a number of families in which one or both parents had IQs below 70 and in which the environment they provided their children was deplorably deprived, there were a few children of average and superior IQ (as high as 130 or above) and superior scholastic performance. From a genetic standpoint the occurrence of such children would be expected. It is surprising from a strictly environmental standpoint. But, even though some proportion of the children of retarded parents are obviously intellectually well endowed, who would wish upon them the kind of environment typically provided by retarded parents? An investigation conducted in Denmark concluded that "... it is a very severe physical trauma for a normally gifted child to grow up in a home where the mother is mentally deficient" (Jepsen & Bredmose, 1956, p. 209). Have we thought sufficiently of the rights of children—of their right to be born with fair odds against being mentally retarded, not to have a retarded parent, and with fair odds in favor of having the genetic endowment needed to compete on equal terms with the majority of persons in society? Can we reasonably and humanely oppose such rights of millions of children as yet not born?

Is Our National IQ Declining? It has long been known that there is a substantial negative correlation (averaging about -.30 in various studies) between intelligence and family size and between social class and family size (Anastasi, 1956). Children with many siblings, on the average, have lower IQs than children in small families, and the trend is especially marked for families of more than five (Gottesman, 1968). This fact once caused concern in the United States, and even more so in Britain, because of its apparent implication of a declining IQ in the population. If more children are born to persons in the lower half of the intelligence distribution, one would correctly predict a decline in the average IQ of the population. In a number of large-scale studies addressed to the issue in Britain and the United States some 20 years ago, no evidence was found for a general decline in IQ (Duncan, 1952). The paradox of the apparent failure of the genetic prediction to be manifested was resolved to the satisfaction of most geneticists by three now famous studies, one by Higgins, Reed, and Reed (1962), the others by Bajema (1963, 1966). All previous analyses had been based on IQ comparisons of children having different numbers of siblings, and this was their weakness. The data needed to answer the question properly consist of the average number of children born to all individuals at every level of IQ. It was found in the three studies that if persons with very low IQs married and had children, they typically had a large number of children. But—it was

also found that relatively few persons in the lower tail of the IQ distribution ever married or produced children, and so their reproduction rate is more than counterbalanced by persons at the upper end of the IQ scale, nearly all of whom marry and have children. The data of these studies are shown in Figure 15.

In my opinion these studies are far from adequate to settle this issue and thus do not justify complacency. They cannot be generalized much beyond the particular generation which the data represent or to other than the white population on which these studies were based. The population sampled by Bajema (1963, 1966), for example, consisted of native-born American whites, predominantly Protestant, with above-average educational attainments, living all or most of their lives in an urban environment, and having most of their children before World War II. Results from a study of this population cannot be confidently generalized to other, quite dissimilar segments of our national population. The relationship between reproductive rate and IQ found by Bajema and by Higgins et al. may very well not prevail in every population group. Thus the evidence to date has not nullified the question of whether dysgenic trends are operating in some sectors.

If this conclusion is not unwarranted, then our lack of highly relevant information on this issue with respect to our Negro population is deplorable, and no one should be more concerned about it than the Negro community itself. Certain census statistics suggest that there might be forces at work which could create and widen the genetic aspect of the average difference in ability between the Negro and white populations in the United States, with the possible consequence that the improvement of educational facilities and increasing equality of opportunity will have a decreasing probability of producing equal achievement or continuing gains in the Negro population's ability to compete on equal terms. The relevant statistics have been presented by Moynihan (1966). The differential birthrate, as a function of socioeconomic status, is greater in the Negro than in the white population. The data showing this relationship for one representative age group from the U.S. Census of 1960 are presented in Figure 16.

Negro middle- and upper-class families have fewer children than their white counterparts, while Negro lower-class families have more. In 1960, Negro women of ages 35 to 44 married to unskilled laborers had 4.7 children as compared with 3.8 for non-Negro women in the same situation. Negro women married to professional or technical workers had only 1.9 children as compared with 2.4 for white women in the same circumstances. Negro women with annual incomes below \$2000 averaged 5.3 children. The poverty rate for families with 5 or 6 children is $3\frac{1}{2}$ times as high as that for families with one or two children (Hill & Jaffe, 1966). That these figures have some relationship to intellectual ability is seen in the fact that 3 out of 4 Negroes failing the Armed Forces Qualification Test come from families of four or more children.

Another factor to be considered is average generation time, defined as the number of years it takes for the parent generation to reproduce its own number. This period is significantly less in the Negro than in the white population. Also, as noted in the study of Bajema (1966), generation length is inversely related to educational attainment and occupational status; therefore a group with shorter generation length is more likely subject to a possible dysgenic effect.

Much more thought and research should be given to the educational and social implications of these trends for the future. Is there a danger that current welfare policies, unaided by eugenic foresight, could lead to the genetic enslavement of a substantial segment

of our population? The possible consequences of our failure seriously to study these questions may well be viewed by future generations as our society's greatest injustice to Negro Americans.

INTENSIVE EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION

We began with mention of several of the major compensatory education programs and their general lack of success in boosting the scholastic performance of disadvantaged children. It has been claimed that such mammoth programs have not been adequately pinpointed to meeting specific, fine-grained cultural and cognitive needs of these children and therefore should not be expected to produce the gains that could result from more intensive and more carefully focused programs in which maximum cultural enrichment and instructional ingenuity are lavished on a small group of children by a team of experts. The scanty evidence available seems to bear this out. While massive compensatory programs have produced no appreciable gains in intelligence or achievement (as noted on pp. 2-3), the majority of small-scale experiments in boosting the IQ and educational performance of disadvantaged children have produced significant gains. It is interesting that the magnitude of claimed gains generally decreases as one proceeds from reports in the popular press, to informal verbal reports heard on visits at research sites and in private correspondence, to papers read at meetings, to published papers without presentation of supporting data, and to published papers with supporting data. I will confine my review to some of the major studies in the last category.

First, some general observations.

Magnitude of Gains. The magnitude of IQ and scholastic achievement gains resulting from enrichment and cognitive stimulation programs authentically range between about 5 and 20 points for IQs, and between about one-half to two standard deviations for specific achievement measures (readings, arithmetic, spelling, etc.). Heber (1968) reviewed 29 intensive preschool programs for disadvantaged children and found they resulted in an average gain in IQ (at the time of children's leaving the preschool program) of between 5 and 10 points; the average gain was about the same for children whose initial IQs were below 90 as for those of 90 and above.

The amount of gain is related to several factors. The intensity and specificity of the instructional aspects of the program seem to make a difference. Ordinary nursery school attendance, with a rather diffuse enrichment program but with little effort directed at development of specific cognitive skills, generally results in a gain of 5 or 6 IQ points in typical disadvantaged preschoolers. If special cognitive training, especially in verbal skills, is added to the program, the average gain is about 10 points—slightly more or less depending on the amount of verbal content in the tests. Average gains rarely go above this, but when the program is extended beyond the classroom into the child's home, and there is intensive instruction in specific skills under short but highly attention-demanding daily sessions, as in the Bereiter-Engelmann program (1966), about a third of the children have shown gains of as much as 20 points.

Average gains of more than 10 or 15 points have not been obtained on any sizeable groups or been shown to persist or to be replicable in similar groups, although there have been claims that average gains of 20 or more points can be achieved by removing certain cultural and attitudinal barriers to learning. The actual evidence, however, warrants the caution expressed by Bereiter and Engelmann (1966, p. 7): "Miracle cures" of this kind are sometimes claimed to work with disadvantaged children, as when a child is found to gain 20 points or so in IQ after

a few months of preschool experience. Such enormous gains, however, are highly suspect to anyone who is familiar with mental measurements. It is a fair guess that the child could have done as well on the first test except that he misinterpreted the situation, was frightened or agitated, or was not used to responding to instructions. Where genuine learning is concerned, enormous leaps simply do not occur, and leaps of any kind do not occur without sufficient cause."

The initial IQ on entering also has some effect, and this fact may be obscured if various studies are coarsely grouped. Bereiter and Engelmann (1966, p. 16), in analyzing results from eight different preschools for culturally disadvantaged children that followed traditional nursery school methods, concluded that the children's average gain in IQ is half the way from their initial IQ level to the normal level of 100. This rule was never more than 2 points in error for the studies reviewed. This same amount of IQ gain is generally noted in disadvantaged children during their first year in regular kindergarten (Brison, 1967, p. 8).

I have found no evidence of comparable gains in non-disadvantaged children. Probably the exceedingly meager gains in some apparently excellent preschool programs for the "disadvantaged" are attributable to the fact that the children in them did not come from a sufficiently deprived home background. Such can be the case when the children are admitted to the program on the basis of "self-selection" by their parents. Parents who seek out a nursery school or volunteer their children for an experimental preschool are more apt to have provided their children with a somewhat better environment than would be typical for a randomly selected group of disadvantaged children. This seems to have been the case in Martin Deutsch's intensive preschool enrichment program at the Institute of Developmental Studies in New York (Powledge, 1967). Both the experimental group (E) and the self-selected control groups (C₁) were made up of Negro children from a poor neighborhood in New York City whose parents applied for their admission to the program. The E group received intensive educational attention in what is overall the most comprehensive and elaborate enrichment program I know of. The C₁ group, of course, received no enriched education. The initial average Stanford-Binet IQs of the E and C₁ groups were 93.32 and 94.69, respectively. After two years in the enrichment program, the E group had a mean IQ of 95.53 and the C₁ group had 96.52. Both pre- and post-test differences are nonsignificant. The enrichment program continued for a third year through the first grade. For the children in the E group who had had three years of enrichment, there was a significant gain over the C group of 8 months in reading achievement by the end of first grade, a score above national norms. This result is in keeping with the general finding that enrichment shows a greater effect on scholastic achievement than on IQ per se.

Many studies have employed no control group selected on exactly the same basis as the experimental group. This makes it virtually impossible to evaluate the effect of the treatment on pre-test-post-test gain, and the problem is made more acute by the fact that enrichment studies often pick their subjects on the basis of their being below the average IQ of the population of disadvantaged children from which they are selected. This makes statistical regression a certainty—the group's mean will increase by an appreciable amount because of the imperfect correlation between test-retest scores over, say, a one-year interval. Since this correlation is known to be considerably lower in younger than in older children, there will be considerably greater "gain" due to regression for younger groups of children. The net

results of selecting especially backward children on the basis of IQ is that a gain in IQ can be predicted which is not at all attributable to the educational treatment given to the children. Studies using control groups nearly always show this gain in the control group, and only by subtracting the control group's gain from the experimental group's gain can we evaluate the magnitude of the treatment effect. Only the gain over and above that attributable to regression really counts.

Still another factor is involved in the inverse relationship generally found between children's age and the size of IQ gains in an enrichment program. Each single item gotten right in a test like the Stanford-Binet adds increasingly smaller increments to the IQ as children get older. Each Stanford-Binet test item, for example, is worth two months of mental age. At four years of age getting just two additional items right will boost an IQ at 85 up to 93. The same absolute amount of improvement in test performance at 10 years of age would boost an IQ of 85 up to only 88. The typical range of gains found in preschool enrichment programs, in the age range of 4 to 6, are about what would be expected from passing an additional two to four items in the Stanford-Binet. This amount of gain should not be surprising on a test which, for this age range, consists of items rather similar to the materials and activities traditionally found in nursery schools—blocks, animal pictures, puzzles, bead stringing, copying drawings, and the like. I once visited an experimental preschool using the Stanford-Binet to assess pre-test-post-test gains, in which some of the Stanford-Binet test materials were openly accessible to the children throughout their time in the school as part of the enrichment paraphernalia. Years ago Reymert and Hinton (1940) noted this "easy gain" in the IQs of culturally disadvantaged preschoolers on tests depending on specific information such as being able to name parts of the body and knowing names of familiar objects. Children who have not picked up this information at home get it quickly in nursery school and kindergarten.

In addition to these factors, something else operates to boost scores of five to ten points from first to second test, provided the first test is really the first. When I worked in a psychological clinic, I had to give individual intelligence tests to a variety of children, a good many of whom came from an impoverished background. Usually I felt these children were really brighter than their IQ would indicate. They often appeared inhibited in their responsiveness in the testing situation on their first visit to my office, and when this was the case I usually had them come in on two to four different days for half-hour sessions with me in a "play therapy" room, in which we did nothing more than get better acquainted by playing ball, using finger paints, drawing on the blackboard, making things out of clay, and so forth. As soon as the child seemed to be completely at home in this setting, I would retest him on a parallel form of the Stanford-Binet. A boost in IQ of 18 to 10 points or so was the rule; it rarely failed but neither was the gain very often much above this. So I am inclined to doubt that IQ gains up to this amount in young disadvantaged children have much of anything to do with changes in ability. They are largely a result simply of getting a more accurate IQ by testing under more optimal conditions. Part of creating more optimal conditions in the case of disadvantaged children consists of giving at least two tests, the first only for practice and for letting the child get to know the examiner. I would put very little confidence in a single test score, especially if it is the child's first test and more especially if the child is from a poor background and of a different race from the examiner. But I also believe it

is possible to obtain accurate assessments of a child's ability, and I would urge that attempts to evaluate preschool enrichment programs measure the gains against initially valid scores. If there is not evidence that this precaution has been taken, and if there is no control group, one might as well subtract at least 5 points from the gain scores as having little or nothing to do with real intellectual growth.

It is interesting that the IQ gains typically found in enrichment programs are of about the same magnitude and durability as those found in studies of the effects of direct coaching and practice on intelligence tests. The average IQ gain in such studies is about nine or ten points (Vernon, 1954).

What Is Really Changed When We Boost IQ? Test scores may increase after special educational treatment, but one must then ask which components of test variance account for the gain. Is it *g* that gains, or is it something less central to our concept of intelligence? We will not know for sure until someone does a factor analysis of pre- and post-test scores, including a number of "reference" tests that were not a part of the pre-test battery. We should also factor analyze the tests at the item level, to see which types of test items reflect the most gain. Are they the items with the highest cultural loadings? It is worth noting that the studies showing authentic gains used tests which are relatively high in cultural loading. I have found no studies that demonstrated gains in relatively noncultural or nonverbal tests like Cattell's Culture Fair Tests and Raven's Progressive Matrices.

Furthermore, if gain consists of actual improvement in cognitive skills rather than of acquisition of simple information, it must be asked whether the gain in skill represents the intellectual skill that the test normally measures, and which, because of the test's high heritability, presumably reflects some important, biologically based aspect of mental development. Let me cite one example. In a well-known experiment Gates and Taylor (1925) gave young children daily practice over several months in repeating auditory digit series, just like the digit span subtests in the Wechsler and Stanford-Binet. The practice resulted in a marked gain in the children's digit span, equivalent to an IQ gain of about 20 points. But when the children were retested after an interval of six months without practicing digit recall, their digit performance was precisely at the level expected for their mental age as determined by other tests. The gains had been lost, and the digit test once again accurately reflected the children's overall level of mental development, as it did before the practice period. The well-known later "fading" of IQ gains acquired early in enrichment program may be a similar phenomenon.

But there is another phenomenon that probably is even more important as one of the factors working against the persistence of initial gains. This is the so-called "cumulative deficit" phenomenon, the fact that many children called disadvantaged show a decline in IQ from preschool age through at least elementary school. The term "cumulative deficit" may not be inappropriate in its connotations with respect to scholastic attainment, but it is probably a misleading misnomer when applied to the normal negatively accelerated growth rate of developmental characteristics such as intelligence. The same phenomenon can be seen in growth curves of stature, but no one would refer to the fact that some children gain height at a slower rate and level off at a lower asymptote as a "cumulative deficit." In short, it seems likely that some of the loss in initial gains is due to the more negatively accelerated growth curve for intelligence in disadvantaged children and is not necessarily due to waning or discontinuance of the instructional effort. The effort required to boost IQ

from 80 to 90 at 4 or 5 years of age is minuscule compared to the effort that would be required by age 9 or 10. "Gains" for experimental children in this range, in fact, take the form of superiority over a control group which has declined in IQ; the "enriched" group is simply prevented from falling behind, so there is no absolute gain in IQ, but only an advantage relative to a declining control group. Because of the apparently ephemeral nature of the initial gains seen in preschool programs, judgments of these programs' effectiveness in making a significant impact on intellectual development should be based on long range results.

A further step in proving the effectiveness of a particular program is to demonstrate that it can be applied with comparable success by other individuals in other schools, and, if it is to be practicable on a large scale, to determine if it works in the hands of somewhat less inspired and less dedicated practitioners than the few who originated it or first put it into practice on a small scale. As an example of what can happen when a small-scale project gets translated to a large-scale one, we can note Kenneth B. Clark's (1963, p. 160) enthusiastic and optimistic description of a "total push" intensive compensatory program which originated in one school serving disadvantaged children in New York City, with initially encouraging results. Clark said, "These positive results can be duplicated in every school of this type." In fact, it was tried in 40 other New York schools, and became known as the Higher Horizons program. After three years of the program the children in it showed no gains whatever and even averaged slightly lower in achievement and IQ than similar children in ordinary schools (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967, p. 125).

Finally, little is known about the range of IQ most likely to show genuine gains under enrichment. None of the data I have seen in this area permits any clear judgment on this matter. It would be unwarranted to assume at this time that special educational programs push the whole IQ distribution up the scale, so that, for example, they would yield a higher percentage of children with IQs higher than two standard deviations above the mean. After a "total push" program, IQs, if they change at all, may no longer be normally distributed, so that the gains would not much affect the frequencies at the tails of the distribution. We simply do not know the answer to this at present, since the relevant data are lacking.

Hothouse or Fertilizer? There seems to be little doubt that a deprived environment can stunt intellectual development and that immersion in a good environment in early childhood can largely overcome the effects of deprivation, permitting the individual's genetic potential to be reflected in his performance. But can special enrichment and instructional procedures go beyond the prevention or amelioration of stunting? As Vandenberg (1968, p. 49) has asked, does enrichment act in a manner similar to a *hothouse*, forcing an early bloom which is nevertheless no different from a normal bloom, or does it act more like a *fertilizer*, producing bigger and better yields? There can be little question about the hothouse aspect of early stimulation and instruction. Within limits, children can learn many things at an earlier age than that at which they are normally taught in school. This is especially true of forms of associative learning which are mainly a function of time spent in the learning activity rather than of the development of more complex cognitive structures. While most children, for example, do not learn the alphabet until 5 or 6 years of age, they are fully capable of doing so at about 3, but it simply requires more time spent in learning. The cognitive structures involved are relatively simple as compared with, say, learning to copy a triangle or a diamond. Teaching a 3-year-old

to copy a diamond is practically impossible; at five it is extremely difficult; at seven the child apparently needs no "teaching"—he copies the diamond easily. And the child of five who has been taught to copy the diamond seems to have learned something different from what the seven-year-old "knows" who can do it without being "taught." Though the final performance of the five-year-old and the seven-year-old may look alike, we know that the cognitive structures underlying their performance are different. Certain basic skills can be acquired either associatively by rote learning or cognitively by conceptual learning, and what superficially may appear to be the same performance may be acquired in preschoolers at an associative level, while at the conceptual level in older children. Both the four-year-old and the six-year-old may know that $2+2=4$, but this knowledge can be associative or cognitive. Insufficient attention has been given in preschool programs so far to the shift from associative to cognitive learning. The preschooler's capacity for associative learning is already quite well developed, but his cognitive or conceptual capacities are as yet rudimentary and will undergo their period of most rapid change between about five and seven years of age (White, 1965). We need to know more about what children can learn before age five that will transfer positively to later learning. Does learning something on an associative level facilitate or hinder learning the same content on a conceptual level?

While some preschool and compensatory programs have demonstrated earlier that normal learning of certain skills, the evidence for accelerating cognitive development or the speed of learning is practically nil. But usually this distinction is not made between sheer performance and the nature of the cognitive structures which support the gains in performance, and so the research leaves the issue in doubt. The answer to such questions is to be found in the study of the kinds and amount of transfer that result from some specific learning. The capacity for transfer of training is one of the essential aspects of what we mean by intelligence. The IQ gains reported in enrichment studies appear to be gains more in what Cattell calls "crystallized," in contrast to "fluid," intelligence. This is not to say that gains of this type are not highly worthwhile. But having a clearer conception of just what the gains consist of will give us a better idea of how they can be most effectively followed up and of what can be expected of their effects on later learning and achievement.

Specific Programs. Hodges and Spicker (1967) have summarized a number of the more substantial preschool intervention studies designed to improve the intellectual capabilities and scholastic success of disadvantaged children. Here are some typical examples.

The *Indian Project* focused on deprived Appalachian white children five years of age, with IQs in the range of 50 to 85. The children spent one year in a special kindergarten with a structured program designed to remedy specific diagnosed deficiencies of individual children in the areas of language development, fine motor coordination, concept formation, and socialization. Evaluation extended over two years, and gains were measured against three control groups: regular kindergarten, children who stayed at home during the kindergarten year, and children at home in another similar community. The average gain (measured against all three controls) after two years was 10.8 IQ points on the Stanford-Binet (final IQ 97.4) and 4.0 IQ on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (final IQ 90.4).

The *Perry Preschool Project* at Ypsilanti, Michigan, also was directed at disadvantaged preschool children with IQs between 50 and 85. The program was aimed at remedying lacks largely in the verbal prerequisites for

first-grade learning and involved the parents as well as the children. There was a significant gain of 8.9 IQ points in the Stanford-Binet after one year of the preschool, but by the end of second grade the experimental group exceeded the controls, who had had no preschool attendance, by only 1.6 IQ points, a nonsignificant gain.

The *Early Training Project* under the direction of Gray and Klaus at Peabody College is described as a multiple intervention program, meaning that it included not only preschool enrichment but work with the disadvantaged children's mothers to increase their ability to stimulate their child's cognitive development at home. Two experimental groups, with two and three summers of preschool enrichment experience in a special school plus home visits by the training staff, experienced an average gain, four years after the start of the program, of 7.2 IQ points over a control group on the Stanford-Binet (final IQ of E group was 93.6).

