# 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.*

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

## 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 helpless, 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 nonprofit 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 percent 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 Members 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 supplemental 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 gentlemen 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:

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

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

"'(i) (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 (i) a person who voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any such hostile force, or (ii) 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 postwar 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 professional 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 consponsor 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 consponsor 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

(Eitorial 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 programed 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 substantial 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 benefiited 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:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | 1968 actual | 1969 estimate | 1970 estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| **FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT** | | | |
| International financial institutions: | | | |
| Investment in Inter-American Development Bank, obligations | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Subscription to the International Development Association, obligations | 104,000 | 160,000 | 160,000 |
| Investment in Asian Development Bank | 20,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 |
| Foreign assistance: | | | |
| Military assistance, obligations | 513,173 | 381,000 | 381,000 |
| Foreign military credit sales, obligations | | 296,000 | 275,000 |
| Liquidation of foreign military sales fund, executive, obligations | 213,322 | | |
| Advances, foreign military sales: procurement assistance, obligations | 1,048,207 | 885,000 | 950,000 |
| Economic assistance: | | | |
| Grants and other programs: | | | |
| Technical cooperation: | | | |
| East Asia | 44,216 | 47,250 | 55,300 |
| Near East and south Asia | 34,855 | 35,341 | 43,960 |
| Africa | 67,706 | 60,232 | 74,860 |
| Latin America | 1,150 | | |
| Interregional and special programs | 59,568 | 45,689 | 66,960 |
| American schools and hospitals abroad | 11,067 | 15,110 | 12,400 |
| Surveys of investment opportunities | 512 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| International organizations and programs, grants: | | | |
| United Nations development program | 75,000 | 70,300 | 85,000 |
| U.N. technical and operational assistance to the Congo | 2,150 | 500 | 500 |
| U.N. Relief and Works Agency | 13,300 | 13,300 | 13,000 |
| U.N. Children's Fund | 12,000 | 13,000 | 12,500 |
| International Atomic Energy Agency operational program | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| U.N. "peacekeeping": | | | |
| Emergency force | 5,197 | | |
| Cyprus | 1,162 | 6,300 | 6,300 |
| World food program | 2,000 | 1,300 | 1,500 |
| Indus Basin Development Fund, grant | 20,900 | 17,600 | 16,000 |
| International Secretariat for Volunteer Service | | 50 | 50 |
| U.N. Institute for Training and Research | 500 | 300 | 500 |
| World Health Organization, medical reserach | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Special contributions for Vietnam | 1,000 | 400 | 1,000 |
| U.N. population program | 500 | 500 | 2,500 |
| World Meteorological Organization, World Weather Watch | | 1,500 | 2,000 |
| U.N. special programs for Southern Africans | 50 | | 50 |
| International organizations and programs, loans, Indus Basin Development Fund | | 12,000 | 19,000 |

[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 | | | |
| Projects | 6,417 | 7,231 | 6,908 |
| Procurement for third countries | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 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 | 459,389 | 728,500 |
| Development Loan Fund, liquidation account: | | | |
| Loans repayable in dollars | 7,850 | 8,500 | 5,000 |
| Interest capitalized | 1,296 | ---- | ---- |
| Unapplied loan disbursements | 7 | ---- | ---- |
| Loans repayable in foreign currency | 21,003 | 21,230 | 18,528 |
| Interest capitalized | 557 | 540 | ---- |
| Change in selected resources | −41,300 | −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 | | | 4,150 |
| 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: Advancements 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 Oragnization | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES | | | |
| Total obligations (operations program) | 133,524 | 173,758 | 198,210 |
| Total obligations (capital outlay) | 2,391,856 | 2,829,578 | 2,767,700 |
| Total obligations (loan program) | 2,525,380 | 3,003,336 | 2,965,910 |
| 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 |
| FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION | | | |
| Advances and reimbursements: Technical assistance, Agency for International Development | 17 | 19 | 20 |
| Grand total obligations | 9,229,111 | 9,150,972 | 9,572,268 |

## 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. Persident 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 hunderds 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 managment 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. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. 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 facilities 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 FARBSTEIN,
*Member of Congress.*

---

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

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
*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 interrelated 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 "incorrigible" 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 or 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 activites, 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 apearing 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 indentifiable 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 expendtiures.)

(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 6

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.

Subesction (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 outstanding 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 without 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 nonpostal 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 substantive 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 I.Q.