The *Durham Education Improvement Program* (1966-1967b) has focused on preschool children from impoverished homes. The basic assumption of the program is stated as follows: "First, Durham's disadvantaged youngsters are considered normal at birth and potentially normal academic achievers, though they are frequently subjected to conditions jeopardizing their physical and emotional health. It is further assumed that they adapt to their environment according to the same laws of learning which apply to all children." The program is one of the most comprehensive and intensive efforts yet made to improve the educability of children from backgrounds of poverty. The IQ gains over about an eight to nine months' interval for various groups of preschoolers in the program are raw pre-post test gains, not gains over a control group. The average IQ gains on three different tests were 5.32 (Peabody Picture Vocabulary), 2.62 (Stanford-Binet), and 9.27 (Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children). In most cases, IQs changed from the 80s to the 90s.

The well-known Bereiter-Engelmann (1966) program at the University of Illinois is probably the most sharply focused of all. It aims not at all-round enrichment of the child's experience but at teaching specific cognitive skills, particularly of a logical, semantic nature (as contrasted with more diffuse "verbal stimulation"). The emphasis is on information processing skills considered essential for school learning. The Bereiter-Engelmann preschool is said to be academically oriented, since each day throughout the school year the children receive twenty-minute periods of intensive instruction in three major content areas—language, reading, and arithmetic. The instruction, in small groups, explicitly involves maintaining a high level of attention, motivation, and participation from every child. Overt and emphatic repetition by the children are important ingredients of the instructional process. The pre-post gains (not measured against a control group) in Stanford-Binet IQ over an eighteen months' period are about 8 to 10 points. Larger gains are shown in tests that have clearly identifiable content which can reflect the areas receiving specific instruction, such as the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities and tests of reading and arithmetic (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1968). The authors note that the gains are shared about equally by all children.

Bereiter and Engelmann, correctly, I believe, put less stock in the IQ gains than in the gains in scholastic performance achieved by the children in their program. They comment that the children's IQs were still remarkably low for children who performed at the academic level actually attained in the program. Their scholastic performance was commensurate with that of children 10 to 20 points higher in IQ. Such is the advantage of highly focused training—it can significantly

boost the basic skills that count most. Bereiter and Engelmann (1966, p. 54) comment, "... to have taught children in a two-hour period per day enough over a broad area to bring the average IQ up to 110 or 120 would have been an impossibility." An important point of the Bereiter-Engelmann program is that it shows that scholastic performance—the acquisition of the basic skills—can be boosted much more, at least in the early years, than can the IQ, and that highly concentrated, direct instruction is more effective than more diffuse cultural enrichment.

The largest IQ gains I have seen and for which I was also able to examine the data and statistical analyses were reported by Karnes (1968), whose preschool program at the University of Illinois is based on an intensive attempt to ameliorate specific learning deficits in disadvantaged three-year-old children. Between the average age of 3 years 3 months and 4 years 1 month, children in the program showed a gain of 16.9 points in the Stanford-Binet IQ, while a control group showed a loss of 2.8 over the same period, making for a net gain of 19.7 IQ points for the experimental group. Despite rather small samples ($E = 15$, $C = 14$), this gain is highly significant statistically (a probability of less than 1 in 1000 of occurring by chance). Even so, I believe such findings need to be replicated for proper evaluation, and the durability of the gains needs to be assessed by follow-up studies over several years. There remains the question of the extent to which specific learning at age three affects cognitive structures which normally do not emerge until six or seven years of age and whether induced gains at an early level of mental development show appreciable "transfer" to later stages. It is hoped that investigators can keep sufficient track of children in preschool programs to permit a later follow-up which could answer these questions. An initial small sample size mitigates against this possibility, and so proper research programs should be planned accordingly.

"*Expectancy Gain.*" Do disadvantaged children perform relatively poorly on intelligence tests because their teachers have low expectations for their ability? This belief has gained popular currency through an experiment by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). Their notion is that the teacher's expectations for the child's performance act as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Consequently, according to this hypothesis, one way to boost these children's intelligence, and presumably their general scholastic performance as well, is to cause teachers to hold out higher expectations of these children's ability. To test this idea, Rosenthal and Jacobson picked about five children at random from each of the classes in an elementary school and then informed the classroom teachers that, according to test results, the selected children were expected to show unusual intellectual gains in the coming year. Since the "high expectancy" children in each class were actually selected at random, the only way they differed from their classmates was presumably in the minds of their teachers. Group IQ tests administered by the teachers on three occasions during the school year showed a significantly larger gain in the "high expectancy" children than in their classmates. Both groups gained in IQ by amounts that are typically found as a result of direct coaching or of "total push" educational programs. Yet the authors note that "Nothing was done directly for the disadvantaged child at Oak School. There was no crash program to improve his reading ability, no special lesson plans, no extra time for tutoring, no trips to museums or art galleries. There was only the belief that the children bore watching, that they had intellectual competencies that would in due course be revealed" (p. 181). The net total IQ gain (i.e., Expectancy group minus

Control group) for all grades was 3.8 points. Net gain in verbal IQ was 2.1; for Reasoning (nonverbal) IQ the gain was 7.2. Differences were largest in grades 1 and 2 and became negligible in higher grades. The statistical significance of the gains is open to question and permits no clear-cut conclusion. (The estimation of the error variance is at issue; the investigators emphasized the individual pupil's scores as the unit of analysis rather than the means of the E and C groups for each classroom at the unit. The latter procedure, which is regarded as more rigorous by many statisticians, yields statistically negligible results.)

Because of the questionable statistical significance of the results of this study, there may actually be no phenomenon that needs to be explained. Other questionable aspects of the conduct of the experiment make it mandatory that its results be replicated under better conditions before any conclusions from the study be taken seriously or used as a basis for educational policy. For example, the same form of the group-administered IQ test was used for each testing, so that specific practice gains were maximized. The teachers themselves administered the tests, which is a *faux pas* par excellence in research of this type. The dependability of teacher-administered group tests leaves much to be desired. Would any gains beyond those normally expected from general test familiarity have been found if the children's IQs had been accurately measured in the first place by individual tests administered by qualified psychometrists without knowledge of the purpose of the experiment? These are some of the conditions under which such an experiment must be conducted if it is to inspire any confidence in its results.

Conclusions About IQ Gains. The evidence so far suggests the tentative conclusion that the pay-off of preschool and compensatory programs in terms of IQ gains is small. Greater gains are possible in scholastic performance when instructional techniques are intensive and highly focused, as in the Bereiter-Engelmann program. Educators would probably do better to concern themselves with teaching basic skills directly than with attempting to boost overall cognitive development. By the same token, they should deemphasize IQ tests as a means of assessing gains, and use mainly direct tests of the skills the instructional program is intended to inculcate. The techniques for raising intelligence *per se*, in the sense of *g*, probably lie more in the province of the biological sciences than in psychology and education.

Gordon and Wilkerson (1966, pp. 158-159) have made what seems to me perhaps the wisest statement I have encountered regarding the proper aims of intervention programs:

"... the unexpressed purpose of most compensatory programs is to make disadvantaged children as much as possible like the kinds of children with whom the school has been successful, and our standards of educational success is how well they approximate middle-class children in school performance. It is not at all clear that the concept of compensatory education is the one which will most appropriately meet the problems of the disadvantaged. These children are not middle-class children, many of them never will be, and they can never be anything but second-rate as long as they are thought of as potentially middle-class children. ... At best they are different, and an approach which views this difference merely as something to be overcome is probably doomed to failure."

"LEARNING QUOTIENT" VERSUS INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

If many of the children called culturally disadvantaged are indeed "different" in ways that have educational implications, we must

learn as much as possible about the real nature of these differences. To what extent do the differences consist of more than just the well-known differences in IQ and scholastic achievements, and, of course, the obvious differences in cultural advantages in the home?

Evidence is now emerging that there are stable ethnic differences in patterns of ability and that these patterns are invariant across wide socioeconomic differences (Lesser, Fifer & Clark, 1965; Stodolsky & Lesser, 1967). Middle-class and lower-class groups differed about one standard deviation on all four abilities (Verbal, Reasoning, Number, Space) measured by Lesser and his co-workers, but the profile or pattern of scores was distinctively different for Chinese, Jewish, Negro, and Puerto Rican children, regardless of their social class. Such differences in patterns of ability are bound to interact with school instruction. The important question is how many other abilities there are that are not tapped by conventional tests for which there exist individual and group differences that interact with methods of instruction.

Through our research in Berkeley we are beginning to perceive what seems to be a very significant set of relationships with respect to patterns of ability which, unlike those of Lesser et al., seem to interact more with social class than with ethnic background.

In brief, we are finding that a unidimensional concept of intelligence is quite inadequate as a basis for understanding social class differences in ability. For example, the magnitude of test score differences between lower- and middle-class children does not always correspond to the apparent "cultural loading" of the test. Some of the least culturally loaded tests show the largest differences between lower- and middle-class children. At least two dimensions must be postulated to comprehend the SES differences reported in the literature and found in our laboratory (see Jensen, 1968c, 1968d). These two dimensions and the hypothetical location of various test loadings on each dimension are shown in Figure 17. The horizontal axis represents the degree of cultural loading of the test. It is defined by the test's heritability. I have argued elsewhere (Jensen, 1968c) that the heritability index for a test is probably our best objective criterion of its culture-fairness. Just because tests do not stand at one or the other extreme of this continuum does not mean that the concept of culture-fairness is not useful in discussing psychological tests. The vertical axis in Figure 17 represents a continuum ranging from "simple" associative learning to complex cognitive or conceptual learning. I have hypothesized two genotypically distinct basic processes underlying this continuum, labeled Level I (associative ability) and Level II (conceptual ability). Level I involves the neural registration and consolidation of stimulus inputs and the formation of associations. There is relatively little transformation of the input, so there is a high correspondence between the forms of the stimulus input and the form of the response output. Level I ability is tapped mostly by tests such as digit memory, serial rote learning, selective trial-and-error learning with reinforcement (feedback) for correct responses, and in slightly less "pure" form by free recall of visually or verbally presented materials, and paired-associate learning. Level II abilities, on the other hand, involve self-initiated elaboration and transformation of the stimulus input before it eventuates in an overt response. Concept learning and problem solving are good examples. The subject must actively manipulate the input to arrive at the output. This ability is best measured by intelligence tests with a low cultural loading and a high loading on *g*—for example, Raven's Progressive Matrices.

Social class differences in test performance are more strongly associated with the

vertical dimension in Figure 17 than with the horizontal.

ASSOCIATIVE LEARNING ABILITY

Teachers of the disadvantaged have often remarked that many of these children seem much brighter than their IQs would lead one to expect, and that, even though their scholastic performance is usually as poor as that of middle-class children of similar IQ, the disadvantaged children usually appear much brighter in nonscholastic ways than do their middle-class counterparts in IQ. A lower-class child coming into a new class, for example, will learn the names of 20 or 30 children in a few days, will quickly pick up the rules and the know-how of various games on the playground, and so on—a kind of performance that would seem to belie his IQ, which may even be as low as 60. This gives the impression that the test is "unfair" to the disadvantaged child, since middle-class children in this range of IQ will spend a year in a classroom without learning the names of more than a few classmates, and they seem almost as inept on the playground and in social interaction as they are in their academic work.

We have objectified this observation by devising tests which can reveal these differences. The tests measure associative learning ability and show how fast a child can learn something relatively new and unfamiliar, right in the test situation. The child's performance does not depend primarily, as it would in conventional IQ tests, upon what he has already learned at home or elsewhere before he comes to take the test. We simply give him something to learn, under conditions which permit us to measure the rate and thoroughness of the learning. The tasks most frequently used are various forms of auditory digit memory, learning the serial order of a number of familiar objects or pictures of objects, learning to associate pairs of pictures of familiar objects, and free recall of names or objects presented from one to five times in a random order.

Our findings with these tests, which have been presented in greater detail elsewhere (Jensen, 1968a, 1968b, 1968d, 1968e; Jensen, 1968f; Jensen & Rohwer, 1968), seem to me to be of great potential importance to the education of many of the children called disadvantaged. What we are finding, briefly, is this: lower-class children, whether white, Negro, or Mexican-American, perform as well on these direct learning tests as do middle-class children. Lower-class children in the IQ range of about 60 to 80 do markedly better than middle-class children who are in this range of IQ. Above about IQ 100, on the other hand, there is little or no difference between social class groups on the learning tests.

At first we thought we had finally discovered a measure of "culture-fair" testing since we found no significant SES differences on these learning tests. But we can no longer reconcile this interpretation with all the facts now available. Some of the low SES children with low IQs on culturally loaded tests, like the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Tests, do very well on our learning tests, but do not have higher IQs on less culturally loaded tests of *g*, like the Progressive Matrices. It appears that we are dealing here with two kinds of abilities—associative learning ability (Level I) and cognitive or conceptual learning and problem-solving ability (Level II).

One particular test—free recall—shows the distinction quite well, since a slight variation in the test procedure makes the difference between whether it measures Level I or Level II. This is important, because it is sometimes claimed that low SES children do better on our learning tests than on IQ tests because the former are more interesting or more "relevant" to them, and thus make them more highly motivated to perform at their best. This is not a valid interpretation, since when essentially the same task is made

either "associative" or "cognitive," we get differences of about one standard deviation in the mean scores of lower- and middle-class children. For example, 20 unrelated familiar objects (doll, toy car, comb, cup, etc.) are shown to children who are then asked to recall as many objects as they can in any order that may come to mind. The random presentation and recall are repeated five times to obtain a more reliable score. Lower- and middle-class elementary school children perform about the same on this task, although they differ some 15 to 20 points in IQ. This free recall test has a low correlation with IQ and the correlation is lower for the low SES children. But then we can change the recall test so that it gives quite different results.

This is shown in an experiment from our laboratory by Glasman (1968). (In this study SES and race are confounded, since the low SES group were Negro children and the middle SES group were white.) Again, 20 familiar objects are presented, but this time the objects are selected so that they can be classified into one of four categories, *animals, furniture, clothing, or foods*. There are five items in each of the four categories, but all 20 items are presented in a random order on each trial. Under this condition a large social class difference shows up: the low SES children perform only slightly better on the average than they did on the uncategorized objects, while the middle SES children show a great improvement in performance which puts their scores about one standard deviation above the low SES children. Furthermore, there is much greater evidence of "clustering" the items in free recall for the middle SES than for the low SES children. That is, the middle-class children rearrange the input in such a way that the order of output in recall corresponds to the categories to which the objects may be assigned. The low SES children show less clustering in this fashion, although many show rather idiosyncratic pair-wise "clusters" that persist from trial to trial. There is a high correlation between the strength of the clustering tendency and the amount of recall. Also, clustering tendency is strongly related to age. Kindergarteners, for example, show little difference between recall of categorized and uncategorized lists, and at this age SES differences in performance are nil. By fourth or fifth grade, however, the SES differences in clustering tendency are great, with a correspondingly large difference in ability to recall categorized lists.

It is interesting, also, that the recall of categorized lists correlates highly with IQ. In fact, when mental age or IQ is partialled out of the results, there are no significant remaining SES differences in recall. Post-test interviews showed that the recall differences for the two social class groups cannot be attributed to the low SES group's not knowing the category names. The children know the categories but tend not to use them spontaneously in recalling the list.

In general, we find that Level I associative learning tasks correlate very substantially with IQ among middle-class children but have very low correlations with IQ among lower-class children (Jensen, 1968b). The reason for this difference in correlations can be traced back to the form of the scatter diagrams for the middle and low SES groups, which is shown schematically in Figure 18. Since large representative samples of the entire school population have not been studied so far, the exact form of the correlation scatter diagram has not yet been well established, but the schematic portrayal of Figure 18 is what could be most reasonably hypothesized on the basis of several lines of evidence now available. (Data on a representative sample of 5000 children given Level I and Level II tests are now being analyzed to establish the forms of the correlation plots for low and middle SES groups.) The form of the correlation as it

now appears suggests a hierarchical arrangement of mental abilities, such that Level I ability is necessary but not sufficient for Level II. That is, high performance on Level II tasks depends upon better than average ability on Level I, but the reverse does not hold. If this is true, the data can be understood in terms of one additional hypothesis, namely, that Level I ability is distributed about the same in all social class groups, while Level II ability is distributed differently in lower and middle SES groups. The hypothesis is expressed graphically in Figure 19. Heritability studies of Level II tests cause me to believe that Level II processes are not just the result of interaction between Level I learning ability and experientially acquired strategies or learning sets. That learning is necessary for Level II no one doubts, but certain neural structures must also be available for Level II abilities to develop, and these are conceived of as being different from the neural structures underlying Level I. The genetic factors involved in each of these types of ability are presumed to have become differentially distributed in the population as a function of social class, since Level II has been most important for scholastic performance under the traditional methods of instruction.

From evidence on age differences in different tasks on the Level I—Level II continuum (e.g., Jensen & Rohwer, 1965), I have suggested one additional hypothesis concerning the developmental rates of Level I and Level II abilities in lower and middle SES groups, as depicted in Figure 20. Level I abilities are seen as developing rapidly and as having about the same course of development and final level in both lower and middle SES groups. Level II abilities, by contrast, develop slowly at first, attain prominence between four and six years of age, and show an increasing difference between the SES groups with increasing age. This formulation is consistent with the increasing SES differences in mental age on standard IQ tests, which tap mostly Level II ability.

Thus, ordinary IQ tests are not seen as being "unfair" in the sense of yielding inaccurate or invalid measures for the many disadvantaged children who obtain low scores. If they are unfair, it is because they tap only one part of the total spectrum of mental abilities and do not reveal that aspect of mental ability which may be the disadvantaged child's strongest point—ability for associative learning.

Since traditional methods of classroom instruction were evolved in populations having a predominantly middle-class pattern of abilities, they put great emphasis on cognitive learning rather than associative learning. And in the post-Sputnik era, education has seen an increased emphasis on cognitive and conceptual learning, much to the disadvantage of many children whose mode of learning is predominantly associative. Many of the basic skills can be learned by various means, and an educational system that puts inordinate emphasis on only one mode or style of learning will obtain meager results from the children who do not fit this pattern. At present, I believe that the educational system—even as it falteringly attempts to help the disadvantaged—operates in such a way as to maximize the importance of Level II (i.e., intelligence or *g*) as a source of variance in scholastic performance. Too often, if a child does not learn the school subject matter when taught in a way that depends largely on being average or above average on *g*, he does not learn at all, so that we find high school students who have failed to learn basic skills which they could easily have learned many years earlier by means that do not depend much on *g*. It may well be true that many children today are confronted in our schools with an educational philosophy and methodology which were mainly shaped in the past, en-

tirely without any roots in these children's genetic and cultural heritage. The educational system was never allowed to evolve in such a way as to maximize the actual potential for learning that is latent in these children's patterns of abilities. If a child cannot show that he "understands" the meaning of $1+1=2$ in some abstract, verbal, cognitive sense, he is, in effect, not allowed to go on to learn $2+2=4$. I am reasonably convinced that all the basic scholastic skills can be learned by children with normal Level I learning ability, provided the instructional techniques do not make g (i.e., Level II) the *sine qua non* of being able to learn. Educational researchers must discover and devise teaching methods that capitalize on existing abilities for the acquisition of those basic skills which students will need in order to get good jobs when they leave school. I believe there will be greater rewards for all concerned if we further explore different types of abilities and modes of learning, and seek to discover how these various abilities can serve the aims of education. This seems more promising than acting as though only one pattern of abilities, emphasizing g , can succeed educationally, and therefore trying to inculcate this one ability pattern in all children.

If the theories I have briefly outlined here become fully substantiated, the next step will be to develop the techniques by which school learning can be most effectively achieved in accordance with different patterns of ability. By all means, schools must discover g wherever it exists and see to it that its educational correlates are fully encouraged and cultivated. There can be little doubt that certain educational and occupational attainments depend more upon g than upon any other single ability. But schools must also be able to find ways of utilizing other strengths in children whose major strength is not of the cognitive variety. One of the great and relatively untapped reservoirs of mental ability in the disadvantaged, it appears from our research, is the basic ability to learn. We can do more to marshal this strength for educational purposes.

If diversity of mental abilities, as of most other human characteristics, is a basic fact of nature, as the evidence indicates, and if the ideal of universal education is to be successfully pursued, it seems a reasonable conclusion that schools and society must provide a range and diversity of educational methods, programs, and goals, and of occupational opportunities, just as wide as the range of human abilities. Accordingly, the ideal of equality of educational opportunity should not be interpreted as uniformity of facilities, instructional techniques, and educational aims for all children. Diversity rather than uniformity of approaches and aims would seem to be the key to making education rewarding for children of different patterns of ability. The reality of individual differences thus need not mean educational rewards for some children and frustration and defeat for others.

REFERENCES

- Altus, W. D. Birth order and its sequelae. *Science*, 1966, 151, 44-59.
- Anastasi, A. Intelligence and family size. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1956, 53, 187-209.
- Bajema, C. J. Estimation of the direction and intensity of natural selection in relation to human intelligence by means of the intrinsic rate of natural increase. *Eugen. Quart.*, 1963, 10, 175-187.
- Bajema, C. J. Relation of fertility to educational attainment in a Kalamazoo public school population: A follow-up study. *Eugen. Quart.*, 1966, 13, 306-315.
- Bayley, N. Research in child development: A longitudinal perspective. *Merrill-Palmer Quart. Behav. Developm.*, 1965, 11, 183-208. (b)
- Bayley, N. Comparisons of mental and motor test scores for ages 1-15 months by sex, birth order, race, geographical location, and education of parents. *Child Developm.*, 1965, 36, 379-411. (a)
- Bayley, N. Learning in adulthood: The role of intelligence. In H. J. Klausmeier & C. W. Harris (Eds.), *Analyses of concept learning*. New York: Academic Press, 1966. Pp. 117-138.
- Bayley, N. Behavioral correlates of mental growth: Birth to thirty-six years. *Amer. Psychol.*, 1968, 23, 1-17.
- Bereiter, C., & Englemann, S. *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Bereiter, C., & Englemann, S. An academically oriented preschool for disadvantaged children: Results from the initial experimental group. In D. W. Brison & J. Hill (Eds.), *Psychology and early childhood education*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968. No. 4. Pp. 17-36.
- Bilodeau, E. A. (Ed.). *Acquisition of skill*. New York: Academic Press, 1966.
- Brison, D. W. Can and should learning be accelerated? In D. W. Brison (Ed.), *Accelerated learning and fostering creativity*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968. Pp. 5-9.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. The psychological costs of quality and equality in education. *Child Developm.*, 1967, 38, 909-925.
- Buck, C. Discussion of "Culturally related reproductive factors in mental retardation" by Graves et al. Paper read at Conference on Sociocultural Aspects of Mental Retardation, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., June, 1968.
- Burks, B. S. The relative influence of nature and nurture upon mental development: A comparative study of foster parent-foster child resemblance and true parent-true child resemblance. *Yearb. Nat. Soc. Stud. Educ.*, 1928, 27 (I), 219-316.
- Burt, C. The evidence for the concept of intelligence. *Brit. J. educ. Psychol.*, 1965, 25, 158-177.
- Burt, C. The distribution of intelligence. *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 1957, 48, 161-175.
- Burt, C. The inheritance of mental ability. *Amer. Psychol.*, 1958, 13, 1-15.
- Burt, C. Class difference in general intelligence: III. *Brit. J. Stat. Psychol.*, 1959, 12, 15-33.
- Burt, C. Intelligence and social mobility. *Brit. J. Stat. Psychol.*, 1961, 14, 3-24.
- Burt, C. Is intelligence distributed normally? *Brit. J. Stat. Psychol.*, 1963, 16, 175-190.
- Burt, C. The genetic determination of differences in intelligence: A study of monozygotic twins reared together and apart. *Brit. J. Psychol.*, 1966, 57, 137-153.
- Burt, C. Mental capacity and its critics. *Bull. Brit. Psychol. Soc.*, 1968, 21, 11-18.
- Burt, C., & Howard, M. The multifactorial theory of inheritance and its application to intelligence. *Brit. J. Stat. Psychol.*, 1956, 9, 95-131.
- Burt, C., & Howard, M. The relative influence of heredity and environment on assessments of intelligence. *Brit. J. Stat. Psychol.*, 1957, 10, 99-104.
- Bloom, B. S. *Stability and change in human characteristics*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Carter, C. O. Differential fertility by intelligence. In J. E. Meade & A. S. Parkes (Eds.), *Genetic and environmental factors in human ability*. New York: Plenum Press, 1966. Pp. 185-200.
- Cattell, R. B. The multiple abstract variance analysis equations and solutions: For nature-nurture research on continuous variables. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1960, 67, 353-372.
- Cattell, R. B. Theory of fluid and crystallized intelligence: A critical experiment. *J. educ. Psychol.*, 1963, 54, 1-22.
- Churchill, J. A., Neff, J. W., & Caldwell, D. F. Birth weight and intelligence. *Obstetrics and gynecology*, 1968, 28, 425-429.
- Clark, K. B. Educational stimulation of racially disadvantaged children. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), *Education in depressed areas*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia Univ., 1963. Pp. 142-162.
- Coleman, J. S., et al. *Equality of educational opportunity*. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, 1966.
- Cooper, R., & Zubeck, J. Effects of enriched and restricted early environments on the learning ability of bright and dull rats. *Canad. J. Psychol.*, 1958, 12, 159-164.
- Cravioto, J. Malnutrition and behavioral development in the preschool child. *Preschool child malnutrition*. National Health Science Public., 1966, No. 1282.
- Cravioto, J., De Licardie, E. R., & Birch, H. G. Nutrition, growth, and neurointegrative development: An experimental and ecologic study. *Pediatrics*, 1966, 38, 319-372.
- Davis, K. Final note on a case of extreme isolation. *Amer. J. Sociol.*, 1947, 57, 432-457.
- Deutsch, M., Katz, I., & Jensen, A. R. (Eds.). *Social class, race, and psychological development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Dobzhansky, T. Genetic differences between people cannot be ignored. *Scientific Res.*, 1963, 3, 32-33. (a)
- Dobzhansky, T. On genetics, sociology, and politics. *Perspect. Biol. Med.*, 1968, 11, 544-554. (b)
- Dreger, R. M., & Miller, K. S. Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1960, 57, 361-402.
- Dreger, R. M., & Miller, K. S. Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States: 1959-1965. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1968 (Monogr. Suppl. 70, No. 3, Part 2).
- Duncan, O. D. Is the intelligence of the general population declining? *Amer. sociol. Rev.*, 1952, 17, 401-407.
- Duncan, O. D., Featherman, D. L., & Duncan, B. Socioeconomic background and occupational achievement: Extensions of a basic model. Final Reports, Project No. 5-0074 (EO-191) U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, May, 1968.
- Durham Education Improvement Program, 1966-1967. (a)
- Durham Education Improvement Program, Research, 1966-1967. (b)
- Dustman, R. E., & Beck, E. C. The visually evoked potential in twins. *Electroenceph. clin. Neurophysiol.*, 1965, 19, 570-575.
- Eckland, B. K. Genetics and sociology: A reconsideration. *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, 1967, 32, 173-194.
- Eells, K., et al. *Intelligence and cultural differences*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1951.
- Erlenmeyer-Kimling, L., & Jarvik, L. F. Genetics and intelligence: a review. *Science*, 1963, 142, 1477-1479.
- Falconer, D. S. *An introduction to quantitative genetics*. New York: Ronald Press, 1960.
- Freeman, R. A. Schools and the elusive "average children" concept. *Wall Street Journal*, July 8, 1968, p. 12.
- Fuller, J. L., & Thompson, W. R. *Behavior genetics*. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Gates, A. I., & Taylor, G. A. An experimental study of the nature of improvement resulting from practice in mental function. *J. Educ. Psychol.*, 1925, 16, 583-593.
- Geber, M. The psycho-motor development of African children in the first year, and the influence of maternal behavior. *J. soc. Psychol.*, 1958, 47, 185-195.
- Geber, M., & Dean, R. F. A. The state of development of newborn African children. *Lancet*, 1957, 1216-1219.
- Ghiselli, E. E. The measurement of occupational aptitude. *Univ. of California Publ. in Psychol.*, Vol. 8, No. 2. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press, 1955.
- Glasman, L. D. A social-class comparison of conceptual processes in children's free re-

- call. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univ. of California, 1968.
- Goertzel, V., & Goertzel, M. G. *Cradles of eminence*. London: Constable, 1962.
- Goodenough, F. L. New evidence on environmental influence on intelligence. *Yearb. Nat. Soc. Stud. Educ.*, 1940, 39, Part I, 307-365.
- Gordon, E. W., & Wilkerson, D. A. *Compensatory education for the disadvantaged*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.
- Gottesman, I. Genetic aspects of intelligent behavior. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), *Handbook of mental deficiency*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963. Pp. 253-296.
- Gottesman, I. Biogenetics of race and class. In M. Deutsch, I. Katz, & A. R. Jensen (Eds.), *Social class, race, and psychological development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968. Pp. 11-51.
- Graves, W. L., Freeman, M. G., & Thompson, J. D. Culturally related reproductive factors in mental retardation. Paper read at Conference on Sociocultural Aspects of Mental Retardation, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., June, 1968.
- Guliford, J. P. *The nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Hardy, J. B. Perinatal factors and intelligence. In S. F. Osler & R. E. Cooke (Eds.), *The biosocial basis of mental retardation*. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965. Pp. 35-60.
- Harlow, H. F., & Griffin, G. Induced mental and social deficits in Rhesus monkeys. In S. F. Osler & R. E. Cooke (Eds.), *The biosocial basis of mental retardation*. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965. Pp. 87-106.
- Harlow, H. F., & Harlow, M. K. The mind of man. In *Yearbook of science and technology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Harrell, R. F., Woodyard, E., & Gates, A. I. *The effects of mother's diets on the intelligence of offspring*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1955.
- Heber, R. Research on education and habilitation of the mentally retarded. Paper read at Conference on Sociocultural Aspects of Mental Retardation, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., June, 1968.
- Heber, R., Dever, R., & Conry, J. The influence of environmental and genetic variables on intellectual development. In H. J. Prehm, L. A. Hamerlynck, & J. E. Crosson (Eds.), *Behavioral Research in mental retardation*. Eugene, Oregon: Univ. of Oregon Press, 1968. Pp. 1-23.
- Heyns, O. S. *Abdominal decompression*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand Univ. Press, 1963.
- Higgins, J., Reed, S., & Reed, E. Intelligence and family size: A paradox resolved. *Eugen. Quart.*, 1962, 9, 84-90.
- Hill, A. C., & Jaffee, F. S. Negro fertility and family size preferences. In T. Parsons & K. B. Clark (Eds.), *The Negro American*. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 134-159.
- Hodges, W. L., & Spicker, H. H. The effects of preschool experiences on culturally deprived children. In W. W. Hartup & N. L. Smothergill (Eds.), *The young child: Reviews of research*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1967. Pp. 262-289.
- Honzik, M. P. Developmental studies of parent-child resemblance in intelligence. *Child Developm.*, 1957, 28, 215-228.
- Honzik, M. P. The mental and motor test performances of infants diagnosed or suspected of brain injury. Final Rep., Contract SA 43 PH 2426. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Health, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, Collaborative Research, May, 1962.
- Hunt, J. McV. *Intelligence and experience*. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.
- Huntley, R. M. C. Heritability of intelligence. In J. E. Meade & A. S. Parker (Eds.), *Genetic and environmental factors in human ability*. New York: Plenum Press, 1966. Pp. 201-218.
- Husén, T. Abilities of twins. *Scand. J. Psychol.*, 1960, 1, 125-135.
- Jensen, A. R. Estimation of the limits of heritability of traits by comparison of monozygotic and dizygotic twins. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 1967, 58, 149-157. (a)
- Jensen, A. R. Varieties of individual differences in learning. In Gagné, R. M. (Ed.), *Learning and individual differences*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1967. (b)
- Jensen, A. R. Social class, race, and genetics: Implications for education. *Amer. Educ. Res. J.*, 1968, 5, 1-42. (a)
- Jensen, A. R. Patterns of mental ability and socioeconomic status. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 1968, 60, 1330-1337. (b)
- Jensen, A. R. Another look at culture-fair tests. In *Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems, Proceedings for 1968, "Measurement for Educational Planning"*. Berkeley, Calif.: Educational Testing Service, Western Office, 1968. Pp. 50-104. (c)
- Jensen, A. R. Intelligence, learning ability, and socioeconomic status. *J. spec. Educ.*, 1968. (d)
- Jensen, A. R. Social class and verbal learning. In M. Deutsch, I. Katz, & A. R. Jensen (Eds.), *Social class, race, and psychological development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968. Pp. 115-174. (e)
- Jensen, A. R. The culturally disadvantaged and the heredity-environment uncertainty. In J. Helmuth (Ed.), *The culturally disadvantaged child*. Vol. 2. Seattle, Wash.: Special Child Publications, 1968. (f)
- Jensen, A. R., & Rohwer, W. D., Jr. Syntactical mediation of serial and paired-associate learning as a function of age. *Child Developm.*, 1965, 36, 601-608.
- Jensen, A. R., & Rohwer, W. D., Jr. Mental retardation, mental age, and learning rate. *J. educ. Psychol.*, 1968.
- Jepsen, N. P., & Bredmose, G. V. Investigations into the age of mentally deficient women at their first delivery. *Acta Psychiat. Scand.*, 1956 (Monogr. Suppl. 108), Pp. 203-210.
- Jones, H. E. The environment and mental development. In L. Carmichael (Ed.), *Manual of child psychology*. (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley, 1954. Pp. 631-696.
- Karnes, M. B. A research program to determine the effects of various preschool intervention programs on the development of disadvantaged children and the strategic age for such intervention. Paper read at Amer. Educ. Res. Ass., Chicago, Feb., 1968.
- Kempthorne, O. *An introduction to genetic statistics*. New York: Wiley, 1957.
- Kennedy, W. A., Van De Relt, V., & White, J. C., Jr. A normative sample of intelligence and achievement of Negro elementary school children in the Southeastern United States. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm.*, 1963, 28, No. 6.
- Kushlick, A. Assessing the size of the problem of subnormality. In J. E. Meade & A. S. Parkes (Eds.), *Genetic and environmental factors in human ability*. New York: Plenum Press, 1966. Pp. 121-147.
- Kuttner, R. E. *Biochemical anthropology*. In R. E. Kuttner (Ed.), *Race and modern science*. New York: Social Science Press, 1967. Pp. 197-222.
- Kuttner, R. E. Letters to and from the editor. *Perspect. Biol. Med.*, 1968, 11, 707-709.
- Lawrence, E. M. An investigation into the relation between intelligence and inheritance. *Brit. J. Psychol. Monogr. Suppl.*, 1931, 16, No. 5.
- Leahy, A. M. Nature-nurture and intelligence. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.*, 1935, 17, 241-305.
- Lesser, G. S., Fifer, G., & Clark, D. H. Mental abilities of children from different social-class and cultural groups. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Developm.*, 1965, 30, (4).
- Lindzey, G. Some remarks concerning incest, the incest taboo, and psychoanalytic theory. *Amer. Psychol.*, 1967, 22, 1051-1059.
- Loehlin, J. C. Psychological genetics, from the study of human behavior. In R. B. Cattell (Ed.), *Handbook of modern personality theory*. New York: Aldine, in press.
- Loevinger, J. On the proportional contributions of differences in nature and nurture to differences in intelligence. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1943, 40, 725-756.
- Medical World News*. Using speed of brain waves to test IQ. 1968, 9, 26.
- Mitra, S. Income, socioeconomic status, and fertility in the United States. *Eugen. Quart.*, 1966, 13, 223-230.
- Money, J. Two cytogenetic syndromes: Psychologic comparisons 1. Intelligence and specific-factor quotients. *J. psychiat. Res.*, 1964, 2, 223-231.
- Moynihan, D. P. *The Negro family*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research, United States Department of Labor, 1965.
- Moynihan, D. P. Employment, income, and the ordeal of the Negro family. In T. Parsons & K. B. Clark (Eds.), *The Negro American*. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 134-159.
- [Page 122 of manuscript was not included in printed copy submitted.]
- Tuddenham, R. D. Psychometricizing Piaget's méthode clinique. Paper read at Amer. Educ. Res. Ass., Chicago, February, 1968.
- Tyler, L. E. *The psychology of human differences*. (3rd ed.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial isolation in the public schools*. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- U.S. News and World Report. Mental tests for 10 million Americans—what they show. October 17, 1966. Pp. 78-80.
- Vandenberg, S. G. Contributions of twin research to psychology. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1966, 66, 327-352.
- Vandenberg, S. G. Hereditary factors in psychological variables in man, with a special emphasis on cognition. In J. S. Spuhler (Ed.), *Genetic diversity and human behavior*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967. Pp. 99-133.
- Vandenberg, S. G. The nature and nurture of intelligence. In D. C. Glass (Ed.), *Genetics*. New York: The Rockefeller University Press and Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
- Vernon, P. E. Symposium on the effects of coaching and practice in intelligence tests. *Brit. J. educ. Psychol.*, 1954, 24, 5-8.
- Vernon, P. E. Environmental handicaps and intellectual development: Part II and Part III. *Brit. J. educ. Psychol.*, 1965, 35, 1-22.
- Walters, C. E. Comparative development of Negro and white infants. *J. genet. Psychol.*, 1967, 110, 243-251.
- Wheeler, L. R. A comparative study of the intelligence of East Tennessee mountain children. *J. educ. Psychol.*, 1942, 33, 321-334.
- White, S. H. Evidence for a hierarchical arrangement of learning processes. In L. P. Lipsitt & C. C. Spiker (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behavior*. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965. Pp. 187-220.
- Willerman, L., & Churchill, J. A. Intelligence and birth weight in identical twins. *Child Developm.*, 1967, 38, 623-629.
- Wilson, A. B. Educational consequences of segregation in a California community. In *Racial isolation in the public schools*, Appendices, Vol. 2 of a report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Wiseman, S. *Education and environment*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1964.
- Wiseman, S. Environmental and innate factors and educational attainment. In J. E. Meade & A. S. Parkes (Eds.), *Genetic and environmental factors in human ability*. New York: Plenum Press, 1966. Pp. 64-80.

Wright, S. Statistical methods in biology. *J. Amer. stat. Ass.*, 1931, 26, 155-163.

Young, M., & Gibson, J. B. Social mobility and fertility. In J. E. Meade & A. S. Parkes (Eds.), *Biological aspects of social problems*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

Zazzo, R. *Les jumeaux, le couple et la personne*. 2 vols., Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.

Zigler, E. Familial mental retardation: a continuing dilemma. *Science*, 1967, 155, 292-298.

Zigler, E. The nature-nurture issue reconsidered: A discussion of Uzgirls' paper. Paper read at Conference on Sociocultural Aspects of Mental Retardation, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., June, 1968.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Is there pending on the Speaker's desk a communication from the Postmaster General?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will respond by saying that there is a communication from the President on the postal service system. It has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when was the referral made?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the referral was made after it was received this afternoon, as are all other communications of a similar nature.

SUSPENSION OF DRAFT CALLS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should suspend the monthly draft calls for a period of 180 days, or 6 months. I have been joined in cosponsoring the resolution by 8 other Members of the House: Congressman BROWN, of California, Congressman BURTON, of California, Congressman BUTTON, of New York, Congressman DIGGS, of Michigan, Congressman EDWARDS, of California, Congressman HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey, Congressman KOCH, of New York, and Congressman POWELL, of New York.

I believe that Congress must express its conviction that no more young men should be drafted to fight the tragic and still undeclared war in Vietnam.

As I have said on numerous occasions, most recently in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill which was before the House last week, Congress has always possessed the power to assert its influence on the conduct of the war. By voting against further appropriations for the Vietnam war, Congress could force the administration to de-escalate our military involvement in Southeast Asia and hasten a negotiated settlement of that conflict.

Similarly, by expressing the belief that

no more young men should be drafted to fight in a war for which Congress has never passed a formal declaration of war, the House could end the infusion of still more men into Vietnam and, moreover, make clear its determination that the administration must begin to withdraw American troops from Southeast Asia.

President Nixon has said that he seeks an agreement with North Vietnam for mutual withdrawal of troops over a 12-month period. But the successful negotiation of such an agreement—if it is possible at all—will take time, perhaps as long as a year. In the meantime, thousands of young men will continue to be drafted to fight in Vietnam, and many will be wounded or killed.

During the calendar year 1968, 298,010 men were drafted into the armed services, 32.3 percent—or almost one in three—of these draftees were sent to Vietnam. The Selective Service System has estimated that about 202,400 additional young men will be drafted during the first 7 months of the current year.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks figures showing the monthly draft calls for calendar year 1968 and the first 7 months of calendar year 1969.

Draft calls for calendar years 1968 and 1969

1968:	
January	34,000
February	23,300
March	41,000
April	48,000
May	45,900
June	20,000
July	15,000
August	18,300
September	12,002
October	13,008
November	10,000
December	17,500
Total	298,010

1969:	
January	26,800
February	33,700
March	33,100
April	33,000
May*	27,600
June*	25,900
July*	22,300
Total for first 7 months	202,400

*Estimated.

Despite the rejection of the policies of the Johnson administration in the primary and national elections of last year, the killing and destruction continues to take a heavy toll in Vietnam. During the 12 months that the Paris peace talks have already dragged on, over 12,000 American servicemen have died, and thousands more have been wounded. Moreover, the Nixon administration has yet to turn away from the military strategy of the Johnson administration.

In addition to the mounting casualties imposed by our continued presence in Vietnam, the war continues to pose a cruel dilemma to thousands of draft-eligible young men who face induction into the Armed Forces.

Many of these young men—including most recently over 250 student body presidents and newspaper editors from some of our finest universities and colleges—have indicated that, so long as the war in Vietnam continues, they intend to

choose jail, if necessary, rather than serve in the Armed Forces.

A few months ago during the presidential campaign, President Nixon said that he favored substituting a volunteer army for the draft. Yet his only legislative proposal thus far has been to recommend a lottery system for selecting draftees. While a lottery would no doubt aid the millions of draft eligible young men in determining if and when they must serve in the Armed Forces, it would retain the basic feature of the present system—namely, conscription.

While substantive alternatives to the present draft, including both a volunteer army and a system of alternative service which would allow a conscriptee to choose service in any of several domestic programs in place of military service have been suggested, it is unlikely that any of these proposals will be acted upon until the Vietnam war is over unless Congress takes the initiative.

An immediate 6-month suspension of the draft calls by the President would provide an opportunity for Congress to assert its proper role in formulating foreign policy, assess alternatives to the present draft system, and evaluate the progress made by the Nixon administration in negotiating an end to the conflict. It would additionally make clear the determination of Congress to withdraw American troops from Vietnam, thereby helping also to persuade the North Vietnamese that the administration does indeed seek a negotiated settlement.

Well over a year ago, in the course of the New Hampshire primary, presidential candidate Richard Nixon said:

The next President of the United States must end the war in Vietnam.

Today, President Nixon has yet to end the war in Vietnam. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that the present policy represents any change from the basic strategy which was pursued for so many years at such an incredibly heavy price by his predecessor.