(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 underpining 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 concluison:

"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 achivement 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 "achivement" 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 an-*

*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 commission by the Minister of Public Instruction in Paris for the explicit purpose of identifying children who were likely to fail 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 discriminations 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 at 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 Gibralter 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. Tuddenham (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 Wechler 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 proficiency 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.

$$\hat{r}_{12}=r_{tt}\sqrt{\frac{CA_1}{CA_2}}$$

where $\hat{r}_{12}$ = the estimated correlation between tests given at times 1 and 2.
$r_{tt}$ = 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 $CA_2$ is age 10, at which time the empirical value of $r_{12}$ 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., $r_{tt}>r_{12}>r^2_{tt}$). 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 chronologcial 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 diviation 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 ½ [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 interim correlations 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 ½. (Imagine the extreme case in which all item intercorrelations were perfect and the difficulty level of all items was ½. 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 ½ 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 overage 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 I 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 exthe 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 ½ to ¾ of 1 percent of the total population falls into the IQ range below 50; this is fewer than ⅓ of all individuals classed 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 feebleminded (IQs 50 to 75). Figure 3 shows the IQ distributions of the *siblings* of imbecile and feebleminded children (Roberts, 1952). Note that the siblings of imbeciles have a much higher average level of intelligence than the siblings of the feebleminded. 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 sibships. 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 readout 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 inellecual 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 charactertistics, 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,

$$V_P = \underbrace{\frac{(V_G + V_{AM}) + V_D + V_I}{V_H}}_{\text{Heredity}} + \underbrace{\frac{V_E + 2Cov_{HE}}{V_E}}_{\text{Environment}} + \underbrace{\frac{V_I + V_e}{\text{Error}}}_{\text{Error}} \quad (2)$$

where:

$V_P$ = phenotypic variance in the population
$V_G$ = genic (or additive) variance
$V_{AM}$ = variance due to assortative mating. $V_{AM} = 0$ under random mating (panmixia).
$V_D$ = dominance deviation variance
$V_I$ = epistatis (interaction among genes at 2 or more loci)
$V_E$ = environmental variance
$Cov_{HE}$ = covariance of heredity and environment
$V_I$ = true statistical interaction of genetic and environmental factors
$V_e$ = 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 overriden or "dominated" by the dominant gene. Thus, in terms of increments which genes add to the metric value of the phenotype, if r=o and D=1, then r+r=o, 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 constituting 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 excells 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 × 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 × 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 × environment interaction. Criticisms of the analysis of variance model for the components of phenotypic variance (e.g., Equation 2), put forth

[3] I 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 impiles 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 × 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 × 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:

$$H=\frac{(V_G+V_{AM})+V_D+V_i}{V_P-V_e} \qquad (3)$$

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 probabalistic 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 probabalistic 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 $\pi$ 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 determine 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 characterstic 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 ($r_{po}$) 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 ($r_{po}$) in fact closely approximate the values of $H$ as estimated by various 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 [1] |
|---|---|---|
| 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 H×E interaction ($V_I$) | 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 parentheses 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 ($H_B$) 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 Value [1]) 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 Value [2]) 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 | −0.01 | 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 | 3 | +.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.

[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:

$$H_N=\frac{(V_G+V_{AM})}{V_p-V_e}$$

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: 1.00−0.75=0.25. 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 correlations 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 varition 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 amout 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

---

[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 correspond 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 kindship 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 partialled 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, 1966). 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.

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 extreme 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 variaiton, 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 environmetnal 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 improbably 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 (Cravioto, 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 significantly 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 overexertion, 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 undertermined 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 sociologist to devise tests intended to eliminate SES differences in measured intelligence, none of these efforts has succeeded (Jenson 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 diffences 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 coedited 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 genic-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 students 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 cartilege, 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 essential 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 population! 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 × 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, Dever, 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 normallly 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 3½ 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 ($C_{ss}$) 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 $C_{ss}$ group, of course, received no enriched education. The initial average Stanford-Binet IQs of the E and $C_{ss}$ 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 $C_{ss}$ 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 its 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 potentialy 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 differents 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 evalution, 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 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 ahcievements, 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 heirarchial 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., & Engelmann, 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*, 1966, 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 Univer., 1963. Pp. 142–162.

Coleman, J. S., et al. *Equality of educational opportunity*. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, 1966.

Cooper, R., & Zubek, 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.*, 1968, 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. *Univer. of California Publ. in Psychol.*, Vol. 8, No. 2. Berkeley, Calif.: Univer. of California Press, 1955.

Glasman, L. D. A social-class comparison of conceptual processes in children's free re-

call. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univer. 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.

Guilford, 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: Univer. of Oregon Press, 1968. Pp. 1–23.

Heyns, O. S. *Abdominal decompression.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand Univer. 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 limtis 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 Reit, 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 Univer. 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 Uzgiris' 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 deescalate 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 Legion 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 reevaluate 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 AMVETS 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. WAGGONNER. 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 topmost 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 unequaled 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 wth 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 nonpartisan.

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.

Guided 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 Adiministrator 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 parliment." 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 be 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 DelVecchio 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 toil—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 descriminate, especially in its military, has descriminated against myself. I was not descriminated 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. Otepka," where Mr. Fortas played a crucial role after the assasination 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. Otepka 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. Otepka." 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. Otepka would be "left to Mr. Rusk", the source commented.