The killing continues and the drafting of more young men goes on. If the administration is not prepared to take the steps necessary to extricate us from the quagmire in Southeast Asia, then I believe that Congress must assert its role—and I have outlined on a number of occasions how that can best be accomplished—to bring about a change in policy. Our first action ought to be to tell the President of the United States, as we propose today in our resolution, that no more young men should be drafted to fight in a war in which so many of them do not believe and find they cannot support. I urge that this resolution be brought to the House for prompt consideration.

HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER—23 YEARS OF FEDERAL CAREER SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the Government's finest servants is leaving. The loss of Administrator

William J. Driver of the Veterans' Administration is more than the loss of a dedicated, unusually competent career public servant. We are losing a man who not only is the most competent administrator in Government, but one who knows, understands, and works most effectively with Congress on both sides of the aisle.

I cannot feel too much sympathy for Administrator Driver, for I understand he has job offers that make his Government pay look rather niggardly. I am surprised that one of his ability, competence, good sense, and understanding has not left for greener pastures years ago. But it is a mark of Bill Driver's character that he chose to remain, at financial sacrifice, to serve his Government and a constituency of veterans numbering in the millions.

Never has one man been so widely respected by Congressmen of both parties and by the veterans' groups as has Bill Driver. He has served with a single goal—to serve the veterans of this country as intended by the laws passed by the two bodies here. His success is marked by any measure one chooses to apply—response to veterans' needs, efficiency, compliance with congressional intent and results.

Bill Driver is the first career official to administer the affairs of America's veterans and their families. In the superb performance of his assignment, he has brought great and everlasting credit to the career service.

When he was appointed Administrator in December 1964 by President Johnson, the President declared:

I hope the recognition of Mr. Driver for his effective and dedicated service will serve as an example to others in government service.

He has more than fulfilled those expectations.

Mr. Driver's service at the Veterans' Administration stretches back over almost 23 years, with time out only to return to military service in the Korean conflict.

Many professional honors have come to this exceptional man. He was winner in 1964 of the Coveted Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League and holds the Exceptional Service Medal and Meritorious Service Medal, the two highest awards granted by the Veterans' Administration. In 1965, he was the winner of the Management Achievement Award from the Society for Advancement of Management. He has received numerous awards for achievements and administration from Veterans' Service Organizations.

Mr. Driver was chosen by the President to serve on many important committees, including the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the President's Committee on Health Manpower, the Joint United States-Philippine Commission, the President's Committee on Consumer Affairs, the National Housing Council and several home financing committees.

Bill Driver holds degrees in business administration and public administration and a law degree which he earned in evening class attendance under the World War II GI bill. He was an outstanding military officer, winning the Le-

gion of Merit, Bronze Star, Order of the British Empire, and Croix de Guerre.

His record of effective administration at the Veterans' Administration begins with his appointment in 1946. He was successively promoted to Director of Compensation and Pension Service, head of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, and then to Deputy Administrator.

We all know of the magnitude of VA's programs. Yet, under Bill Driver, this tremendously complex, immense operation embracing over 170,000 employees and expenditures of over \$7 billion was run with astonishing success. He is responsible for some of the most effective innovations in administration and medical research. He initiated and made work efficiently and effectively a huge insurance program. He improved medical and nursing care in the Nation's largest medical program.

The esteem and high respect in which Mr. Driver's coworkers held him, I believe, is a true mark of his ability to bring out the best in those he worked with. If the Government had to pay overtime for the thousands and thousands of hours put in by Bill Driver and those dedicated to him and the VA, a supplemental appropriation would be necessary.

I salute Bill Driver not only as the finest Administrator of Veterans' Affairs ever to serve in the post, not only as a man with unparalleled congressional understanding, not only as a believer in causes of equality and human rights, but as a respected friend of many years.

This Congress, the Veterans' Administration—indeed, the entire Federal Government, and the millions served by the VA are going to sorely miss Bill Driver.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the VA, as an independent agency, was 16 years old when Bill Driver joined it in 1946. It had a record of 35 years of service to America's veterans when he became its Administrator in 1965. Yet it can be said that in the past 4½ years, under Bill Driver's leadership, the VA has accomplished more "firsts" than in its entire previous existence.

For example, since January 1967 VA contact representatives in Vietnam have been providing first-time-in-history battlefield briefing on veteran benefits to our servicemen there. To date, nearly three-quarters of a million troops have been briefed on their veteran benefits.

In November 1966, VA representatives began counseling disabled servicemen in U.S. military hospitals on their veteran benefits. Under this program, begun in Bill Driver's tenure as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, more than 160,000 interviews have been conducted, and more than 100,000 applications for benefits filed by servicemen in the 184 U.S. military hospitals served by VA.

Servicemen at 304 separation centers throughout the United States are also receiving veteran benefit briefing.

I could go on citing the "firsts" achieved by VA since William J. Driver became Administrator. The establishment of 21 U.S. veterans assistance centers throughout the country. VA's Outreach program to contact returning Vietnam era veterans, particularly the

disadvantaged, to encourage them to further their education and assist them in finding jobs.

However, all of these "firsts" simply confirm a fact all of us who are privileged to know William J. Driver have long recognized.

The retiring Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is a man of compassion, concern, and can-do when it comes to helping America's veterans.

We will miss him. But we wish him, his wife and family nothing but continued health, happiness, and success in the years ahead.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Bill Driver was appointed Administrator of Veterans' Affairs by President Johnson in late 1964. Undoubtedly, the President had men like Bill Driver in mind when he said in a message to Congress in 1966:

Among the many blessings which Americans can count is a corps of Federal civil servants that is unequaled anywhere in the world. Honest, intelligent, efficient, and—above all—dedicated, these men and women represent a national resource and a national asset.

Bill Driver's appointment was widely applauded at the time. A veteran of two wars and the first career official to administer the affairs of America's ex-servicemen and women, he brought to the office a demonstrated record of achievement and ability over a period of 16 years in the VA.

The needs of the Nation's veterans and their families were changing. Servicemen returning from Vietnam at a rapid pace were becoming new veterans with new needs. Veterans of other wars were growing older and their economic requirements were different. The GI home loan program needed adjusting to meet current market prices. It was the time to re-evaluate the entire structure of veterans' benefits.

The President and the Congress responded to the challenge and set a landmark in veterans' legislation. New laws were passed to update benefits. The additional demands placed on the Veterans' Administration required capable leadership. Bill Driver put himself to the job. And I believe Members and veterans alike agree generally that he has done an excellent job.

My best wishes go with Bill and Mrs. Driver for health, happiness, and prosperity.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to William J. Driver who has resigned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. For almost 4½ years Bill Driver has served as head of the Veterans' Administration. He came to that office with eminent preparation and his outstanding performance as the Administrator can be attributed to his intimate knowledge of the agency and his devotion to veterans, to our country, and to our Government.

Each administration faces the challenge of attracting qualified people to serve in top positions. I submit that we should look more often to employees in the Federal career service. Bill Driver's career is a case in point.

William J. Driver graduated cum laude from Niagara University in 1941

with a degree in business administration. From 1942 to 1946 he served as a commissioned officer with Headquarters, Adjutant General, European Theater of Operations.

He joined the Veterans' Administration in Washington in February 1946 as special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Service. While progressing through positions, each with increasing degrees of responsibility, he attended night classes at the law school of the George Washington University under the GI bill until he earned an LL.B. degree. Later, he received a master's degree in public administration from that university.

During the Korean conflict he was recalled to active duty, serving as a lieutenant colonel with the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. His military decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Order of the British Empire, and the Croix de Guerre.

When his second tour of duty was completed Mr. Driver returned to the VA. He was named Director of the huge Compensation and Pension Service in 1956, and in January 1958 became head of the entire Department of Veterans' Benefits. In February 1961, he was named to the No. 2 post in the VA as Deputy Administrator. He was appointed Administrator of Veterans' Affairs by President Johnson on December 26, 1964.

Many awards attest to Bill Driver's ability. In 1964 he received the coveted Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League. He holds the Exceptional Service Medal and the Meritorious Service Medal, the two highest awards granted by the Veterans' Administration. In 1965 the Society for the Advancement of Management named him the winner of its Management Achievement Award for significant contributions toward the advancement of management in government. In 1967, he received AM-VETS highest award, the Silver Helmet, for "outstanding and effective administration of the greatest rehabilitation accomplished in the history of mankind."

He was chosen by the President to serve on several important committees including the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the President's Committee on Health Manpower, the Joint United States-Philippine Commission, the President's Committee on Consumer Affairs, and the National Housing Council.

He is a member of the Advisory Committee on Education and Scholarships of the American Legion.

In the haste of business we so often take our public servants for granted. I cannot let this happen to Bill Driver who has served all of us faithfully and well.

I trust that Bill and his lovely wife, Marian, will enjoy their new endeavors. I hope that they will fondly remember the fine relationship the Administrator had with so many Members of Congress and be warmed by our good wishes that go with them.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad event that William J. Driver, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has resigned.

Surely there can be no doubt of Mr. Driver's outstanding executive ability. Since joining the VA more than 23 years ago, he has climbed the ladder from a comparatively low rung to the highest position.

He began as the special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Service in February 1946 and was named to the top post in December 1964.

At one point he was director of VA's huge Compensation and Pension Service which today dispenses about \$4.6 billion annually. Later he headed VA's entire Department of Veterans' Benefits which included the familiar GI education bill, the loan program, which assisted in the building of one out of every five American homes after World War II, and one of the largest life insurance operations in the world.

When he became the No. 2 man in the VA in February 1961, and later as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, his responsibility was expanded to include the largest medical program in the free world, which now includes a network of 166 hospitals.

The VA overall, judged by the size of the budget or by the number of employees, is the third largest agency in the entire U.S. Government.

Surely a career civil servant who can start at a modest post and work his way to the top of such a large and complex operation, has already proved he has what it takes.

As a Member of Congress, I wish Mr. Driver well in whatever he selects in the days and years ahead to further his already brilliant career.

Mr. Driver, in my opinion, was the most capable Administrator in the Federal service. I say this with no intention of exaggeration. I regret that his career was turned into a political football but I am sure that those who took part in the harassment have lost as much as those of us who defended him. Both sides are the losers equally because we have lost the services of this good man.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, there is no better example of cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of our Government than that set in the administration of veterans' affairs during the past 3 years.

This Nation's 26 million veterans have been fortunate to have had a career civil servant, William J. Driver, at the head of the Veterans' Administration. The Congress and the Nation as a whole have shared in that good fortune.

Bill Driver knows the needs of veterans from the standpoint of his own experience as a veteran of two wars. He knows the science of administering these benefits from the lessons learned during the 19 years he spent in VA before he became its Administrator. As an intelligent student of government who completed two of his three academic degrees after entering Government service, he appreciates the significance of veteran's programs in the total social and economic framework of this country.

All of these qualifications have allowed him to work closely with the Congress

in developing and administering programs that are deserved by our veterans and constructive to the total national interest.

As he leaves Government service after 23 years, I commend his record to all those who aspire to high civil service positions and to those who seek merely to earn the satisfaction of having served their country well. His departure is, I hope, but a temporary setback in the promotion of inservice career employees to the highest positions of responsibility in the U.S. Government.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman speaks for his constituents and there is one voice back in Texas that just must be heard today as we pay tribute to William J. Driver, the retiring Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

In 1964 President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Mr. Driver to VA's highest position. The President did not know Bill Driver personally but in his wisdom he felt a Federal career employee would be best for the job. Mr. Driver was then serving as VA's Deputy Administrator. The President studied his outstanding record, he was also aware of the respect veterans' organizations held for him. The qualifications were there and so the President chose this fine career official to head the very large Veterans' Administration. He could not have made a better choice.

President Johnson's deep concern for America's veterans is a matter of record and his legislative program in this field is unsurpassed. He was very proud of the accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration under the leadership of Bill Driver. He often spoke, publicly and privately, of the dedication the Administrator brought to his duties. I believe he would like to have his words reiterated on this occasion.

When President Johnson signed H.R. 12555 on March 28, 1968, he said:

I want to pay public tribute to a career man whom I did not know when I named him to one of the most important posts in Government. There is not a Cabinet officer who handles much more money—other than perhaps HEW and Defense. There is not a more efficient administrator in the Government and not a finer public servant. I do not know what party he belongs to. I don't even know what State he comes from. All I know is that he does a great job for our country. Mr. William Driver.

At another bill-signing ceremony on October 23, 1968, the President said:

Particularly, I want to recognize the services and the wisdom demonstrated by one of our career men, the man that all the veterans' organizations and the men of both parties recommended to me as the Veterans Administrator, Mr. Bill Driver. He has been a model of a public servant. And his ability to deal with these very delicate problems, with men who have suffered disabilities, and who are trying to be readjusted to life—it is just beyond compare. So as I leave this office, I want to say to Mr. Driver that if I could leave one wish behind me, it would be that all civil servants could handle their job like you handle yours and that we could have more civil servants in top administrative positions.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse every good word spoken on behalf of Bill Driver. I

wish a happy future for him and his lovely wife, Marian, and I am sorry that this man is leaving the Federal service.

The city of Austin literally fell in love with this quiet-spoken, distinguished gentleman. He has visited our city several times—at VFW functions, chamber of commerce banquets, and dedications. Our citizens have a higher respect for governmental employees because of the conduct and bearing and knowledge of Bill Driver, and I personally know him to be a high type, delightful public servant in the finest sense of the word.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us in the House of Representatives, but particularly those of us who are privileged to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, wholeheartedly join President Nixon in expressing warm thanks to Bill Driver for his many years of dedicated service to our country.

The accomplishments on behalf of America's veterans during William J. Driver's tenure as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs speak for themselves. And it is well that they do so because his inherent, sincere modesty would preclude the outgoing Administrator from setting forth a record of which any Government official and any American could be justly proud.

All of Bill Driver's outstanding civilian career in our Federal Government has been spent with the Veterans' Administration. This fact alone is a measure of his devotion to the welfare of America's veterans, their dependents and survivors. For, make no mistake, his repeatedly demonstrated administrative abilities could have won for him the same spectacular advancement in other agencies that marked his service with VA.

We on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will remember Bill Driver for many things. For his unfailing courtesy. For his thorough preparation on every subject on which he ever testified before our committee. For his cooperation in response to all our requests.

But most of all, I think, for his determination and ability to make certain that our veterans and their families received the same courteous treatment, the same knowledgeable assistance, the same ready cooperation from all of his associates in VA that have been accorded us.

Bill Driver knew well that the highest possible standard of excellence in VA's service to our Nation's veterans would more than meet the requirements of those of us in Congress who have known and worked with him.

His successor can also be certain of this.

I have no doubt that the retiring Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will be an outstanding success in whatever endeavor he undertakes in the future. Certainly, I wish him such success as well as continued health and happiness.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it is no exaggeration to call William J. Driver, "Mr. Career Civil Servant."

A softspoken, modest man, Bill Driver has become to the thousands of executives in Government agencies what Sam Rayburn was to Members of the House of Representatives and Dwight

Eisenhower was to the military—a man who worked his way to the very top.

After receiving a business administration degree from Niagara University, Bill Driver—like some 14 million others—went off to serve his country in World War II.

After the war he joined the VA in Washington as a special assistant to an assistant administrator.

Commendable, surely, but not yet noteworthy.

Rolling up his sleeves and going to work, Bill Driver received promotion after promotion to jobs with increasing responsibility.

In the early years he took law courses at night under the World War II GI bill and received an LL.B. degree from George Washington University.

His incredible success story evolved further in the years following his return to the VA after his active service in the Korean conflict.

After holding two major posts in the VA's huge Department of Veterans' Benefits, Bill Driver became Deputy Administrator of the VA in February 1961.

When he was named Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in December 1964 he became, as far as I know, the only man in modern history who started in the ranks and worked his way to the very top position in one of the largest Government agencies.

Mr. William J. Driver is, indeed, a synonym for "Mr. Career Civil Servant." And I salute him as a friend of mine and the veterans of America. I am sorry to see him depart, but confident we shall again see him in public life, serving his nation and his government.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, William J. Driver, the man who has done the most in behalf of this Nation's veterans, is about to leave Government service after 23 years. I want to express my appreciation for his legacy of public service as he departs for what I am certain will be many more years of dedicated service to a grateful Nation.

It is typical of Bill Driver that he is hardly known outside of the Federal Government, yet the programs he administers touch the lives of almost half the population of the United States.

As Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Bill Driver directs an agency that is larger than several of the Presidential Cabinet Departments combined. The Veterans' Administration has more than 170,000 employees, annual expenditures of some \$7 billion, and the mission of serving eligible beneficiaries among the Nation's more than 26 million veterans.

His accomplishments are unique not only for their magnitude and excellence, but for the fact that his entire adult career has been spent as a Government employee.

While he has barely reached the half-century mark, he has reached the top-most rung of the civil service ladder, and he has climbed every step of it by competence, dedication, and devotion to his Nation and our people.

From the time he earned his bachelor's degree in 1941, Bill Driver has served his country both as a civil servant and as a military man. His dedication has

been evident in the quality of his service and the fact that he found time to complete two additional academic degrees while carrying full time executive responsibilities.

Men of his quality are a national resource of inestimable value no matter where their talents are applied. We shall miss Bill Driver as a public servant. I hope he returns to the fold in the near future.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, there was no Veterans' Administration when Abraham Lincoln committed himself, his fellow citizens, and all future generations of Americans "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

He would have been eminently pleased, however, with the manner in which William J. Driver, as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the past 4½ years, has led our Nation in the accomplishment of this essential task.

Every Member of Congress will have his own assessment of the outgoing Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. For myself, I think we may never again know the kind of leadership in the Veterans' Administration which he epitomized. Leadership forged from inherent ability, complete dedication, and unparalleled experience.

Leadership whose hallmark will be: He cared.

For America's veterans, their dependents, and survivors.

For all his associates in the Veterans' Administration, from the newest to the oldest employee.

For the Members of Congress who have the responsibility of enlarging, modernizing, and preserving the structure of veteran benefits built by our Nation over nearly two centuries.

For all of our citizens who must support not only an adequate, meaningful program of veteran benefits, but all governmental activities, from national defense to urban renewal.

Bill Driver will be missed, but he will never be forgotten.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of young people who are considering careers in Government, I want to draw attention to the outstanding career of William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Since his graduation from Niagara University in 1941, he has devoted his life to Government service, and has achieved new heights in career civil service.

As a young veteran of World War II, he joined the Veterans' Administration in 1946. About 19 years later Bill Driver was selected for the top post in this huge organization.

Bill Driver brought professional management to the \$7 billion veterans' affairs program. While doing this Bill Driver earned the respect and admiration of veterans organizations as well as his associates in Government.

Among his honors is the coveted Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League, the Exceptional Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, and the Management Achievement Award given by the Society for the Ad-

vancement of Management for significant contributions toward the advancement of management in Government.

Bill Driver's greatest achievement, Mr. Speaker, is having successfully climbed the career ladder to head the third largest agency in the U.S. Government. He is the first man to achieve this distinction among the millions who have served before him.

On his departure from Government, he deserves our utmost gratitude for his services and our best wishes in his future career. I tender both to him, Mr. Speaker, in grateful admiration.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest friends a veteran ever had has resigned after serving them with courage and compassion for more than 20 years.

I refer, of course, to the Honorable William J. Driver who since 1965 has steered the third largest independent Federal agency as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

His efforts on behalf of the Nation's 26,800,000 veterans can not pass without comment.

Bill Driver's outstanding leadership has been clearly demonstrated in conflict and peace—at home and abroad.

Those whom he has so faithfully served during his long span of service with the Veterans' Administration have time and again singled out Bill Driver with honors and testimonials.

Bill Driver was promoted to the post of Administrator by President Johnson who at that time singled him out for his outstanding achievement and demonstrated ability during his long career with the VA and his service to his country. His promotion was a milestone in career service. His departure will discourage thousands who strive for recognition as loyal and dedicated civil servant.

It has been a rare privilege for this great Nation of ours to have had such unequalled leadership in such a high Government post. Bill Driver has served with devotion his country, his Government, and his fellow veterans.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I have had the opportunity as we all do to talk to the heads of many Government agencies.

The job of a top Government office is really a temporary job, one that generally changes with the change of each administration.

However, Members of the House have, in recent years, dealt with a highly competent individual who knows more about his agency than any other man now in public service and I speak of Bill Driver, retiring head of the VA.

The reason is simple:

William J. Driver did not come to the post in the VA from Congress, from an executive position in State government or from some key position in private industry. Unlike any other top man in a large Government office, he came from within the agency.

Bill Driver just knows more about the VA than anyone else, and all of us who worked with him hoped we would be able to continue to do so.

We learned with sadness this is not

going to happen. Bill Driver is departing, Mr. Speaker, and with him will go the know-how and competence we so greatly need in Government today. We cannot afford, as a Nation, Mr. Speaker, to lose the services of many Bill Drivers. We have too few to begin with.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, Bill Driver has resigned as the distinguished leader of the Veterans' Administration.

As head of the third largest Federal agency, this richly endowed yet modest Administrator has clearly demonstrated his love for mankind, but more especially for those who offered their lives in the defense of this great Nation of ours.

Bill Driver, is a remarkable man. He graduated cum laude from Niagara University with a degree in business administration. He added to this a degree in law, and yet, in spite of his busy career, Bill Driver went on to earn his master's degree at George Washington University.

Since his promotion by President Johnson as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in 1964, Bill Driver has carried forth with vigor, honesty, and determination the trust vested in him.

His executive ability is keen as shown in his successful and continuous striving for improved legislation for the benefit of our 26,800,000 veterans and their families.

His colleagues in war and peace are proud of Bill Driver.

His country and those who have defended her flag are justly proud and will be forever grateful to Bill Driver.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Affairs Committee is losing the services of a man who has made our work a lot more effective during the last 4 years. While he was not a member of this committee, this man, William J. Driver, was a key figure in the development of sound programs for veterans of this Nation's wars.