"BOBBY" BAKER

Another reason for President Johnson's "changing his mind" on Otto F. Otepka, 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 Otepka. The issue was clear that in this case it was "Bobby" Baker who would be saved and Otto Otepka 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 Counsel 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 "legitimatize" 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 "legimatizing" 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 ration 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 alertnesss, 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.

(o) 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 necessaries.

"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 frivolus 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, housekeeping, 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 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 public 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 atttiude 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 years 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 sufferage 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 extend 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 hypertricohology; 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 salacicus 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. ERLENBORN, 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 Secretray 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. FARBSTEIN, 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. BRADEMAS, 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. PELLY, 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 antitrust 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. WALDIE, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CORMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GIAIMO, 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.

When you want to find out how this much-lauded man is most often regarded, you talk to unwed mothers who have been at St. Roselia, to alcoholics, to taxi drivers and bus drivers, to militant blacks who got financial aid from him in the face of frowns of many, to his adoring household staff, to the mothers whose babies he has baptized at St. Paul's Cathedral on Easter.

And from them you get a picture of a man who squeezes hours from one of the busiest schedules in the City to make time for people.

"He didn't look at me like I was dirt. He kept making jokes and he even asked me to pray for him. Can you imagine that!" said a young woman who had an illegitimate child.

A mother whose baby he baptized exclaimed, "When I look at that man, I really feel I kind of know what Jesus must have been like. He's firm but he's as kind as God makes them."

A bus driver said after listening to a Wright sermon, "You get the feeling he's one of the best politicians around. You just feel he gets whatever he goes after. But I admire him for it."

The adulation, the limelight, the glowing adjectives—have they changed the man?

Leo Donnelly, his chauffeur and personal assistant who's been with him for 22 years, the nuns who run his house, the priests who assist him insist he's the same.

He still stops to talk to little children on the street. He still greets everyone he meets with a handshake or a hug and a "God bless you," and he still says goodbye with a hearty "Pray for me."

He ramrods through each day on a schedule that barely gives him time to brush his teeth and he does it with a joviality that turns glowers into beams wherever he goes.

The new cardinal is not a simple man, despite his frank openness.

Each time he makes news—especially when he wrote the U.S. bishops' qualified endorsement of Pope Paul's controversial encyclical forbidding artificial birth control—he has baffled some of the top journalists in the country by defying classification as either "liberal" or "conservative."

Robert Gruenberg of the Chicago Daily News Service was one of those who struggled unsuccessfully to pinpoint him and finally gave up.

"He is recognized as one of the more erudite men of the American Catholic establishment. . . . A study of his past pronouncements on various issues—from race to peace—would tempt the indiscriminating to place him in either the 'conservative' or the 'liberal' camp," the newsman wrote.

"The closest that one might come in describing him is as a 'hard-nosed dove' (on matters of war and peace) or as a Catholic 'Boston Brahmin' in matters of intellect."

Cardinal Wright says emphatically, "I despise labels. They're a lazy way for people to categorize. I much prefer to have ideas and men judged on their own merits."

The 11,000-word pastoral letter he wrote last fall emphasizing that the Church's traditional stand condemning contraception still applies.

But the letter also said that Catholic couples who practice contraception will not be turned away from the Church, which ties in with one of the cardinal's strongest beliefs.

"You cannot judge another man," he states with all the positiveness of a Harvard mathematician reciting the multiplication table.

"If history and experience has taught me anything, it's that the reasons why people do things are never what you suspect and never what they say," he said in a recent interview.

For all the complexities of his nature, ebullient Cardinal Wright nevertheless has an overriding philosophy that gives him a solid concrete foundation to what he says and does.

"You can't say no to life," he repeats. "You have to say yes to life and art and beauty and love."

Cardinal Wright doesn't believe that man is getting better and better, what he calls the "myth of progress."

Sitting with his leg curled up underneath him, he stared out the window. "I find wonderful examples of humanity in antiquity and I find all the examples of evil present today. And the reverse is true. Everything I'd want to ask God was asked by Job. The Hebrew prophets described the exact same social problems we have today.

But he admits there are special problems today. "We're in grave danger of being dehumanized by technocracy—not technology. It's the impersonalized, automated, IBM card-way people are being treated."

Cardinal Wright believes something else has happened to our society, something he thinks is far worse. He believes the U.S. has started to say "a qualified yes" to life. "That means we're sick because the next step is to say no."

He explains that one area where he thinks this has happened is in family life—birth control. "People are saying no to life—the next step is to start strangling babies after they're born if they're not wanted. Oh yes, I believe it's coming."

He foresees the end coming—"It happened in Greece."