Because he has spent more than 20 years in VA as a civil servant—the first to head the Veterans' Administration—Bill Driver could be depended on for sound recommendations as to the needs of veterans. As a skilled administrator, he could be depended on to carry out programs in the spirit intended by the Congress.

His rise to this position as head of the third largest agency in the Federal Government is a tribute to our career civil service system. His personal merit has been recognized and rewarded by advancement in this system because he has remained objective, dedicated, and non-partisan.

His decision to resign from Federal service saddens me personally and leaves me with a sense of loss for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I would feel an even greater sense of loss if I were not confident that Bill Driver's exceptional talents for administration and his deep sense of integrity will continue to serve this Nation wherever he chooses to apply them.

Perhaps by leaving Government in his prime after a successful career, he will furnish still another example of the value in the exchange of talents between

the various sectors of our national endeavor.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I hate to lose him, but, knowing Bill Driver as I do, I am confident that he is leaving his agency in such a position that it will make the transition to a new Administrator quite smoothly and that it will serve Bill Driver's successor loyally and effectively.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, as Administrator, William J. Driver was involved with the many departments of the Veterans' Administration. I was particularly interested in his relationship with VA's large Department of Medicine and Surgery. I wondered how a layman would provide leadership in the complex field of medicine. I believe Bill Driver was successful because he is a true professional among professionals. I am sorry he is leaving the public service.

Administrator Driver recognized and honored the commitment of the physician to his patient and he never lost his clear perspective and unerring faculty for differentiating between administrative and medical judgments.

Thus he built a remarkable feeling of mutual confidence, trust, and tolerance between his office and that of the medical staff. He shared with his professional colleagues a personal commitment to an ideal of service to humanity and a broad public concern.

Mr. Driver was deeply aware of problems facing the medical department: The competitiveness for scarce professional personnel, the rising cost of health care services, the need for modernizing or replacing outdated facilities, the impact of sophisticated and costly new procedures. Yet, he was not parochial in seeking creative solutions to these problems. He recognized that medical care of veterans is inextricably tied to the delivery of health care service to all Americans.

Mr. Driver's support of medical research, the education and training of professional and technical personnel in VA institutions, the sharing of facilities and skilled personnel with the medical community, the exchange of medical information, stemmed from his deep conviction that the VA medical program can best serve the veteran when it also contributes to the improvement of health care for all.

As Administrator, he enthusiastically learned all he possibly could about the rapid and dramatic changes occurring in the field of medicine. His interest proved to be stimulating and insatiable to the medical staff.

He encouraged and supported the development of the latest techniques, procedures, and treatment methods required to keep VA in the forefront of American medicine. These include organ transplants, hemodialysis, open heart surgery, day hospital care, nursing home care, and restoration programs.

As a true professional, Mr. Driver never lost his commitment to learning, to rationality, and to process of reasoning. More than this could not be asked of any Administrator. Bill Driver has done his work well.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my

colleagues in expressing regret that William J. Driver has resigned as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

He has been a strong and progressive leader. Fortunately, veterans will continue to benefit from many of the constructive actions wrought under his administration. I think, in particular, of the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission.

In 1967, Administrator Driver responded to a Presidential directive in a bold and imaginative manner. The President asked VA, in consultation with leading veterans groups, to conduct a comprehensive study of the full scope of veterans needs and existing benefits. Two goals were specified but the manner of fulfilling the request was left to the Administrator.

Mr. Driver selected an 11-man study group which became the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission. The composition of the members reflected careful deliberation on behalf of the Administrator. He chose a well-rounded, impartial group with each member having a special knowledge to contribute. The Chairman was the former chairman of the National Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion; other members were five immediate past national commanders of veterans organizations, four State service directors and one retired military officer.

The Commission held hearings across the country. All who wished to speak were accorded an opportunity. Witnesses appeared from business, industry, professional groups, the press, private citizens and, of course, all veterans' organizations. The VA staff provided technical and mechanical assistance. Mr. Driver was always available when asked but the Commission was on its own because the Administrator wanted a truly citizens' report. This is typical of the sincerity Bill Driver brought to every deliberation.

As a result, the report issued by the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission forms a basis for a sound and progressive veterans program. It will be useful for years to come.

So many accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration reflect Bill Driver's ability to act on current problems and to project a path for success in the future. This is the highest form of leadership. Members of Congress and the veterans of our Nation will miss it.

The public service is suffering a great loss with Bill Driver's departure. I wish him well in his new venture and I express gratitude for the service he has rendered our Government.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for many years the needs of America's veterans, their wives, their widows, and children have been administered and guided by one who has served his Nation so well in time of conflict and peace.

Bill Driver's acute awareness of these needs for his brothers in arms has resulted in the world's most liberal system for rewarding men and women who offered their lives for the cause of freedom.

His dedication and ability have been demonstrated repeatedly in the successful direction of the third largest independent Government agency—the VA—

which administers programs to assist approximately one-half of the total population of the United States.

Bill Driver's responsibilities to his country have been accepted with honor and humility. He has administered the largest medical program in the United States—a program that includes a network of hospitals and clinics involving some 5,000 doctors and 15,000 nurses.

He has directed one of the largest life insurance operations in the world, servicing some 6 million GI insurance policies with a face value of \$40 billion.

Bill Driver knows only too well the horrors of war and the pain and suffering of many who fought them. He served his flag with gallantry in World War II and in the Korean conflict. His efforts were rewarded with decorations by a grateful United States, the British Empire, and the Republic of France.

As a career man, he has served the Veterans' Administration with fidelity, his service being recognized by coveted awards from the National Civil Service League, the Society for the Advancement of Management, and the American Veterans of World War II.

Seldom in history has a public administrator been endowed with such modesty and leadership ability.

It is a grateful Nation that today acknowledges with compassion and thankfulness these fine attributes in Bill Driver—a faithful servant who discharged his obligations without fanfare—a man who gave of his talents that others may benefit—a soldier of war—a leader in peace.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 26, 1964, William J. Driver became the first career official to head the Veterans' Administration. Now, 4½ years later, he has resigned. I am sorry this is so but I accept his judgment and I want to pay tribute to this fine public servant.

Under his leadership VA has served the veteran community in an exemplary manner. On behalf of the veterans of Florida and, indeed, the whole Nation, I express deep appreciation to Bill Driver.

The Veterans' Administration is the largest independent agency in the Federal Establishment. As Administrator, Mr. Driver was charged with awesome responsibilities. It is an agency with a diversity of duties, its programs affect the lives of America's veterans and their dependents who comprise 48 percent of the total population. For example, the Veterans' Administration:

Operates the largest chain of hospitals in the country.

Is responsible for the third largest life insurance program in the world.

Pays out \$4.5 billion annually in compensation and pension disability and death benefits to 5 million recipients.

Guides the largest program of adult education ever undertaken.

Conducts over 5,000 research projects covering almost every field of medicine.

These are but a few activities of the Veterans' Administration yet Bill Driver was an expert in each field.

Surely in the annals of the Veterans' Administration William J. Driver will be recorded as a great Administrator. This

is a tribute to all Federal career employees.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I find that many people outside of Government do not really have a clear picture of the Veterans' Administration. Often they do not know how large it is—the third largest in Government—with a budget of more than \$7 billion.

Of course it takes a large agency to deal with a lot of people. As of March 1969, there were 26,794,000 veterans in civil life. Together with their families veterans make up nearly half of the population of the United States.

This grateful Nation has offered a variety of benefits to men who have served their country. They include:

Education and training under the GI bill for 11½ million veterans.

A loan program which has provided home, farm and business loans of more than \$68 billion to more than 7 million veterans.

Compensation and pension payments of over \$4.5 billion annually to some 4.5 million disabled veterans and dependents of deceased veterans.

Life insurance under a program whereby VA services some six million policies and supervises another 3.6 million.

A medical program described as the largest in the free world under a single head. On an average day some 92,995 veterans are treated in VA's 166 hospitals.

As must be apparent, any man who can run an operation of this magnitude and diversity with genuine understanding must truly be an unusual man.

And Mr. William J. Driver is that unusual man. A top-level Administrator, Bill Driver, could, no doubt, run any large organization inside or outside of Government.

This calm, knowledgeable, cooperative, Administrator has been a man who I, as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, have come to know and place confidence in. He not only has technical knowledge, he has an inner sense of compassion and duty.

Bill Driver has been the right man in the right place and at the right time. I am sorry to see him go.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding civil servant: William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

I regret that it is occasioned by his resignation from the Veterans' Administration.

Many Members of Congress feel a very personal loss because Bill Driver is leaving public service. We have come to rely on his leadership in all things dealing with veterans. But I think now of another group he served well—the 171,000 VA employees, third largest workforce in Government.

The policies of an agency reflect the character of its highest official. Yet, more important is the implementation of those policies. It is only when words are translated into action that the intent of the program is tested and the concern of management is known.

To Bill Driver, equal employment opportunity is a way of life and employees

are individuals with feelings and ambitions.

Because he was a career public servant himself, he recognized and encouraged the special dedication to duty desired by our Government and inherent in the best of career employees.

His high regard for public service is reflected in the members of his top staff. Each is a career employee with an average of 20 years VA service.

He chose a woman as the Assistant Administrator for Personnel—not because it was the popular thing to do, but because he knew her work and had confidence in her ability. Even as veterans benefited from this knowledgeable staff, so did VA employees.

The extraordinary record of employee relationship set by the Veterans' Administration under Bill Driver was hailed on many fronts.

Lyndon B. Johnson, former President:

I am proud of the fine record the Veterans Administration has set in supporting our Economic Assistance Programs. VA's youth employment initiatives are an example for all our partners in Government.

John W. Macy, Jr., former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission:

Throughout VA's vast organization, there has been a managerial desire to seek improvements in human relations, a willingness to tackle the complex problems of the contemporary market place, and there has been affirmative support for interagency enterprises in the community. I am certain that these conditions were a reflection of the imagination and leadership in the agency.

John F. Griner, National President, American Federation of Government Employees:

I have noted a pronounced improvement in the morale and working conditions under the administration of William J. Driver. As a citizen as well as President of this Union, I am grateful that he considered equitable treatment of employees as a major responsibility in conducting the Veterans Administration's affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have had many opportunities to work very closely with Bill Driver in Government, and I have found him to be one of the most dedicated and conscientious public servants that I have ever known.

Bill Driver's service to his country, and particularly to the Veterans' Administration is one to which he and all of us can look with pride.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it is a great honor and pleasure for me to say: Thank you, Mr. Administrator, for a job well done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, William J. Driver is leaving the Veterans' Administration, but the contributions he made in 20 years of service will continue to benefit the veterans of this Nation for years to come.

Throughout Mr. Driver's VA service, the growth of veterans programs and extension of benefits to veterans and their families brought about increasing workloads in the VA and a need for effective and efficient tools for processing the masses of data associated with the administration and operation of veterans programs. To this end, the most modern

business tools and techniques are being employed.

The VA was one of the first Federal agencies to use computers for the processing of large amounts of data, having initiated the program under the leadership of the then Administrator, Sumner Whittier. Mr. Driver, as the Chief Benefits Director, recognized the vast potential of automatic data processing—ADP—and was an enthusiastic advocate of its use. He was responsible for the conversion of the enormous compensation and pension system, from a variety of manual-mechanical operations maintained at 69 separate stations to a centralized ADP system. The magnitude of this undertaking may be appreciated by the fact that this system maintains 4.6 million accounts and disburses about 57 million checks each year representing Government benefits to veterans and their families totaling close to \$4.5 billion.

As Deputy Administrator, Mr. Driver played a leading role in establishing a new department; the Department of Data Management which centralized the supervision of all data processing activities and resources of the agency under a single organization. This was a pioneering step subsequently taken by many in private industry and elsewhere in the Government.

During Mr. Driver's tenure as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the development of automated systems to replace the slower and less flexible manual systems has flourished and brought about greatly improved service to veterans at far less cost to the Government.

Under his leadership, the VA personnel and payroll operation was converted to a centralized ADP system. The system automatically processes personnel and payroll data for over 170,000 central office and field station employees. Every other week it produces a magnetic tape authorizing the Treasury Department to issue salary checks, and U.S. savings bonds and notes for VA employees. The system also generates personnel documents, various management reports and accumulates cost accounting data.

Mr. Driver's ability to anticipate an agency need for adapting to changing conditions brought increasing emphasis on the use of computers to facilitate expanding operations. By mid 1969 the VA had over 50 data-processing systems in operation, most of which replaced less effective processes and lowered administrative costs. These processes have provided administrative savings totaling close to \$20 million. These are recurring annual savings which on a cumulative basis total over \$86 million. In addition, about \$21 million savings have been realized from ADP systems which were developed to satisfy one-time requirements such as a Federal pay raise or an increase in veterans compensation and pension payments.

As Administrator, Bill Driver set an example that I hope others will follow. Service to veterans was first in his mind and he balanced it with an economical awareness.

My warmest wishes go with Marion

and Bill Driver. I know that Bill will contribute greatly to whatever endeavor he undertakes, and I truly appreciate the many years of outstanding service he has given to this Nation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned a few weeks ago of William J. Driver's intended resignation as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

It was my privilege to serve with Bill Driver on the United States-Philippine Commission charged with the duty of resolving the sensitive question of payments for certain Philippine veterans. Throughout our deliberations it was impressive to observe Bill Driver's diplomacy and the response he invoked in the other members. With a wisdom enhanced by sincerity, he sought a just solution. That effort was recognized by men of good faith from both countries.

Many times I have called on the VA Administrator for counsel, information, and help in veterans' affairs. No VA matter was too minor to receive his personal attention. Sometimes immediate action was required. Never was I left wanting, even on a weekend.

On one occasion a pilot group of U.S. veterans assistance centers—USVAC's—were announced with less than 20 days allotted for the opening. Much of the preparation fell to the Veterans' Administration. The first 10 USVAC's were opened on schedule. A month later, a second group, including one in my home district of Milwaukee, was in operation. This indicates a well-organized agency.

I know and veterans have confirmed it repeatedly that they find it easier to get information and help from the VA—a fact directly attributable to the aggressive programs Bill Driver encouraged.

Servicemen about to be discharged for disability are given a headstart on their vocational rehabilitation through the assistance of VA representatives who visit them at military hospitals. Bedside assistance is also furnished to speed claims for compensation, disability insurance, and other benefits administered by VA.

These are but a few of the VA accomplishments initiated by Bill Driver. His record will be hard to match.

I regret our veterans are losing this outstanding man. Surely good things will follow him as he enters private life and I wish him every happiness and satisfaction in all that he pursues.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the retiring Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is a genuinely modest man who advanced through the ranks of the Veterans' Administration during his 23-year career with VA on the basis of outstanding ability and solid accomplishments.

To each new assignment he brought fresh enthusiasm, an undiminished capacity and willingness to learn, a continuing dedication to the welfare of America's veterans, and, of course, the invaluable experience of his previous jobs.

For example, I am sure he is proud, as am I, of the success of the present post-Korean GI bill, of the 60 percent enrollment at the college level compared

with 49 percent under the Korean GI bill and 46 percent under the World War II program after the same period of time.

I am confident that he is gratified, too, at the cooperation of our military officials in permitting VA representatives to offer battlefield briefing to our servicemen in Vietnam on their veteran benefits, and to provide similar orientation to servicemen in U.S. military hospitals and at separation points throughout the country.

And I am certain that he has been thrilled by the quiet but monumental triumphs of VA medical research.

As he leaves the Veterans' Administration, William J. Driver can be proud of his record as an outstanding Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the special order taken by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

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

There was no objection.

THE U.N. STRIKES A BLOW AGAINST HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, an event at the United Nations last week is well worth the attention of this House. A concerted Arab and Soviet effort to expel B'nai B'rith after 22 years of participation in human rights debates has made significant headway. By a 10-to-8 ballot, the Economic and Social Council voted to postpone continuing a specific "consultative" category to the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations. The coordinating board represents B'nai B'rith chapters in 40 countries with 500,000 members. This delays for a year assurance of the continuing right of this group to make proposals and participate in U.N. activities on human rights matters.

How bizarre this decision is. Well might Arab States and the Soviet Union unite in unholy wedlock to silence the voice of this Jewish organization in the area of human rights. Truth and the spotlight of information hurts, especially in this case.

The whole world knows slavery still proliferates in areas of the Arab world, along with barbaric punishments and tortures. The entire world also knows how the Soviet Union speaks of human rights to the globe as it actively and mercilessly persecutes Jews within its borders. Hitler is alive and well within the Soviet Union and in the Arab States.

Other nongovernmental organizations will be intimidated by this action, and become fearful of bringing human rights matters to the attention of the U.N. Expulsion of one organization can lead to expulsion of others. The Soviets have

pried open the door to ejection of other organizations which are Western-oriented. The U.N. Charter gives nongovernmental organizations the right to seek "consultative status" by vote of the Economic and Social Council. Such status allows them to focus attention upon such evils. Now a precedent has been set which can stifle future activities of this sort.

Where is the voice of U Thant, that ardent champion of the mighty? Where is the spirit of the United Nations, now that a crisis of severe internal proportions confronts it? What will it do?

The American Jewish community has given fervent support to the United Nations from its very inception. It has stood by in seething, growing indignation as this organization has pilloried Israel via a series of unfair resolutions and condemnations. Now this insult and subjugation of liberty to dictatorship has been inflicted upon an organization which has always been in the forefront of the struggle for human rights. Perhaps no other organization of its kind has better symbolized the search for dignity and championship of the oppressed. Is this not a central idea of the U.N. itself—or one of them?

Shall the U.N. become an instrument for oppression? Or perhaps the Security Council will now pass a resolution condemning B'nai B'rith for aggression in defense of its right to be heard on behalf of the voiceless?

I must admit my patience is sorely tried and my disgust growing at this succession of action. Always, however, one theme runs through all these actions as a thread in a piece of cloth.

It is the Jew who is to blame. It is the Jew who must be singled out. It is the Jewish state which must sacrifice its interests to placate butchers and dictators. It is Israel which must plead for recognition and rationalize its right to survive. It is a Jewish organization which is pilloried mercilessly by so-called civilized delegates of an organization which savors the title of "world parliament." I would sooner listen to a prostitute speak of love.

Yet the Jewish people are accustomed to such a role, and bear it upon their shoulders as a familiar—nay, even a friendly burden. Let others search their consciences.

A free world must not permit a combination of Soviet oppressors ashamed of the truth and their Arab bootlickers who fear the future to silence the voices of truth. Let dictators shout louder and curse truth—it will be heard over their bellows, propaganda machines and cannon. Look to the Middle East for confirmation. For all of Russia's arms, the banners of David stand firmly where they were placed in the June war. Let the people who run the U.N. take heed. In the American community, their good will is very rapidly running out. I say this with great sadness.

THINKING BEYOND CONTROLLING OUR MILITARY DYNAMIC

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, here on Capitol Hill we are now engaged in an unprecedented confrontation between Congress and the military. This is not occurring because of sheer contrariness on the part of Congress. Rather, it is because basic concepts are in need of challenge, thoughtful review and revision. A continuing series of revelations on Pentagon misuse of major fund appropriations is only the charge which has triggered the present chain of events.

We are confronted not just with abuse of trust, nonenforcement of contracts and growing militarization of society. Instead, we have a question of deciding whether our entire posture in a diplomatic and military sense is germane to today's confrontations and tomorrow's inevitable challenges.

Accepted doctrines must be called into question because they have failed. The Communist world is no longer monolithic, as continuing military confrontations in Asia between Red China and the Soviet Union amply illustrate. Revolutionary conflicts will continue throughout the have-not world, and we must decide whether or not we choose to become involved. Even now we continue to thrash in agony in the grips of our present Vietnam involvement. With more urgency all the time, we are confronted with choices on weapons systems which are not only prohibitively expensive, but questionable as to necessity. How many times over must we be able to annihilate any given enemy? How necessary are all our overseas military installations, with their challenge to local sensitivities, expense of maintenance and military commitments?

What is superiority in this age in a military sense? Surely, there is no comparison to what it meant in times gone by. We are seeking to apply Metternich's balance of power theory, World War I's system of alliances and World War II's sufficiency of force to this new world. Battleships, divisions, field firepower, and showing the flag are meaningless in a thermonuclear era. Further, we are faced with the fact of Soviet parity with us in the sphere of thermonuclear sufficiency. There is no Pax Americana, and we must understand that this is so not because of our internal failure, but because of ability of the Soviet Union to produce the same type and quantity of weapons we can. Escalating such an arms race is folly piled upon foolishness.

We must rethink our concepts in light of these factors, applying them geopolitically, fiscally and with a fine understanding of what our society must aim for. For the present, our Military Establishment is a choice target, and rightfully so, in terms of abuses they have perpetrated in tandem with our industrial giants in the military field. Reining in the military industrial complex, is essential, to be sure. But we must also take this one step beyond—in the realm of our foreign presence, commitments, and priorities.

America will destroy herself if she insists upon intervening everywhere, doing this in such a fashion that we undermine and betray our traditional principles upon which our Nation rests. One

reason for the national malaise of the spirit now besetting the Nation is our trampling upon national ideals in the name of Vietnam. How can we pose as a citadel and exemplar of democratic principles when we support, arm, and intervene on the behalf of every tinpot dictator in the world? A list of those we support and favor with red carpet treatment is as sad as it is long.

Stroessner of Paraguay. Franco of Spain. Portugal's dinosaurs. Every military junta from Spain to Argentina. No, this is not Jefferson's realized dream. Nor is it what we speak of on the 4th of July. Americans have always been ready to fight and die for liberty, dignity, and the soaring elements of the human spirit. They are only degraded, however, when they nestle closely with men and regimes our forebears would abhor and reject instantly.

By all means let us place strict controls over the raging, unchained monster across the Potomac and its masters in the industrial establishment. Let us avoid, however, making the complex a mere scapegoat. By doing this, we become enmeshed in the sideshows and forget the main tent.

America must place greater emphasis on selectivity in its choice of allies and giving of commitments. Our bases must be few as well as strategic. Our commitment of force must be carefully chosen, agreed to by the legislative branch, and minimum in terms of time. Our deterrent must be enough to counter the maximum Soviet challenge, and not enough to pulverize all mankind a thousand times over.

These are the salient points to make in the ABM debate—in cutting military budgets—in discussing commitments and sale of weapons. For if we become so obsessed with weapons, commitments and the symbols of power, we shall surely lose our soul as a free nation. In the name of freedom, we are in danger of discarding liberty internally.

We are a participatory democracy, devoted to the dignity of the individual and inextricably attached to making this real to all. Now is the time to reaffirm such devotion in the form of the reforms we institute. It is our responsibility to make our institutions, including the complex of our military and defense firms, reflect our national ideals. They must not be allowed to become our masters, with a life all their own. Which dynamic shall prevail? I wonder. If the military dynamic wins out, we are lost as a free nation and the world will inevitably topple over the brink of thermonuclear conflict. Let us not forget that creation of an overwhelming amount of military force to such an establishment as ours creates an irresistible attraction to use it. This was amply proved in World War I. Our technology is out of control, and must be channeled as well as controlled.

It is my passionate desire to see a strong America, her civilian life rich and in control, acting prudently in the national interest which in turn reflects our heritage and institutions. Let us keep these long range goals in mind as we continue to press our effort to control the forces which now are loose among us.

REV. ALEXANDER RINALDO, C.S.

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

Mr. HANLEY, Mr. Speaker, on May 15 of this year, my home community, Syracuse, N.Y., paid tribute in the form of a testimonial to a most dedicated servant of God on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of his ordination to the Holy Priesthood, the Rev. Alexander Rinaldo, C.S., pastor of St. Peter's Church, in that city.

Father Rinaldo has accurately been described as a "spiritual dynamo," in recognition of his untiring efforts in behalf of all things good. Further, he is also known as "the priest with time for all."

A native of Dueville, Italy, Father Rinaldo was ordained in Piacenza and served as a chaplain to English war prisoners in Trieste, later coming to America and eventually assuming his present role as pastor of St. Peter's Church.

I believe that Father Rinaldo's message on this occasion was magnificent and thus would like to share it with my colleagues:

MAY 18, 1969.

My first pleasant duty, this evening is to express my thanks to the Father Provincial, To His Honor Judge Frank DeVecchio and to Mr. Mario Rossi, for their speaking participation in this program.

I shall always cherish the beautiful sentiments which they have put into words. It would have been honor enough for me to merely have had them in attendance, but to have them speak such eloquent testimonials—none of which I feel I deserve—fills my heart to overflowing.

And my second chore, of course, is to voice my gratitude for your presence—parishioners and friends who have joined me on this felicitous occasion. We have broken bread together—you and I—this morning during the sacrifice of the Mass—tonight—at this brotherly meal—and it is I who must be thankful, for you have come here on a Sunday evening to do me this honor. It is as though you had entered my home—and while my residence could never approach this one in size—today this is, indeed, our abode—our dwelling—our house of many mansions.

For, this is where our heart is—
And wherever that is,
Wherever we are together—
That is our home.

I have been a priest for 30 years. But that is unimportant.

For God Himself has measured our term in infinity itself:

"Thou are a priest forever."

You know the yard stick used by the Catholic Church is the frame of Eternity. The Deposit value is the souls of all men. The reward is God. Under this light we should evaluate the past, 12 years in Seminary training the young man in prayer, meditation, sacrifice, give ample time to learning; literature, science, religion. At the end the young man can really accept responsibility and pledge to God and to the Catholic Church: chastity, poverty and obedience.

Only on this condition the Bishop can give the young man the Priestly powers and say: "Thou are a priest forever."

I will not, therefore, reckon the milestones beyond the reference I have just made: I will, instead, speak briefly of the emotions which move me on this occasion. Tonight, I want to reach across the separation of miles and time and touch the hands of all Priests,

that had the honor to serve this Community of St. Peter's. It is really a journey of spirit, love and thanksgiving. I want them to feel sure that the faith of our community is the faith of our Fathers.

And tonight, you and I—together—turn our thoughts, too, to our beloved Bishop, His Excellency, the Most Reverend Walter A. Foery for his guidance and counsel, for his patience and understanding, in making it possible for our parish to move forward and to reach its goals.

The new Church, which some people consider a gem of art and of Religion, a new Rectory, the home for Priests, and not in long distance the promise of a Religious Center of Education for our youth and adults alike to keep the people of God united in the charity of Christ. My devotion and admiration is tonight toward Father Louis Riello, who, in all humility and determination gave us the beautiful house of the Lord where to pray and to purify our souls.

The bricks, the mortar, the plaster that are St. Peter's Church are important of course, but they fade into the background for me, tonight, because the Church I see as I stand among you is the Church made up of people—my loyal and energetic and devoted Assistants, Father Louis and Father Henry—the choir that lifts its voice to God—the sisters who train our children in Religion—the parishioners who come to Mass—to Confession—to receive the Sacraments—at times of Joy and sorrow—the men and women and the youth who toil so willingly and so happily in our Societies and organizations—the afflicted and the agonizing who do me honor when they seek my humble counsel.

Yes, the panorama tonight is human, indeed—it stretches before my mind's eye from the days when I said farewell to my mother in Italy—to that period of trepidation and misgiving when I first walked on the good earth of America, the land of the brave and the land of the free—to the parishes where I was privileged to serve as an Assistant Pastor—to St. Peter's. I see so many people—so many who have been kind and good and loyal—who have given of themselves unsparingly so that we might—together build for the future.

The monument of memory reaches high, and it is built of souls. Jesus started his Mission when he reached the age of thirty years.

You, the people, are my mission.

Thirty days, thirty months, thirty years, for me—it does not matter. Time is one. My time is you. And I say this with humility and gratitude. It has been my good fortune to have been called to serve you.

God has been generous to me in this respect; I would not presume to ask anything more—for to be among you is a duty that touches my heart deeply, but rests lightly on my shoulders. I do not reckon my labor as toll—but as an expression of joyful endeavor.

The good Lord has been kind to me and so have you, my beloved parishioners.

No matter if we pray in Church, at home, or on the street, prayer and charity are two reflecting lights that shine from the Sanctuary of God and return to him and gives you, my people a great privilege, as St. Peter the Apostle says: "You are the Royal Priesthood".

Rev. Fathers, Rev. Sisters, Honorable guests of the dais, honor guests, Ladies and gentlemen:

I thank you and may God bless you.

WILLIAM J. DRIVER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commenting on the exemplary career of a civil servant who is about to leave Government at the height of his career. William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has illustrated during 23 years that Government service, in and out of uniform, can lead a man to heights above and beyond the call of ordinary duty.

In addition to serving his country in uniform during two wars, he has climbed civil service ranks to the very top. During his brilliant administration of veterans' affairs he has demonstrated executive skills that will assure his achieving new heights in the private sector where these skills and his brand of integrity are no less important to our Nation.

Bill Driver's success is based on intelligence, perseverance and dedication. A cum laude graduate of Niagara University before he entered World War II military service, he saw fit to study law at night while carrying full-time responsibilities as a civil servant. Earning a law degree at George Washington University in 1952, he continued there to earn a master's degree in public administration in 1965.

His educational achievements have been matched and surpassed by his administration of the third largest Government agency. The VA has more than 170,000 employees, annual expenditures of some \$7 billion, and the mission of serving eligible beneficiaries among the Nation's more than 26 million veterans.

The intricate fabric of this Nation's economy has positions that require executive abilities of similar magnitude, and surely Bill Driver will fill one of them. No matter what capacity he chooses to serve in after he leaves Government, I am convinced that Bill Driver will demonstrate that the opportunity for public service is not limited for those who serve as civil servants and in uniform.

PFC. BENJAMIN R. MAULDIN, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ASKS TO SERVE HIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from one of my constituents, Pfc. Benjamin R. Mauldin of Temple, Tex., who is now serving in the U.S. Marine Corps. I think his letter and his attitude is so striking that I want to share it with the Members of the House.

This young man's letter reads:

DEAR SIR: I being a person, a citizen of the United States, now employed by that government in its military service find that even though this government claims not to be discriminate, especially in its military, has discriminated against myself. I was not discriminated upon because of my race or my sex, but rather, because of my age. I am but seventeen years old and, because of that reason I find myself restricted. It seems, that because of my age I am denied even an equal opportunity to serve in a war zone. I have been in the Corps for seven months now and think myself at least as capable as the next

Marine to serve in VietNam. For this reason, among others, I am now putting forth to you, my representative, as an American citizen, a request that I receive at the very least an equal opportunity to receive orders to report to staging for Wes Pac and if at all possible, with your much appreciated help, do, in fact, receive orders to report to Wes Pac.

I am not quite sure what is in your power to be done but I could see no other action to take which might have so quick a result as this. I realize that this action restricting people of my age from serving in Viet Nam was taking into account such as my own safety. Sir, I waiver any right I have because of this law. I am ready to serve my country, my government, my people, and my heritage now! Sir, with people pledging violence rather than faith and obedience as I now am, can't you find some way to help me? There are people sent to Viet Nam who don't want to go. I will gladly replace anyone of them. Please, sir, have an understanding of my situation and take some action in my behalf. I request this of you as an American who wishes to earn his right to live in this country, to dissent its policies if I think myself well enough informed, to protest its dissenters when I see fit, and to stand up and say that I have done my fair share.

My M.O.S. is 0844. My parents address is as follows:

Mr. & Mrs. Roy Mauldin,
710 North 4th Street,
Temple, Texas 76501.

Thank you very much,

Pfc. BENJAMIN R. MAULDIN,
U.S. Marine Corps.

This letter is signed by Benjamin R. Mauldin, Pfc., U.S. Marine Corps, of Temple, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent this young man, and I hope that he will be permitted to earn his right to serve his country as he desires.

We need more men of his kind.

RESEARCH ON AGING ACT

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation entitled the "Research on Aging Act." This bill would provide an intensive, centrally coordinated review of what has been learned and what remains to be investigated about the biological process of aging. It is identical to S. 870, which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The bill proposes to establish a Research Commission on Aging to gather, analyze, and evaluate all information related to the biological aspects of aging, and through a biological research board within the Commission, prepare a 5-year research plan.

Medical developments push the longevity figures higher and higher each year, increasing the number of senior citizens in the Nation as a proportion of the total population. It is right and humane that we do everything possible to insure that our senior citizens are able to lead healthy, comfortable lives in retirement. Many medical experts believe that mastery over the very process of aging itself is very nearly within the grasp of scientific and medical knowledge. Researchers in the field of aging say we have reached a point in our knowledge

and technology where dramatic breakthroughs may be expected. They compare the potential of modern genetic biology to the physical sciences in the 1930's when many of the revolutionary advances of the past several years were germinated.

Despite these conditions and possibilities, the Federal Government is currently spending less than 5 cents per person per year on basic research on the aging process. A new gerontological research center within the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development of the National Institutes of Health is now in the process of construction by the Federal Government. It will house more than 300 scientists and supporting personnel. But this new facility must be utilized efficiently and responsibly.

At the moment, breakthroughs are occurring in molecular biology, immunology, and many other fields that may have application in understanding and affecting the aging process. Research on aging itself is being conducted in insufficient amounts and without specific goals.

What is needed is a careful effort to pull existing knowledge together into a useful form, and to devise a truly comprehensive design for future exploration in this important research area.

At the time he introduced the same bill in the Senate, Senator WILLIAMS noted that the bill "would provide the strong leadership of the Federal Government which is required to bring to fruition the dramatic potential of such a program of research." I wholeheartedly concur with that assessment, and am happy to join with him to advance this program by introducing the Research on Aging Act.

EXPOSED—GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE INSIDERS, FOR THE INSIDERS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Government Employees Exchange for May 28, 1969, carries a very startling exposé of a conglomerate of leading national officials which calls itself the National Council of Technical Services Industries. An interesting feature of NCTSI is that top level favors cost less than \$40,000 in annual dues which, in turn, is probably deductible as a business expense from their income taxes.

Among the members of the giant influence cartel are Abe Fortas, Secretary of State William Rogers, former Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and Dean Rusk, Gossip Columnist Drew Pearson, former income tax Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, and a myriad of other behind-the-scenes actors.

Mr. Sidney Goldberg, the courageous editor of Government Employees Exchange, is certainly deserving of the commendation of every Member of this House and the thanks of the American people for relentlessly exposing corrupt double dealers who have sneaked themselves into the heart of our Government to rot away its structure for their own

personal enrichment and aggrandizement.

I include the news article from the Government Employees Exchange, as follows:

FORTAS TIED TO NCTSI, ROGERS, ACHESON, HISS—"SMEAR" OF CIVIL SERVANTS LAID TO CAMPAIGN OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BASED ASSOCIATION

The "all-pervasive" ties of resigned Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas brought him into intimate association with a group of private contractors, organized as the National Council of Technical Service Industries, which led a "smear campaign" against Federal employees, a representative of the Internal Revenue Service revealed to this newspaper on May 22.

Other "lobbying and political" ties of the former Justice included Secretary of State William P. Rogers, former Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and Dean Rusk, as well as Alger Hiss, with whom Mr. Fortas had first collaborated as a "colleague" in the office of the General Counsel of the Agricultural Administration Agency in 1933.

Other "colleagues" at the AAA were Thurmond Arnold, later a law partner in the firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter, and Adlai E. Stevenson, whose law partner George Wildman Ball subsequently became Under-Secretary of State under Dean Rusk.

OTTO F. OTEPKA

The ties which Mr. Fortas formed with Thurmond Arnold, Dean Acheson and Alger Hiss subsequently placed him in the camp "against Otto F. Otepkas," where Mr. Fortas played a crucial role after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the source revealed.

Because of President Johnson's close ties to two high officials, both of whom had aroused the opposition of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, President Johnson initially was disposed to "re-instate" Mr. Otepkas as Chief Security Evaluations of the State Department, the source stated.

At this juncture, Secretary Rusk asked former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, of the "lobby law firm" of Covington and Burling, to have Mr. Fortas "intercede" with President Johnson "against Mr. Otepkas." A member of the law firm of Covington and Burling is Donald Hiss, the brother of Alger Hiss, the source revealed.

After Mr. Fortas' intervention with President Johnson, it was agreed that Mr. Otepkas would be "left to Mr. Rusk", the source commented.

"BOBBY" BAKER

Another reason for President Johnson's "changing his mind" on Otto F. Otepkas, the source said, was the fact that Abe Fortas was the lawyer of Robert "Bobby" Baker, who had been Mr. Johnson's "good right arm" when he was a Senator. It was known that "Bobby" Kennedy was determined to force Vice President Johnson "off the ticket" by prosecuting "Bobby" Baker.

To save "Bobby" Baker, Abe Fortas made arrangements with Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, columnists with The Washington Post to "reveal" scandals about Foreign Service Officer Don Reynolds on whom Attorney General Robert Kennedy had been counting for a probe of Mr. Baker's ties.

A "hidden force" in the background, on whom Mr. Fortas was counting, was William P. Rogers, the Attorney General under President Eisenhower who had developed the extreme doctrine of "executive privilege", asserting that the Executive Branch could deny documents to the Legislative Branch.

WILLIAM P. ROGERS

After the defeat of Richard Nixon for President by John Kennedy, William P. Rogers became closely associated with The Washington Post, was legal counsel for Drew

Pearson and later was Director of The Washington Post, including Radio and Television Stations WTOP.

William P. Rogers had gained in great influence at *The Washington Post* following the suicide in August 1963 of Philip Graham, who had tried to keep its reporting "objective". However, this event marked the beginning of the rise of a "strong pro-Johnson and pro-Fortas policy" at *The Washington Post* and the concurrent influence there of William P. Rogers who was allied both with Mr. Fortas and with Drew Pearson.

OTEPKA OR BAKER

Because of the attack of Robert Kennedy on "Bobby Baker", a situation arose where President Johnson came to realize he would have to choose between protecting "Bobby" Baker or Otto Otepkas. The issue was clear that in this case it was "Bobby" Baker who would be saved and Otto Otepkas who would be sacrificed, the source revealed.

LOBBY LAWYERS

Abe Fortas, Dean Acheson, William P. Rogers and George Wildman Ball were all members of "lobby law firms", a Washington phenomenon based on the "peddling" of political influence rather than on brilliant law practice, the source at the Internal Revenue Service continued. The main function of these "lobby firms" is to represent in Washington the large American corporations with "billions of dollars" of contracts with the American government. Through their passing their members between the executive, legislative and judicial branches, these law firms generally have access at all times to "secret" files, including FBI reports and CIA documents, the source revealed.

One of the main areas of "secret" documents is the Internal Revenue Service which is able to check out all "income flow documents", including the records kept at banks of all checks written. Thus the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service is, from the standpoint of political "influence," on the par with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency, the source at the IRS continued.

SHELDON COHEN

The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service under President Johnson became Sheldon Cohen, a partner and close friend of Abe Fortas. Through Sheldon Cohen, the firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter obtained an advantage over the other "lobby firms", such as the one to which George Wildman Ball, Dean Acheson and William P. Rogers belonged, the source said.

"The nature of this advantage can be seen", the IRS source continued, "by the fact that Secretary Rogers had intimations of the Fortas-Wolfson carried them out in a way that nothing could be traced back to him".

"Through two associates, Norman Ostrow and John A. Wells, confidential material from Alexander Rittmaster became available to Mr. Rogers", the IRS lawyer stated. "Yet publicly Mr. Rogers continued to support Justice Fortas", he added.

"The reasons for Mr. Rogers action may soon be published", he said. "They may very well have a great deal to do with the ties of Sheldon Cohen to Justice Fortas and material in the secret files of the IRS", the source commented.

NCTSI

On the recommendation of the firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter, approximately twenty of the largest private contractors having contracts for "personnel services" grouped themselves into a "National Council of Technical Service Industries" with an office publicly shown as located at 888 Seventeenth Street, N.W. The dues membership of the largest corporations was placed at \$39,000 per year and the annual income of the NCTSI ranged between \$400,000 and \$500,000.

In turn, the NCTSI actually allowed its main business to be run by Paul Porter acting for Abe Fortas and Thurmond Arnold. The Constitution of the NCTSI expressly stated that its Board of Directors would hold "the annual meeting on the third Wednesday of January in the law offices of Arnold and Porter at 1229 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.", the source revealed.

"SMEAR" CIVIL SERVANTS

In its campaign against the Classified Civil Service, the NCTSI resorted to a publicity campaign, including the "ghost writing" of an article which appeared in the October 1968 issue of *Nation's Business*, the official publication of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The article was entitled, "Riding the Gravy Train" and it stated that Federal employees were overpaid and cost the government more than hiring personnel through private contractors.

The article in *Nation's Business* aroused an "outcry" among Federal employees and John W. Macy, Jr., the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission wrote a letter to the magazine in which he called the article a "low, vicious, unjustified attack" on Federal Employees. Joe Young of *The Washington Evening Star* called the article "so much bilge water".

JOHN F. GRINER

John F. Griner, the President of the American Federation of Government Employees, wrote letters to Senators, Congressmen and to Sheldon Cohen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service pointing out that the article in *Nation's Business* has been published under the inspiration of the NCTSI. He asked that the IRS investigate whether the NCTSI was a bona fide "non-profit education association" or a "lobbying organization" instead. Although Mr. Griner's letter was mailed in November, the IRS has to date not rendered any public decision regarding the "status of the NCTSI", the source at the IRS commented.

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Besides his contacts in the executive and legislative branches, Abe Fortas "cultivated" the judiciary where his firm was an "inside influence", the same IRS source, himself a lawyer, continued.

Part of Abe Fortas influence on the judiciary came from "ideology," based largely on Abe Fortas' early ties with the Harvard and Yale law students who manned the "New Deal Agencies". Among these were William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, who taught Fortas at Yale.

Besides "ideology", Mr. Fortas was active in setting up "interlocking" financial ties in investments with members of the Federal bench. These took the form of "tax shelters", or real estate corporations in which Supreme Court justices and judges of the federal bench could "profit" handsomely.

A typical "tax shelter" arrangement involved a partnership between Supreme Court Justices Abe Fortas and William Brennan, who together with David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and Judge J. Skelly Wright of the same court had an interest in Concord Village Associates. The Associates owned the complex of 531 "garden type apartments" in Arlington Virginia known as Concord Village. Besides the four members of the judiciary, other "partners" were Mrs. Bazelon; Mrs. Fortas, using her professional maiden name of Carolyn Agger; former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg; and a Senator.

THE PARVIN FOUNDATION

The "closest" ties in the Abe Fortas complex, however, involved a merger of "ideology" and "practical" interest, such as the Justice's relationship with the Louis A. Wolfson Foundation. Another such relationship

existed with the Albert Parvin Foundation, which was a "front" for the various Albert Parvin enterprises, the IRS lawyer revealed further.

The "attorney" for the Parvin Foundation was "Carolyn Agger," the maiden name used by Mrs. Fortas in her legal work. The only "paid" official of the Parvin Foundation was Justice William O. Douglas, Mr. Fortas' teacher at Yale. Another Director of the Parvin Foundation is Chief Judge William J. Campbell of the United States District Court for Northern Illinois, who is a protege both of Mr. Fortas and of the late Adlai Stevenson, another young lawyer whom Mr. Fortas came to know in 1933 as an attorney at the Agricultural Administration Agency.

HARRY A. GOLDMAN

Besides the Albert Parvin family, the chief operator of the Parvin enterprises is Harry A. Goldman, who arranged the investment of the Parvin money into two major gambling houses in Las Vegas, the Flamingo Hotel and the Fremont Hotel.