He is convinced the continent of the 21st Century is Africa. "They're on the way up. They're saying yes to everything. The time will probably come when they start saying no and then the picture will pass to someone else."

When man starts trying to avoid pain by becoming inhibited and not saying yes, Cardinal Wright believes he's "over the hill."

The ruddy-faced cardinal himself appears to be a long way away from the hill.

This is a man who bristles with enthusiasm and zest for life, love, art, music, theater, good food and most of all people.

At 59 he's strong and healthy—but worried about being overweight. "You have to be careful if you want to stay around," he says with a faint sigh. The nuns who take care of his big, homey house on Warwick Terrace say he skimps on breakfast and lunch and only at dinner eats a full meal.

The eighth bishop of Pittsburgh was born in the Dorchester section of Boston on July 18, 1909. As the eldest of six children of John J. and Harriet L. Cokely Wright, he was a mixture of English and Irish ancestry but it was quickly observed he had a heavy dose of Irish wit.

His father attended Burdett Business College and was an accountant for a paper firm in Hyde Park, Mass. He died in 1962. His mother is very ill in a nursing home in Massachusetts.

Cardinal Wright has two sisters and three brothers, including a librarian and a physician, but none is in religious life.

Handsome and likable, young John Wright showed early signs of being highly intelligent and eargerly curious about the world and his place in it.

After going to Boston Latin School, he started out thinking he wanted to be a reporter. During college he worked on the night desk of a Boston newspaper.

The story persists that he changed his mind when sent to get a picture of a dead girl from the grief-stricken mother.

The 1931 yearbook of Boston College said in its capsule characterization of him: "Jack stands unopposed as the outstanding scholastic figure in the class." The cardinal shrugs that off as an attempt to offset the fact he was not exactly the school's sports star—he hated athletics.

He also used to be employed after school at the Hyde Park branch of the Boston Public Library for the hefty sum of 25 cents an hour.

It was from his father, an avid reader, that he learned to love books, devouring them by the shelfful.

An early riser who still nevertheless reads late into the night, he has kept many of the same habits he has always had—with a few exceptions. He no longer chases fires after listening to the police radio.

Since being ordained a priest in Rome in 1935 at the age of 26, his church career has sped ahead like greased lightning. His doctoral thesis was published as a book. He served as a priest in Scotland, England and France.

He taught philosophy at St. John's Seminary, and in his spare time taught Italian and poured forth a steady stream of pamphlets and articles on Catholic social teaching.

In 1950 he took over as the first bishop of the then brand new diocese of Worcester, Mass., where he became known as the "little man's pal."

Before he left in 1959 to head the six-county Pittsburgh Roman Catholic Diocese, he was named "citizen of the year."

He delighted his Worcester flock and won their affection with his corncob pipe, his knowledge of the cartoon character Charlie Brown, his teas for unwed mothers, his love of music, his New England frugality and his Boston-brogued charm.

But he also became known as a perceptive businessman in his dealings to build a new hospital and to rebuild a tornadoed college. His debating background always kept him garnering the last word.

Since he came to Pittsburgh—on St. Patrick's Day—he has been a consistent newsmaker, more for himself than his office.

Almost immediately he established a list of firsts.

He was the first Catholic bishop to visit the County Workhouse in its 93-year history and confirmed 21 inmates who were serving sentences on everything from murder to morals charges.

He was the first Catholic prelate to speak before a Methodist general conference in the 226 years of Methodism. And later he became the first Catholic bishop to speak at a Lutheran church convention in America.

He made 41 round trips to the Rome sessions of the Second Vatican Council where he served on the principal theological commission.

When he got back he conducted a night course to explain the council's declarations.

He still thinks the ideas of the historic council have not yet filtered down to all the people. He shrugs that "you can't expect instantaneous results from something that far reaching."

But he also adds, "Former councils lacked the means to communicate. It used to be hard to get the news. Now it's hard to get the news straight."

He says he means the news media present reactions to the news so fast that "before the real issues are clear, the bonfires have started."

The black-haired, big-eyed cardinal has consistently impressed others with his many interests.

Historians marvel at his collection of St. Joan of Arc artifacts, valued at well over $70,000 and the largest personal collection in the country.

He speaks fluent Italian and French and keeps informed on what's happening in the world—a throwback to his early newspaper days.

Asked to sum up Vatican II, an almost all-consuming interest for a long while, he said: "The 19th or 20th bishop of Pittsburgh, probably black, will say, I think, that we did a reasonably good job. It is a planting. It will take many years of weeding and cultivating before reaping a harvest."

He has been outspoken on social issues.

In 1966 he called for a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam. He refused to talk about race unless it was the "human race." He said

Pope Paul VI gained a "heroic stature" for his stand against birth control. He told organized labor it had to fight for social justice.

In Pittsburgh too he crusaded against the name "morals court," saying it was being used to try other offenses and was ruining reputations. He was successful in getting it changed.