Part of the information which "Bobby" Kennedy had planned to use against "Bobby" Baker involved conversations and arrangements involving the transfer of money at Las Vegas, the source revealed.

LEGITIMIZING INCOME

One of the main functions of the Las Vegas and Reno gambling establishments, the IRS source continued, is to "legitimize" illegal income. He explained that the "major hoodlum, gangster and MAFIA" organizations have income from such illegal operations as the "numbers rackets", "prostitution", "drug smuggling" and "black mail" and "protection." Since these are all illegal forms of income, the money earnings must be made "legitimate" by some method. The "method" is to lose the money at the gambling tables to a "gambling banker", who then pays taxes on his gambling winnings and can thereafter deposit all the previously illegal money into any bank as "legitimate" money.

A major portion of the money that flows into "political patronage" on Capitol Hill originates in the "legitimizing" halls of the gambling casinos in Las Vegas and Reno, the IRS source observed. "How some of this money gets into the pockets of elegant gentlemen would amaze the civics course teachers in the American public schools", he concluded.

LEADERSHIP

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include pertinent material on "Leadership.")

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, some years ago my friend, Gen. Bruce C. Clark, U.S. Army, retired, wrote a booklet entitled "Soldier Management and Moral." In this booklet General Clark sets down in simple language the concepts and ideals that are required of anyone expected to exercise leadership today.

I would especially commend the reading of General Clark's booklet to the administrators and educators on our Nation's campuses who seem to have lost the "keys to leadership" and find their schools beset by almost open revolt.

Gen. George Marshall said:

First in importance will be the development of a high morale and the building of a sound discipline, based on wise leadership and a spirit of cooperation through all ranks.

This statement sets the tone for General Clark's booklet, which has been translated into many languages, and

used by field commanders all over the world.

I include this booklet as a part of the RECORD, so that all Members and others who are interested, might be able to study this fine article:

SOLDIER MANAGEMENT AND SOLDIER MORALE

Gen. George C. Marshall: "First in importance will be the development of a high morale and the building of a sound discipline, based on wise leadership and a spirit of cooperation through all ranks."

OCTOBER 1, 1965.

FOREWORD BY BRUCE C. CLARKE, GENERAL, USA, RETIRED

The subject of Leadership is complicated to the theorist. Many and large books have been written on the academic side of the problem of being a good leader. Fortunately, the rules are capable of being reduced to a few simple and practical terms. The two short articles in this little pamphlet were prepared originally to do just that. Soldier Management was an outline which I prepared several years ago for a lecture on Leadership to the First (Senior) Class at West Point. Soldier Morale was prepared for a lecture to commanders and staff officers of X Corps in Korea in 1953 when the troops there were faced with the morale problems which usually follow an armistice. Together these two outlines might well be used as closely related leadership check lists which officers and noncommissioned officers can use to an advantage in their units. On looking back upon my experience in the Army serving under many immediate commanders whose ranks have progressed through the years from corporal to that of 4-star general, I recall no case where any one of my superiors was able to establish a climate of good leadership in his unit if he violated many of the simple rules given here. Conversely, all who observed well the simple rules were looked upon by their subordinates as good leaders. Many of them were outstanding.

SOLDIER MANAGEMENT FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE COMPANY OFFICER

An outline

1. Introduction: (a) From the company officer's viewpoint, soldier management and leadership go hand in hand. The purpose of this talk is to assist the young officer and the senior noncommissioned officer in his everyday problems of handling and managing soldiers.

(b) There were fair, good, and outstanding units of all echelons in the past war. Primarily this variation in units was in direct relation to the qualities of leadership displayed by the unit officers.

(c) Leadership which produces success in battle can easily be adapted to other activities and produce equal or greater success.

2. What men expect from their leaders:

(a) Men have a right to expect from their leaders:

- (1) Honest, just, and fair treatment.
- (2) Consideration due them as mature professional soldiers.
- (3) Personal interest taken in them as individuals.
- (4) Loyalty.
- (5) Shielding from harassment "higher up."
- (6) The best in leadership.
- (7) That their needs be anticipated and provided for.
- (8) All the comforts and privileges practicable.
- (9) To be kept oriented and told the "reason why."
- (10) A well-thought-out program of training, work, and recreation.
- (11) Clear-cut and positive decisions and orders which are not constantly changing.
- (12) Demands on them commensurate

with their capabilities not too small nor too great.

(13) That their good work be recognized—and publicized where appropriate.

(b) To the military leader, men are tools. He is successful to the extent that he can get the men to work for him. Ordinarily, and on their own initiative, people run on only 35% capacity. The success of a leader is measured by the extent to which he can "tap" the other 65%.

(c) It is the men below who make or break an officer. Sometimes, but not often enough, those above recognize what the ones below do for them in this respect. Regardless of the recognition the officer should not lose sight of the basic truth.

3. Some Pointers on Leadership: Some people are natural-born leaders. Others, possessing the ordinary attributes, can be fine leaders through the observation of certain procedures. Some of these are:

(a) Almost every man wants to do what is expected of him. When he does not do so, it usually is because he has not been properly instructed. This is the only tenable attitude an officer or NCO can take toward his subordinates. He will recognize the exceptions and know what to do about them.

(b) Men admire a strict officer if he is also just.

(c) An officer who tries to be a "good fellow" loses his grip early.

(d) A new officer cannot be easy at first and then get strict. He can, however, be strict at first and then ease off as circumstances warrant.

(e) Company and platoon leaders should know every man in their organizations.

(f) Men must look to their titular leaders for rewards and punishments. The company commander, himself, must decide who shall be promoted. He can and should accept recommendations, but it must never be thought that he rubberstamps the first sergeant's list. The company commander personally assesses company punishment, not the first sergeant. He usually does this in the first sergeant's presence.

(g) One should be able to select competent subordinates. If the commander makes a mistake in choice then the man should be replaced. Do not carry deadwood along for fear of admitting an error in selection. Handle your own mistakes; do not pass them along.

(h) An officer should not look for cheap popularity with his subordinates. They expect the officer to play his part according to his position. They do not begrudge him his rank, pay, or prerogatives if he uses them in the interest of his subordinates and superiors.

(i) Military courtesies start between officers. Observation of these courtesies between seniors and subordinates is not belittling to either; they are evidences of alertness, pride, and good manners.

(j) An officer can expect the same attention from his men that he gives them—it works both ways.

(k) The officer should give orders in a manner which indicates he expects compliance. He should be clear and positive and should follow them up.

(l) An officer should not issue orders which he cannot enforce. Along that line, it is a wise officer who refrains from criticism of a situation until he learns the reasons therefor, and can make logical constructive suggestions.

(m) An officer must develop initiative in his subordinates. They learn by doing. In so learning they make mistakes. Learn to underwrite the honest mistakes of your subordinates.

(n) An officer must not belittle the importance of his subordinates. He must give them responsibilities and then back them up. A good officer does not by-pass subordi-

nate commanders. He uses his NCOs and adds to their prestige by so doing.

(c) An officer should be as good as his word. He should not make promises of rewards and punishments he cannot fulfill. He should fulfill those he makes.

(p) A good officer will know the names, background, and individual characteristics of his men. He must have a genuine personal interest in them or they will not have it in him. Each individual has problems. There is no easier way of getting a grip on men than by helping them to solve the personal problems that give them great concern.

(q) Be enthusiastic and cheerful. These attitudes in a leader, as well as their opposites, are contagious.

(r) Do not be too familiar with your men. Good soldiers do not expect it. It is not necessary to call your men by their first names or nicknames even if you sleep in the same foxhole with them. Doing so does not increase your leadership ability or your grip on your men.

(s) Morale is a natural product of good leadership. Morale is not produced only by USO shows. Diversions are important, however, good morale comes from doing well a worthwhile job and receiving recognition for it. (See article on Soldier Morale which follows.)

(t) Every man experiences fear in a crisis. The leader cannot show it. He must fortify himself with a scale of values which enables him to control his emotions. The only fear that should worry a good leader is the fear of being afraid.

(u) Do everything you can to increase the personal pride of your men. Cleanliness, neatness, and orderliness are evidences of personal pride. A proud outfit is a good outfit.

(v) When a man has punishment coming to him be sure to give it to him, but in an impersonal way and to a degree that fits the circumstances and the offense. When he pays his debt, forget the incident.

(w) Listen to the suggestions of your subordinates. If they are adopted pass on the credit to them.

(x) Be intellectually honest. An officer cannot be expected to know everything. He cannot bluff his men and retain their respect. When he does not know he should say so.

(y) Be loyal. Criticism of your superiors in front of subordinates lays you open to the same treatment. Remember, loyalty works both ways.

(z) Rank should be used to serve your subordinates. Rank is not a reward nor a license to exercise your idiosyncrasies. Rank has one object: to enable the officer to fulfill his responsibilities.

(aa) An officer's presence when the conditions are unpleasant and where the going is tough—"sharing the situation with the men"—is all-important.

(ab) Above all, set the proper example. Men will look to the officer for their model. The higher the rank the greater the obligation to those below to set the proper example.

4. Conclusion: Basis of the officer-enlisted man relationship in the American Army. We have heard the charge that the officer-enlisted man relationship is based upon the Prussian system as brought to this country by Baron von Steuben. There is nothing wrong today with the following instructions written by Baron von Steuben at Valley Forge and published by the Continental Congress. It is when we get away from them that we get into difficulties:

"Instructions for the Captain

"A captain cannot be too careful of the company the state has committed to his charge. He must pay the greatest attention to the health of his men, their discipline, arms, accoutrements, ammunition, clothes, and necessities.

"His first object should be to gain the love of his men by treating them with every possible kindness and humanity, inquiring into their complaints, and when well founded, seeing them redressed. He should know every man of his company by name and character. He should often visit those who are sick, speak tenderly to them, see that the public provision, whether of medicine or diet, is duly administered, and procure them besides such comforts and conveniences as are in his power. The attachment that arises from this kind of attention to the sick and wounded is almost inconceivable; it will, moreover, be the means of preserving the lives of many valuable men.

"Instructions for the Lieutenant

"He should endeavor to gain the love of his men, by his attention to everything which may contribute to their health and convenience; he should often visit them at different hours; inspect into their manner of living; see that their provisions are good and well cooked, and as far as possible oblige them to take their meals at regulated hours. He should pay attention to their complaints, and when well founded, endeavor to get them redressed; but discourage them from complaining on every frivolous occasion."

SOLDIER MORALE

The one question most frequently asked by visitors to military units is: "How is the morale?" This question usually leads to a discussion of many things and usually ends in an agreement that the morale is "Excellent." I am aware of no commander who ever rated the morale of the men in his unit as anything but "Excellent." But I am sure that the morale in some units is "more excellent" than in others.

What is morale? Our manual on leadership defines morale as the mental and emotional state of the individual. As such, it is naturally influenced by many factors.

The basis of good morale

Although morale is a complex and intangible quality, it must have a solid basis of these three factors which lead to a general feeling of confidence, well-being and accomplishment. Military leadership and management play a large part in providing the three factors, although the military commander alone cannot provide them all to the full extent needed:

1. Doing well,
2. An important job,
3. And receiving recognition.

Adjuncts to Morale

During the course of this article I will refer to these elements, but first let's consider the several adjuncts to morale which have an influence on units but which in themselves alone do not produce good morale if the basis of good morale is missing.

Good Management: We all like to be in a unit where there is good management, where things run smoothly, where things are planned, where men do not have to "hurry up and wait." The basis for good management is prior planning, thorough organization, and continuing supervision.

Well Informed: Men like to be kept informed ahead of time as to things that affect them or are apt to affect them. It is far better for the commander to keep his men informed, than to have them seek to get such information from rumors. Most soldiers enter into training programs and other military activities with vigor and enthusiasm if they know their purpose and the reason.

Well Trained: This is an important part of factor one. If, a unit is not well trained its men know it. This fact adversely affects their confidence, especially if they anticipate there is a possibility of using that training in a critical situation. Every soldier likes to feel that he is playing on a winning team—he knows he can't win if he isn't well trained.

Chances for Advancement: Making progress is morale raising to all men. Knowing that there is an opportunity for advancement and that only excellent performance and preparation lead to promotion in a unit helps the morale.

Good Physical Condition: Good physical condition goes hand-in-hand with good mental condition. These two elements are basic to achieving good morale.

Good Administration: Men like to know that the administration in their unit is good, that their pay accounts and individual records are correct, that the date they are due for rotation home will not be overlooked, that their allotments are going through on schedule. These matters are very personal to a man and affect his confidence in his unit.

Confidence in Their Equipment: We are the best equipped Army in the world. There is always better equipment under development than is in the hands of troops. There would be no progress unless that were true. The talking down of our equipment as being obsolete, the statements that we do not have the latest and best are detrimental to morale.

Confidence in Their Leaders: Men expect their leaders to know their jobs, to share the hardships with them and to take a personal interest in their problems. The men like to see their leaders where things are going on—where the weather is bad or the night dark and wet.

Comfortable Quarters: With a little encouragement men will fix up comfortable quarters under most any condition. They should always be made as comfortable as the circumstances permit.

Good Mess: The food issued to the American soldier is the best that any Army ever received. There is no excuse in the Army for other than a good mess. Where messes are not good, command attention is lacking.

Good Mail Service: The importance of this should be apparent to all. The soldier counts on his mail—he looks forward with anticipation to every mail call.

Good Medical Attention: Confidence in the medical service is of tremendous importance to any unit, especially to a combat unit.

Post Exchange Facilities: The Post Exchange gives the man a source of small necessities and little luxuries so that he can vary the routine of issue items and have some things in accordance with his own wishes.

Leaves and Passes: A constant and well-implemented policy in such matters provides breaks in routine which are most beneficial. The leave program should be planned so that each individual knows approximately when he is going. He can then plan for it.

Religious Services and Character Guidance: It is especially important that an Army made up mostly of young soldiers be provided with facilities for religious services in accordance with their preferences and a program of character guidance with a view to continuing in the service the wholesome influence of home and community life.

Awards and Letters of Commendation: These means of recognition of good work play a most important part in factor three of the basis of good morale. A good commander is ever alert to detect and recognize good work.

Diversions: There are many important activities that fill up spare time, thereby keeping the soldier pleasantly and profitably occupied and adding to his contentment. Among these are movies, U.S.O. camp shows, dayroom and library facilities, athletics, and well equipped hobby shops.

Standards: Soldiers like to be in a "sharp" unit. They appreciate the achievement of high standards in discipline, dress, house-keeping, police, maintenance, training, and athletics. The lift in morale that comes from

impressive military ceremonies is an important factor.

Most of the various adjuncts to morale are expected by troops as a matter of course. Therefore, the presence of them does not necessarily add to morale but the absence of any of them is quickly noticed and adversely affects the morale substantially.

Evidences of morale

In discussing the subject of morale with visitors, I often ask and am asked: "What do you look for in a unit in order to gauge the morale?" Since morale is influenced by so many factors, there are naturally many indications of the state of morale in a unit. The things I look into and note in making a quick size-up of a unit include:

Saluting: Is it well done? Do the men speak? Do they seem pleased to greet you? Do they come forward to report?

Dress: Is it uniform, neat, clean, worn smartly?

Good Housekeeping: Is the area neat, orderly, clean? Are offices cluttered up? Are bulletin boards neat? Are signs clean, neat, uniform? Are barracks neatly arranged? Has there been an effective effort to make the unit attractive?

Pride: Are they eager to show their accomplishments? Are they eager to point out their history? Do they have something good to sell and try to sell it?

Participation in Charities and Unit Improvement Projects: These extra-curricular activities indicate the unit spirit in an organization.

Athletic Programs and Support of their Teams: An athletic program, enthusiastically supported, on the small unit level so that many men actually participate, is always a favorable indication of morale as is the support of unit teams in competitions. Competition between platoons is most beneficial.

Church Attendance: This is a good indicator.

Soldiers Deposits and Other Savings: A man who is saving his money each month is "banking on his future" and is usually a well adjusted and confident soldier. When there are many such soldiers in a unit there is a depth of stability in the organization.

Enlistment and Reenlistment Records: Except where unusual conditions exist, the records of enlistment and reenlistment are good indices of the relative morale in the units.

AWOLs: Where situations exist to make such offenses on the part of the man reasonably easy to commit, this item is an indicator of morale.

Size of Sick Call: Unless there are special reasons for it, a continuing large sick call is a danger signal in a unit.

Courts-Martial Rate: This often indicates morale in a unit, but it must be analyzed carefully for extraordinary influencing factors. For example, a very low court-martial rate may indicate not good morale, but a lax discipline.

Incidents and Accidents: Usually these occur in sizeable numbers only as a result of conditions existing over a period of time which set the stage for them. Because of this, they are an indication of the soundness of the basic structure of a unit which include the state of morale of its members.

Complaints to the Inspector General: These come about when men are not well informed and properly handled. Thus, they are an indication of morale.

Outside influence on morale

The factors, adjuncts and indications of morale covered so far have to do with those things that are generally within the ability of military leadership and management to influence. But there are influences on the morale of soldiers, especially those on duty in a far-off land, which stem from attitudes of officials, members of Congress, the press, radio commentators and the pub-

lic at home. These factors have to do with the last two elements of the basic premise:

2. An important job,
3. And receiving recognition.

It is necessary that the soldier feel that he is needed where he is in an important mission, that his sacrifices are of both immediate and of long range benefit to his country, his home, his family and himself. He will feel that importance so long as the people at home feel it. He is very sensitive to public opinion at home and, because of good radio, newspaper, and mail facilities, is constantly abreast of the attitude at home toward the importance of his job. The "home town" and other releases by Information Officers play an important part in the attitude at home. Unless the people at home help maintain in him the feeling that he is doing an important job for them, the heart of the basic premise upon which good morale is built is eliminated. Then the several adjuncts to morale cannot fully fill the void regardless of the efforts made.

The third element—"receiving recognition"—generally follows from the second, insofar as the attitude of the public is concerned. Visits, speeches and actions of officials, articles by newspaper correspondents and contents of letters which the soldier receives from home all affect morale. Because of this, every citizen shares with the military leaders the responsibility for the morale of the service personnel.

SUMMARY

The morale of a man in a military organization comes from many factors. It may well be summed up in one word, "Confidence." Confidence in his training, equipment, leadership, in himself, in his unit and in the support from home. The military commanders play a big part in it but so do civilian officials, members of Congress, the press, radio commentators and the general public at home. Together they must insure that the soldier does well an important job and receives recognition for it. So long as this is accomplished there is a general feeling of confidence, well-being, and progress in a military unit; and the report which states that the "morale is excellent" will be sound.

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

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

Mr. KOCH, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, requiring the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities. In sponsoring this legislation, I am joining with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Hon. GAYLORD NELSON, and my colleague from New York, Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

On Monday of this week, I testified before Commissioner Bess Myerson Grant, of the Department of Consumer Affairs of the city of New York, on the matter of food pricing and packaging, and at this point I insert the statement I presented at that hearing:

Commissioner Grant, ladies and gentlemen—It is a pleasure for me to be here on the occasion of the first public hearing to be conducted by the Department of Consumer Affairs. When I was a member of the City Council last year, I voted to establish this Department, and to give it independence from the Economic Development Administration. If that legislation had not passed as amended by the Council, I doubt

that these hearings today would have taken place.

I would like, also, to commend Commissioner Bess Myerson Grant for her initiative and her enthusiasm. She is devoting herself without reservation and without fear to the consumer interest. I look forward especially to the productive results from this hearing.

Last week the cost of living again reached an all time high, with an increase of seven-tenths of one percent recorded for the month of April alone, and a 2.6 percent rise for the first four months of 1969. The running increase in consumer prices for the last twelve months was 6.5 percent, which means that if you had put your money in a savings bank and received the legal maximum of five percent interest you would have been 1.5 percent worse off at the end of the year than at the start of it. And that figure is before taxes. These inflationary pressures make consumer protection a most important subject, particularly to those who live on fixed or limited income, and that includes most of us.

Unfortunately, there is little that the Department of Consumer Affairs can do about inflation. But what it can do is to see that consumers get enough information to make sensible choices about how and where they are going to spend their money. One way to do this is by truth-in-pricing.

In the past few years, the consumer has had to face a bewildering array of supermarket monkeyshines. First is the enormous proliferation of package sizes and dimensions. The hearings on the Federal Truth-in-Packaging law revealed that some common products have multiplied into hundreds of different sizes, some of which may be expressed only in the most complex fractional form.

Second, we have an incredible variety of shapes of containers, what Deputy Mayor Costello last year called "the snail and giraffe shaped packages." There is a salad oil that comes in a vessel shaped like an hourglass. There are packages of air, with the produce resting on the bottom of the box. The ingenuity of the finest creative minds is brought to bear to make less appear to be more, and their efforts are frequently successful.

Third is the practice of shaving the third dimension. This is the custom of reducing the quantity of a product offered for sale, but not changing the traditional or accepted package size. This is accomplished in various ways: a transfusion of air, an extra layer of glass or other packaging material, or a reduction in that dimension of the product which is not normally noticed by the consumer. For example, soda has gone from 32 to 28 ounces while the normal height of the bottle has been retained, raisins and frozen foods now come in packages which are wider but flatter. This practice is the equivalent of shrinking the size of the moon by paring off pieces from the dark side. You get away with it for a while, but eventually, you will poke through to the sunny side, and there will be no more moon.

It is by no means every manufacturer or packager who engages in the misleading and deceptive practices which I have described. But it is every honest businessman and competitor who must be protected from the trickster, from those who would spare the package and spoil the product. The consumer should not be the hamster on whom every new artifice is tested and perfected before the years pass and the Federal Trade Commission finally catches up with it.