He has waged a consistent fight against alcoholism and has backed proposals helping alcoholics' rehabilitation.

As bishop he banned uniform apparel for children receiving their first communion and ordered a 10 per cent tithe on diocesan collections for "neighbors in need."

Cardinal Wright's soaring kite has a lengthy tailstring of honorary degrees and merit citations.

His hard-driving demands are sometimes hard on his staff and he can be inflexible in how he wants things done.

But John Joseph Cardinal Wright is also a kind man. The men and women who have known him the longest love him—perhaps the best testimonial of all.

The key to Cardinal Wright may be in one statement he made in a recent interview. "I love the Catholic Church as I love nothing else," he said earnestly. "I don't think of the Church as an organization—an institution. To me it's the personal presence of Christ in history.

"I see all truth and all faiths related to the Church and I think the Church has never been more powerful, more influential in the world. The pope is a symbol of permanence and stability in the midst of chaos."

This is a man who has stacked all the zeal and energy and devotion most men put into family or a career or making money into his religion without becoming a fanatic.

He is getting ready now to leave Pittsburgh. On the day he learned Pope Paul named him a cardinal, he said, "I'd spend the rest of my life in Pittsburgh." But he was quick to add, "But I'm ready to go wherever the pope wants me. We priests accept our assignments without knowing much about them."

But he's looking forward to the challenges and opportunities of Rome as he has always looked forward to every big step in his life.

In his words, "You have to keep saying yes or you're over the hill."

And John Joseph Cardinal Wright is a church man who isn't ready to start slipping down the other side.

---

## COMMISSIONER BENNETT TO RETIRE

---

## HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a notable career in Federal Government service comes to a close this coming Saturday. Robert L. Bennett, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, will retire after 36 years, largely in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Commissioner Bennett is an Indian and a graduate of the respected Haskell Institute at Lawrence, Kans. He progressed through ranks of the BIA to become a skilled and visionary Commissioner.

The Commissioner recently delivered a speech at Dartmouth College where he told of the challenges and achievements of Indians.

I include the text of his address in the RECORD:

CULTURAL FACTORS IN THE EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS

It might be said that we are celebrating two events today—not only the 200th anniversary of Dartmouth College, but also the revival, during the 1960's, of public concern for the educational well-being of American Indian youth. Because Dartmouth was founded with a primary purpose of providing higher education for Indians, I am most gratified to have this distinguished forum to discuss publicly those aspects of Indian education which particularly require the attention of groups such as this.

Since both Dartmouth and the American Indians pre-date the American Republic itself, it is plain that both possess a remarkable ability to adjust to the ever-changing shape and pace of America's cultural, social and political life. In our time, however, those changes seem to be coming so swiftly and so irrevocably that we are all put to test to maintain the socio-political equilibrium. Dartmouth, like other educational institutions, is not immune from the pressure. Nor are the Indian citizenry of this Nation. I am convinced that the responses of the great colleges like Dartmouth to the needs of people such as Indians will be a significant factor in determining the form and substance of the new American society.

Although Indians are a very small minority in this country—the Indian population is well under a million—there is considerable new political action taking place among the Indian communities. For more than a hundred years Indians had remained the stolid and silent prototypes of what the white man alleged they were. But, today, Indian young people have moved in upon the fronts of community action. The Indian warrior today is fighting his great battle on the social level. He has abandoned the arrow and the musket for books and public platforms.

The transition from obscurity to a conspicuous role in contemporary political affairs has not been an easy one for the new generation of Indian youth. It has been accompanied by some confusion as to goals, some hostility to the dominant society, and a great deal of defensiveness in the way Indians see themselves. These are traits that characterize many of the social activists in this country today; but in the Indian they are often more acute because the culture gap between Indians and other Americans is wide and deep.

There are fundamental differences, however, between Indian social action and some of the current social movements by other groups. Indian youth are motivated by the desire to *stabilize* their communities, not disrupt them; to make them more economically viable rather than more dependent upon government largesse. They are turning to the government for increasing help but are rejecting the paternalism that was the core of the special federal-Indian relationship for so many decades.

"We are building, not burning," is the way one youthful Indian leader puts it. It is indeed true. From Florida to Alaska, there are evidences that building is going on in Indian communities. Not merely construction of facilities, like homes and schools and water and power lines and roads. Community spirit is building up, too. The voices of the Indian people are beginning to be heard on matters of resources development, environmental control, and education of their children.

Such constructive activities as these can be sustained only through an educated leadership. Indians understand the tremendous importance to themselves of quality education and equality of educational opportunity. The various tribes invest about $20 million annually in college scholarships; and during the past three years that I have served as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Affairs contributed another $10 million for higher education aid.

The vast majority of young Indian men and women today are seeking not to close the gates of the colleges, but to force open gates to institutions that have hitherto had few if any Indians among the student ranks.