There is a relatively easy answer to price and package confusion. That is truth-in-pricing: a simple rule that would require the store to state, at the point of sale, just what the product costs per ounce. Let the buyer decide if she wants to pay more to pour her maple syrup out of a spout. She may reasonably decide to do so. But let her know

that she is paying for the glass as well as the syrup.

If the housewife wants the new miracle ingredient in her detergent that will make clothes whiter than white, she is welcome to it. If she wants higher quality, solid fruit instead of fragments, perfume instead of toilet water, so much the better. But let her know the choice she is making. And do not try to fool her into thinking that she is paying less when in fact she is paying more.

I do not believe that people will flock to the cheapest brands when truth-in-pricing regulations are adopted. Many shoppers, for reasons of taste or pride, prefer expensive brands. Whole schools of advertising have grown up to appeal to such preferences.

But it is unconscionable for the housewife who wants the cheapest brand of an identical product to be unable to pick it out because she is faced with a zoo of trick packages. That is not a system which will be tolerated indefinitely, despite the pressure of industry lobbyists.

Truth-in-pricing is not the ultimate solution to the complicated problem of providing fairness in the marketplace. But it is, in my judgment, a minimum requirement in order to allow the consumer to make intelligent comparisons of value.

It is not, in any sense, a radical reform. You can get the best view of it as part of an evolutionary process: first, a package was required by law to state its contents and weight or volume; second, under Regulation 49 of the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs, it was required to state its total price. Each past regulation was protested on the ground that it was impractical, unenforceable and a restriction on trade. Each past regulation proved itself over the years to be practical, enforceable, and no restriction on trade. And so it will be with truth-in-pricing. This regulation will become a benchmark for honest competition, and, years from now, people will wonder how we ever did without it.

So my advice to you, Commissioner Grant, is to move ahead. Let New York City lead the way in consumer protection, and give us in Congress an example for the nation.

Thank you.

THE SUPREME COURT AND WELFARE

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's ruling on residency requirements in State welfare programs further evidences the necessity for adoption of House Joint Resolution 82, to enable Congress by two-thirds vote of each House to override decisions of the High Court.

The decision on residency is as unfair to families appearing to benefit from it as it is to the States themselves. It may very well discourage families from establishing firm roots in any community, thus leading to an emergency of vagabond almsmen who move with the birds between North and South as the seasons change.

During the depression years before World War II, many a father or son reluctantly left western Pennsylvania in search of employment in Cleveland, Detroit, or any other metropolitan area where there was an opportunity for employment. Seldom did anyone send for the rest of the family, however, until he

felt that his job was secure and the new residency permanent.

Under the philosophy now established by the Supreme Court, families will be encouraged to move about like gypsies in the full knowledge that instant relief will be available wherever the grass appears to be greener or the weather more appealing.

The decision destroys an inherent State right and can bring about a breakdown in residency requirements for voting and in various licensing systems. Furthermore, reciprocity arrangements between States may eventually become meaningless if the new concept for welfare applicants is extended.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following recent editorial from the Wall Street Journal and the editorial of May 5 from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

A LARGE BLANKET

The Supreme Court's edict against residency requirements in state welfare programs is disturbing in its likely practical effects, but even more disturbing as further evidence of the Court's willingness to write its own social opinions into law on any handy if tenuous Constitutional ground.

The residency requirements have been passed by more than 40 state legislatures, and also authorized by the Federal Congress. We think most Americans would agree they are manifestly reasonable. If the citizens of a state decide to tax themselves to pay especially high benefits to the indigent among them, why should they be penalized for this generosity by the additional necessity to support the indigent of other states who may be attracted by the high benefits?

The standard one-year residency test seems a straightforward means of avoiding such a penalty. All the more so since, as Chief Justice Warren pointed out in his dissent, other means of support are in fact often available to those who fail to meet this test.

The Court majority struck down the tests by alleging they restrict a Constitutional right to travel. This is a "fundamental" right, it held, and no citizen should suffer a "penalty" for exercising it. Thus, to the extent such requirements are intended to "deter" interstate travel of indigents they are unconstitutional. Other justifications offered in their defense are not the "compelling" reasons necessary to impinge on a fundamental right.

There seems to be legal precedent for much of this argument, and it would make some sense if the provisions in question were in fact a "penalty" or "deterrent." Yet no one alleges (at least yet) that the Constitution requires any state to maintain a welfare program, let alone a schedule of benefits higher than those elsewhere. If it chooses to do so without a residency restriction, it subsidizes and provides an incentive for the migration of indigents. The whole purpose of residency requirements is merely to mitigate that incentive.

The distinction between enacting a penalty and refusing to enact a subsidy is admittedly a somewhat subtle one, but we would hope not one beyond the ken of the average Supreme Court Justice. Yet the majority not only disingenuously clouds this distinction, but casts a large blanket for future intervention in legislative prerogatives.

Other than the social notions of the Justices, after all, what are the standards of a "fundamental" right or a "compelling" justification? Why, as the Chief Justice asked, will not the same reasoning be used to strike down residency requirements for voting, professional licensing or what not? Both his dissent and Justice Harlan's quite pertinently allude to the now-deplored era when the

Court used the "due process" clause to write its social views into the Constitution. They observe that the present Court's rationale is similarly open-ended.

The era of "substantive due process" ended in the late 1930s when the Court started to adhere to the principle of using judicial review to pass on a legislature's Constitutional power to pass particular laws, instead of misusing judicial review to pass on a legislature's wisdom in doing so. The welfare decision is merely the latest in a string of rulings showing today's Court has again strayed, and needs to return to precisely the same principle.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 5, 1969]

CONTINUING ATTACK ON RESIDENCY LAWS

Two weeks ago, when the U.S. Supreme Court declared unconstitutional state laws setting minimum periods of residency as an eligibility requirement for welfare applicants, Chief Justice Warren warned in a dissenting opinion that the ruling could lead to invalidation of state residency laws applicable to voters.

It has not taken the Court long to move in the direction predicted by the Chief Justice. It has agreed to hear a challenge against Colorado's six-month residency law for voters which was in effect for last year's Presidential election, even though the law has since been repealed and replaced by a two-month residency requirement.

Additional questions arise as a result of the Court's entry into the thicket of residency laws. If the principle of unrestricted movement of citizens from state to state is to be evoked against residency laws generally, as it was in the welfare ruling, a floodtide of litigation against a wide range of state laws may be in the offing.

What about motor vehicle registration and driver licensing? How about licenses for professional and vocational practices of many kinds? Such regulations and requirements vary from state to state. What of laws requiring holders of certain occupational positions to live within the boundaries of the locality where they work? There is an almost endless list of state laws that, to one extent or another, could be said to cause hardship for persons who change their place of residence.

Arguments before the Supreme Court in the Colorado voting case may be unusually far-reaching in their scope of interest in light of the recent decision nullifying welfare residency restrictions.

NEW AMERICAN POLITICS: VOTING AT 18

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the root feelings of young people today is that they are called upon to bear the heaviest burdens of the Nation through military service, but they are not allowed to help elect the leaders who make the Nation's policies. This feeling inevitably contributes to their frustration with the political process. This Nation cannot risk their alienation. Allowing them to vote would be a dramatic and effective way of showing young people that this Nation wants and needs their participation.

I. PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR VOTING AT 18

Last year's Gallup poll found public support for voting at 18 had reached an alltime high. Two out of every three adults—64 percent—thought 18-, 19-,

and 20-year-olds should be permitted to vote. Only 17 percent of all adults held this view in 1939 when the first national Gallup survey on voting at 18 was conducted.

Today, bipartisan support for voting at 18 is a reality. In its 1968 platform the Democratic Party pledged:

We will support a Constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18.

The Republican Party stated in its 1968 platform:

In recognition of the abilities of these younger citizens, their desire to participate, and their service in the nation's defense, we believe that lower age groups should be accorded the right to vote. We believe that states which have not yet acted should re-evaluate their positions with respect to 18 year olds voting, and that each such state should decide this matter for itself. We urge that the states act now.

Besides public support and bipartisan party support, our recent Presidents have also lent their support to voting at 18:

President Eisenhower in his January 7, 1954, state of the Union message said:

I urge Congress to propose to the States a constitutional amendment permitting citizens to vote when they reach the age of 18.

President Kennedy said on May 21, 1954, before becoming President:

Indeed, I would support such an amendment (voting at 18) in my own state and in the Congress if it were supported by the experience and demand of many states.

President Johnson, in transmitting to Congress a proposal to amend the Constitution to lower the voting age to 18, stated on June 27, 1968:

We should now extend the right to vote to more than ten million citizens unjustly denied that right. They are the young men and women of America between the ages of 18 and 21.

President Nixon, during the recent presidential campaign, had the following to say in support of voting at 18:

I am for the 18 year old vote. The reason I think 18 year olds should vote is that I think they would add to the interest in American elections, they would add to the quality of the debate, the younger generation today is better educated, it knows more about politics, more about the world, than many of the older people. That is why I want them to vote—not because they are old enough to fight, but because they are smart enough to vote.

On February 5, as members of the Youth Franchise Coalition, 15 organizations formally committed themselves to work together to achieve the goal of voting at 18: Americans for Democratic Action; Citizens Division, Democratic Party; Citizens for Vote 18; Citizenship Education Program, SCLC; Committee for Community Affairs; LUV—Let Us Vote; NAACP, Youth and College Division; National Education Association; Southern Committee on Political Ethics; Student National Education Association; Student World Federalists; U.S. National Student Association; U.S. Youth Council; Young Democratic Clubs of America; Young Republican National Federation.

I believe access to the ballot is the fundamental and basic requirement for citizen participation in a democratic society. Today, efforts to involve 12 million

young Americans in the most basic process of a democracy appear to be closer to success than at any time since the first major effort to secure voting at 18 began in 1942.

II. WHY WE HESITATE ON VOTING AT 18

First. The prospect of 12 million new and allegedly irresponsible voters is a cause of concern. The principal theme of those opposed to lowering the voting age is irresponsibility. Twenty-one as the age of voting responsibility has no relevance in our 20th century—hopefully a time in which we all have shed our suits of armor.

Those opposed to lowering the age of voting seek proof positive that youth will handle their franchise intelligently even before having the opportunity to vote. The same impossible demand was made in opposition to female suffrage 50 years ago and equal voting rights for Negroes only 3 years ago. No tragedy occurred on ratification of the 19th amendment in 1920 and no catastrophe has resulted since passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. What has happened is large segments of our population now play a positive role within our political system—one of the earmarks of a democracy.

In May 1968 a Gallup poll disclosed that as many college-aged Americans considered themselves Republicans as Democrats—29 percent Republicans, 29 percent Democrats, and 42 percent Independents.

To counter the arguments of those who point to the December 1964 demonstrations at Berkeley, I point out the demonstrations began with the protests against the very exclusion from decisionmaking that the 21-year-old voting laws epitomize.

If the stereotype of the Berkeley student is false, and it is, then the idea that most college students are irresponsible is all the more false. Almost 10,000 Indiana University students recently protested action by the Indiana General Assembly resulting in a substantial increase in tuition—an action directly affecting them yet an action in which they had no direct voice being excluded from voting. National TV coverage showed the protest was peaceful and orderly.

As Indiana University students recently demonstrated, real experience does not come from observation but from participation. It is our responsibility to insure that positive participation also takes place within, as well as outside, our political system.

Second. Low voter participation of young people between 21 and 30. President Kennedy's Commission on Registering and Voting Participation in its report submitted December 20, 1963 stated:

The Commission is concerned over the low voter participation of this age group between 21 and 30. We believe that a major reason for this low turnout is that, by the time they have turned 21 (the minimum voting age in 46 of the 50 states), many young people are so far removed from the stimulation of the educational process that their interest in public affairs has waned. Some may be lost as voters for the rest of their lives.

Third. There has never been a concerted national effort to bring together

the forces favoring voting at 18 to insure serious consideration by Congress and the State legislatures. The Youth Franchise Coalition has only recently been formed to plan and coordinate a national educational and political action campaign to secure the right to vote for all citizens of the United States at age 18.

The genius of our American political system has been its adaptability. Our political leaders and parties have always been capable in the end of embracing new ideas and new people. Political leaders and parties refusing to accept transfusions of new ideas and new people have always been left behind.

III. WHY WE SHOULD SUPPORT VOTING AT 18

First. The most compelling reason for lowering the voting age is that American politics needs the transfusion that younger voters would provide.

Senator MANSFIELD said:

Lowering the voting age to 18 will tend to bring about a better and more equitable balance in the electorate of the nation. As life expectancy rises, the number of older voters increases. A corresponding expansion in the number of younger voters will not only broaden the political base of the Government, it may well provide concurrently a more balanced approach in the nation's general political outlook.

Forty percent of our population is now under 21 years of age. By 1970 half of our population will be under 27 and about 7 percent will be between the ages of 18 and 21. Thus, the average age of Americans is now approaching the lower 20's after having climbed upward since the first decades of the last century. America is gradually becoming as "young" as it was at the time of its revolution.

Younger voters would indeed provide the transfusion needed today in American politics. More than any other factor, it was the nonviolent and student-led demonstrations of the early 1960's that produced the climate in this country necessary for enactment of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1965. Students have formed the backbone of the opposition to previous U.S. policies in Vietnam.

Because student demonstrations, marches, and speeches have in part been outside our political system, some students have felt the need to resort to unlawful acts to make their point. In doing so, they have made my point as well: there should be no need for civil disobedience in a political system meeting the needs of the people.

The energy, ingenuity, and idealism of young Americans will instill new purpose and drive in our political system if they are given the right to vote—the means to true involvement in the American political system.

Second. If young people receive the right to vote immediately after graduating from high school, they will form the habit of civic responsibility early in life.

Rather than blindly adhering to the present standard, borrowed from ancient English common law which designated 21 as the minimum age for knighthood, why not choose an age marking a definite turning point in the lives of young Americans today—the usual age of graduation

from high school. Given the fact that 21-year-olds are today's most delinquent voters, it makes sense to grant the franchise at the age by which most young Americans today graduate from high school so that what was learned may be put to practical use before being forgotten.

Seventy-five percent of our people graduate from high school today. Over 40 percent will attend college at some point. By comparison, 45 percent completed high school in 1940 and 16 percent could expect to attend college.

Third. TV now gives young people a feeling of immediacy and involvement concerning international and domestic problems—an involvement never before possible.

The 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds have witnessed the important events of our age. Such experiences combined with knowledge gained in high school have created the desire in young Americans to have a real voice in decisions affecting them.

Improved education combined with a feeling of identification with the important social and political currents of today have made young people an important force. Our voting laws have unfortunately relegated young Americans to an outside force exerting pressure on, rather than participating within, our political system.

Fourth. Increasingly, the lives of 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are being affected by direct Federal Government action—the draft, taxation, job training programs, as well as through service in the Peace Corps, VISTA, and the Teacher Corps. All responsible Americans should have a voice in determining how their Government will affect their lives. Congressional resolutions lowering the voting age to 18 were first introduced in 1942—the same year the draft induction age was lowered to 18. The same situation exists today with one-half of our servicemen killed in Vietnam not being able to vote.

Fifth. 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds can marry and start families, pay taxes, drive cars, and carry firearms. They are subject to the same penal code as are those of 21 years of age and over. Being treated as adults under the law, they should join adults in determining the laws which apply equally to both groups.

Sixth. Since Georgia, Kentucky, Alaska, and Hawaii now provide for voting by young Americans under 21, those under 21 and residing in other States are being deprived of their equal rights under the law in not being able to vote. Certainly the capacity of young Americans to make intelligent choices is not governed by the State boundaries within which they happen to reside.

Seventh. Nothing in the recent political history of the four States providing for under-21 voting indicates the college-age vote is irresponsible. In Kentucky, a State in which 18-year-olds have been voting since 1956, 80 percent of almost 200,000 18-to-20-year-olds went to the polls. Gallup polls in 1954 showed that 77 percent of Georgia's 18-to-20-year-olds would go to the polls if able to vote. Subsequently, Georgia's 18-to-20-year-

olds now make up 20 percent of the State's electorate.

Eighth. Eighteen-year-olds now vote in 18 other countries of the world. Certainly young people residing in the United States are as well prepared today to make intelligent choices as are their contemporaries in other countries of the world.

IV. CONCLUSION

The history of the 18-year-old suffrage dates back to 1770 when there were attempts to draft a lower voting age in State constitutions. Today, efforts to involve 12 million young Americans in the most basic process of democracy appears to be more near success than at any time since 1942.

With assurances from the Youth Franchise Coalition that 18- to 20-year-olds really want to participate within our political system and that these new voters will support legislators who make it possible, chances for passage of a constitutional amendment providing for voting at 18 by the 91st Congress is bright.

I join those supporters of Votes in their feeling that a nation distrustful of its youth, "is a nation that does not have the vision to endure."

Mr. Speaker, the proposed constitutional amendment follows:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. The right of any citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age if such a citizen is eighteen years of age or older. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. TIERNAN of Rhode Island (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. WYMAN of New Hampshire (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for an indefinite period on account of illness.

Mr. MIZELL of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today on account of official business.

Mr. CULVER for the week of June 2 on account of official business for the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) to address the House and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS), to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. RARICK, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in four instances, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACGREGOR following message of President on foreign aid.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia to revise and extend his remarks in colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. KEITH to follow Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. GROSS, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. MESKILL in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS in three instances.

Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. MAYNE.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROBERTS in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. FUQUA in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. LANDRUM in two instances.

Mr. OBEY in two instances.

Mr. SATTERFIELD.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 277, 91st Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, June 2, 1969.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 277, the House adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

810. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

811. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration by the Small Business Administration of the disaster loan program in connection with the 1964 Alaska earthquake; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 425. Resolution, transfer of funds within the offices of the Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-278). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RONAN, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. SHIPLEY):

H.R. 11737. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11738. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 11739. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons

to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11740. A bill to promote the advancement of biological research in aging through a comprehensive and intensive 5-year program for the systematic study of the basic origins of the aging process in human beings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to expenses of plastic surgery and hypertrichology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11742. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11743. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11744. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 11745. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. KARTH):

H.R. 11746. A bill to establish a clean water trust fund, in which Federal water use fees shall be deposited and from which shall be expended all amounts for Federal water pollution control programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCCLURE, Mrs. MAY, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. WOLD, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 11747. A bill to impose a quota on imported fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb meat and certain prepared or preserved lamb meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 11748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 regarding credits and payments in the case of certain use of gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11749. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the Armed Forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. STEED, Mr. PASSMAN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. HULL, and Mr. PURCELL):

H.R. 11750. A bill to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. RHODES, Mr. POFF, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. BOW, Mr. BUSH,

Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ERLÉN-BORN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BROOK, and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 11751. A bill to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. UTT, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. AYRES, Mr. ZION, Mr. ESCH, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 11752. A bill to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 11753. A bill to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 11754. A bill to impose an excess profits tax on the income of corporations during the present emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11755. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 11756. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 11757. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCDADE:

H.R. 11758. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. MAILLIARD):

H.R. 11759. A bill to amend title III of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for a program of investment guarantees in Latin American countries to encourage local participation in self-help community development projects; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11760. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide financial assistance for education and information programs relating to drugs and their abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 11761. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors,

and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. RONAN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. PIKE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GRAY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. DIGGS):

H.R. 11762. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REES (for himself, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 11763. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11764. A bill to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of all levels of government, by providing Federal block grants for States and localities which take steps to modernize State and local government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that an expenditure otherwise allowable as a medical expense deduction shall not be disallowed on the ground that it is a personal, living, or family expense if it is made pursuant to the prescription or recommendation of a physician; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PELL, Mr. KEITH, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. BRAY):

H.R. 11766. A bill to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11767. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 11768. A bill to assist students who, to attend college, are relying on their own wage-earning capacity rather than depending on others; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11769. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11770. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED (for himself, Mr. EDMUNDSON, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 11771. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEED (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 11772. A bill to supplement the anti-trust laws of the United States by providing for fair competitive practices in the termination of franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 11773. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 11774. A bill to afford protection to the public from intrusion into their homes through the postal service of offensive sexually oriented mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. WADDIE, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CORMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GAIANO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. GROVER, Mrs. MAY, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 11775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 11776. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 748. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United

States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 749. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 750. Joint resolution to proclaim National Night Driving Safety Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 751. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.J. Res. 752. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. POWELL):

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution requesting that the President of the United States stop selecting and inducting individuals into the Armed Forces for a period of 180 days; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

199. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the age requirement in the aid to the permanently and totally disabled public assistance program, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 11777. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fredesvinda Mercedes Gonzalez-Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11778. A bill for the relief of Vincent Shau Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11779. A bill for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

127. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to impeachment proceedings, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JOHN JOSEPH CARDINAL WRIGHT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert in the Record another article regarding John Cardinal Wright, of Pittsburgh, Pa., so that his story is brought to the attention of the Members of Congress and the American people:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, May 4, 1969]

JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT—STILL IN TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE
(By Ann Carey)

An Irish-blooded priest whose favorite dish is Italian spaghetti, who keeps jelly beans in his living room and sniffs hyacinths every chance he gets—that's Pittsburgh's new cardinal.

Robust John Joseph Cardinal Wright, Boston born and bred and a 10-year resident of Pittsburgh as its eighth Catholic bishop, has impressed three popes and many bishops and cardinals with the scholarship of his writings.

The New York Times has called him "one of the most able administrators and thinkers in the American hierarchy."

His formal elevation six days ago to cardinal, bypassing the usual American step of being named archbishop, in a solemn, centuries-old ceremony in Rome's venerable Sistine Chapel, makes him one of the most powerful men in the Catholic Church.

But it's the cardinal's warm, merry "humanness" that has endeared him to people throughout the world, from a handful of Paris Boy Scouts he went camping with as a newly ordained priest in France to thousands of Pittsburghers in the second largest Catholic diocese in the country.