Even so, only about 20 percent of the Indian college age population continues schooling beyond high school, whereas the national rate exceeds 40 percent. There are serious blocks to their success in school and college—financial need being one, but the culture gap being an even greater obstacle. For this reason, the educational needs of American Indians must necessarily be viewed from the perspective of the American Indian culture, and the special education requirements it imposes upon our schools.

This is the area in which Dartmouth College could, with singular appropriateness, assume a leading role in broadening educational opportunities for Indians. What could be more in keeping with the spirit of this 200th anniversary celebration than to sponsor a nationwide effort to develop educational programs that accommodate to the needs of Indian students? The focus is needed equally at the college preparatory and the college levels.

Dartmouth is already moving in such a direction. I commend to the attention of all communities the program called A.B.C.—"A Better Chance." It is a program that works with maximum effectiveness when a high school and a college both participate. Dartmouth is participating in A.B.C. with the town of Hartford, Vermont, situated across the Connecticut River from Dartmouth's site in Hanover, New Hampshire. Hartford has opened its high school—and, more than that, its heart—to educationally and socially disadvantaged youngsters from many parts of the country. This year Hartford is providing schooling, board and room, for ten Indian boys, and Dartmouth is providing tutorial services needed by those boys to qualify them for entrance into the College.

Dr. McGean, Secretary of the College—and to whom I am indebted for the invitation to be the speaker at this bicentennial—informs me that the townspeople of Columbia are also eager to launch an A.B.C. program. I hope it will be possible. There would be no more fitting locale than here, where Dartmouth's founder, Dr. Wheelock, began his teaching services to Indians as head of Moor's Charity School more than two centuries ago.

The need for charity is hardly less today than it was in Dr. Wheelock's day. I do not mean charity in the narrow sense that implies an obligation of the more affluent to provide for the poor, but charity in the broad sense of kindliness and understanding. These are the qualities that Indian students need most desperately to feel within the school environment; because when they are absent the relevance of education declines precipitously for them. This is a *cultural* response on their part which cannot be ignored in our desire to stimulate the intellectual response.

Indians are frustrated by the tendency of most other Americans either to romanticize and stylize them on the one hand, or, on the other, to minimize their place in our society. Even after 200 years, and in spite of the purposeful efforts of many Indian leaders today to be involved with the non-Indian world, most Indians are still a people apart, still strangers in their own land.

Even while adopting the outward aspects of modern American life, Indians today, as a whole, are probably less fully attuned to the non-Indian lifeway than many of them were in the early part of the last Century. Some of the Eastern tribes in those days assumed with ease and great success such European culture add-ons as systematic farming and formal schooling.

Back in the days when Oklahoma was Indian Territory, Indian groups operated schools and colleges that later formed the

core of the State's public school system. This kind of *leadership* in education on the part of Indians has been absent for many, many years, except in individual instances. It is only now beginning to reappear, currently in the form of Indian demands for control of elementary and secondary schools serving their children. The new interest in education is prompted by a sense of frustration with the average school program that ignores the Indian cultural background.

Indians today feel threatened by the pressures now forcing total assimilation, because they fear the loss of their self-identity. Being *Indian* and being aware of it sustained them during years of oppression. They challenge the motives of those who would make them less Indian. They seek from education the ability to be both Americans *and* Indians. An either/or choice is intolerable to them. Because Indian history, and Indian contributions to the building of this Nation, are an integral part of our national history, Indians ask that these facts be fully acknowledged within the framework of our educational programs. Only when other Americans recognize the full significance of the Indian role in the making of the nation will the Indian people of today be accorded their rightful place of dignity and social acceptance within the American ecumene.

The Indian's determination to retain his identity has contributed to a social phenomenon in modern America—the revival of tribalism. To be sure, today's tribalism has little in common with primitive tribalism, other than to retain remnants of the religious orientation of the Indian society. Today's tribal structures are usually modeled upon American governmental forms, and the objectives and services of tribal governments are, broadly speaking, comparable to those of county governments. The new tribalism is multi-ethnic in character, as is the Indian cutlure itself. Indian lifeways have been modified by the Spanish horse and Spanish weaving and by the industrious, acquisitive English mores. They have also been modified by the trade and agriculture schools of the 19th and early 20th Centuries, and by commercialized farming and motorized deep-sea fishing; by World War II and the enlistments of thousands of young Indian men; by air transportation and rocketry. Native Alaskans man the defense early warning system on the Arctic, Navajos and others assemble intricate electronic devices for space exploration, and the tribes are turning to computers to help keep account of their natural resources.

But the new Indian doesn't always feel comfortable in his new role. The tenor of Indian thinking is well expressed by a student who recently graduated from the federal Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe. He composed a brief piece of poetry that is memorable to me not alone because it demonstrates literary artistry but also because of is revealing undertone of bravado. It goes like this:

"We shall learn all these devices the white man has.
"We shall handle his tools for ourselves.
"We shall master his machinery and his inventions, his skills, his medicine, his planning;
"But we'll retain our beauty.
"And still be Indian."

Some Indians, like myself, walk always in two worlds, trying to maintain the perspectives of both and to draw unto ourselves the best of both. This is not always done with ease, yet it is the course that must be walked by all American Indian children growing up today. It will be harder for them than it was for me, because the gap between the traditional Indian lifeway and the new technological society is far greater than was the gap between rural and city life in the earlier part of this Century. Some of the traits and values that are the very core of contemporary American society are totally alien to their Indian upbringing. They must learn to live by the new code, yet their heritage cautions them against foolishly abondoning the basic values of the old.

To be sure, thousands upon thousands of Indians have already become a part of present-day city and suburban American life. But many thousands more remain in their traditional home environs, on or near their reserved lands. They live in a sub-culture which is too often made up of the worst aspects of American civilization mitigated only by remnants of a simpler and more orderly lifeway. Poverty is the common chord shared by nearly all rural Indians today. The economic depression of the more isolated communities is exceeded only by the atmosphere of social depression. These are the conditions that today's Indian leadership is trying to combat.

From such rural environments comes the booming Indian population. Seventy-five percent of today's Indians is under the age of 25 years!

These are the young people for whom I have such great concern. These young people are the hope for rebuilding the Indian-owned lands and for the making of a new Indian culture that can live compatibly and coequally with the whole American community.

These Indian youth are usually very sensitive—sometimes hyper-sensitive—to the differences between themselves and others. They tend to deal with slights, real or imagined, by snubbing the offender forever. This is a form of censure that derives from the Indian culture; but outside the Indian culture it has the unfortunate effect of exhausting the patience and goodwill of many non-Indians. Such niceties of social behavior point up the culture difference between Indians and other Americans.

Although Indian students are attending colleges and universities today in unprecedented numbers, many find the experience an endurance test that exceeds their capacity. Very few institutions—either secondary or collegiate—have attempted seriously to help them through the adjustment period. They need academic help to enable them to progress in the classrooms, and they need social help in accommodating to the alien patterns of student life.

Most high schools, and colleges as well, tend to polarize rather than synthesize the cultural differences between Indian students and others. Perhaps this is a large part of the reason why so few Indians are to be found today in colleges like Dartmouth.

It may also be argued, of course, that Indians are not in the Ivy League because there are no longer many Indians in the East. It is true that most tribes, including those for whom Dartmouth was founded, were long ago moved westward. They generally tend today to think of themselves as westerners and to look only to western schools for their education. Even my own people, the Oneidas, to whom upstate New York was homeland, are now very much a part of the Wisconsin scene.

Indian students today are found predominantly in schools in the west—in the State universities and land grant colleges; and in such places as Fort Lewis College in Durango, Colorado, or Bacone College in Oklahoma, both of which were, like Dartmouth, founded largely for purposes of providing higher education for Indians. A few institutions in the West, most notably thus far in Arizona and New Mexico, have established special centers for furtherance of Indian affairs studies. The University of New Mexico has established a special program in law studies for American Indians, to encourage the entrance of more Indians into the legal profession. Arizona State University and the the University of Arizona both encourage Indians to enter the teaching profession and are developing new programs for teachers of Indian children which include the teaching of English as a second language and the teaching of Indian history.

Indians have not found a like degree of interest and concern in the institutions located in more easterly parts of the country. I wish a more intensive effort could be made to attract Indians to schools outside their own regions because the ultimate effect would be to give tremendous new breadth to Indian thinking and to Indian understanding of their own country.

It is not enough to offer scholarships, grants and loans to the Indian students who are the cream of graduating classes of the better high schools and academies. My concern is that the less well academically and socially prepared have an opportunity to broaden their backgrounds so that they, too, can compete successfully in such academic environments as Dartmouth offers.

They need such programs as A.B.C. They need, also, programs such as the transitional year that Yale has instituted. I have no doubts about the ultimate abilities of Indian children to perform as capably as any others in the classrooms. In fact, in the earlier elementary years they do somewhat better than average. The slump comes in the early 'teens, when chronic deficiencies in mastering the English language are compounded by chronic feelings of social frustration.

Within the school environment, whether it be a public high school or a private academy or a college, Indian students need to be re-assured that they truly belong within the American society. They need to know that their teachers and their peers hold them in regard for their own worth as individuals. It is not enough to pay them passing tribute because they are the First Americans; they ask to be recognized as a vital part of the fabric of America today.

What Indian youth hope to find in school is the experience of achievement that will sustain them and help obliterate the feeling of being born losers that engulfed their parents and their grandparents.

I believe my observations are sufficient to suggest ways in which the educational institutions of this country can help Indians toward the feeling and the reality of achievement.

As for the general public, typified by the townspeople of Columbia, Connecticut, there are other ways to help. The A.B.C. program is one. Your continuing public awareness and active interest in Indian education is another.

Your tax dollars are contributing to the education of about 100,000 or more Indian youngsters in public high schools throughout the country. Federal aid is available to those schools, often to a greater extent than it is employed, to provide the special language and counseling and related supplementary education services that many Indians require. You can help assure that funds are used more effectively for Indians in public schools.

Your tax dollars are also contributing to the education of about 50,000 Indian youngsters in the federal day and boarding schools that serve Indians who cannot attend public schools—either because none are available or because their needs are such that they require supplementary services not provided by their public schools. Federal boarding schools today operate on a per capita student budget of about $1,650 annually—half the amount expended in the operation of a first-rate private preparatory school. We *cannot* do justice to Indian youth on such a pennypinching scale. The schools need expert counselors and corps of teacher specialists in all fields—the price for which comes high, and the competition for which is usually won by the affluent and progressive high school systems in more urban areas.

Where there is the will, a way can usually be devised. Indian youth today have the will to build a better world for themselves and their people. You, the public, can help pave

the way, by being informed and concerned. I have confidence that the educational community of America—and the general public—will respond to the yearning and the need of Indian young people and pave the way for more of them to move out of the shadows of limited educational opportunity. When all of them have access to the best in education this country has to offer, and the most they can absorb, then the Indian people will no longer feel like strangers in their own land.

In any way that I can help, I shall always do so to the ultimate of my own ability and influence, for the problem of making quality education available to Indian children is always the matter of uppermost concern to me.

In a sense, this is my valedictory. At the end of this month, I plan to withdraw from my position as Commissioner of Indian Affairs. I shall not, however, withdraw from active participation in efforts to foster the betterment of the Indian citizenry of this country. For most of the 35 years I have given to public service, the service has been in the area of Indian affairs. It has been my life—and my life interest will go on. Perhaps, with release from the administrative responsibilities, will come the ability to be more active within the general community—and so I look forward to closer contact with interested people such as yourselves.

And, because old Indians never die, I look forward to the next 200 years of friendship with Dartmouth.

---

## SEX EDUCATION—PARENTS TAKE ACTION

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the battle by concerned parents to stop immorality and perversion from entering their schools is now nationwide.

The unfortunate situation is that in most States instead of the sex panderers seeking to legitimatize their nefarious design on youth they have been able to sneak into the education field and force the outraged parents to come to the defense of their children by restricting and outlawing the pornographic education.

It is unfortunate that many of these concerned parents have not yet followed the example of those who brought suit in the name of religious freedom under the Constitution to protect their children from God in the schools. Further, in many States it is a criminal offense for anyone to contribute to the delinquency of a minor child, even in the guise of "education."

Clearly the extremists in the field of perverting the minds of our youth under the guise of sex education programs have disturbed a hornet's nest and it is probably only a matter of time until criminal actions and other litigation arises. And I feel confident that once this evil monster is brought out into the open with all of its unwholesome and unnatural objectives it will be completely removed from any program of compulsory education.

Mr. Speaker, I include, following my remarks, a resolution from the Missourians for National Security, a letter from Mrs. Frances H. Purcell, of Rock Island, Ill., and a news clipping from the local paper.

The courts were used to get God out of schools—surely the courts can be used to get compulsory pornography out.

The material referred to follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
*May 17, 1969.*

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
*House of Representatives,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. RARICK: For what assistance it may be worth to you in connection with your House Resolution 329, there follows the text of a resolution adopted by Missourians for National Security:

"Whereas Missourians for National Security have become aware of a massive drive to establish compulsory and detailed sex education in the public schools of our Nation beginning with kindergarten pupils, such drive primarily being led by SIECUS, and

"Whereas we approve the teaching of physical hygiene and proper health habits as well as biological facts at suitable ages, we are unalterably opposed to the promotion of the "new morality" regarding intersexual relations, perversions, and/or other "situation ethics" as expounded by SIECUS in the kindergarten or elementary grades, and

"Whereas we are in accord with Psychiatrist William McGrath, M.D., of Phoenix, Arizona, who stated 'Premature interest in sex is unnatural and will arrest or distort the development of the personality. Sex education should not be foisted upon children; should not begin in the grade schools. Anyone who would deliberately arouse the child's curiosity or stimulate his unready mind to troubled sex preoccupations ought to have a millstone tied around his neck and be cast into the sea,' therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That Missourians for National Security, by unanimous vote, go on record in full support of House Resolution 329, which would establish a ten-man committee to conduct a thorough and penetrating investigation into the operations and tax-exempt status of SIECUS."

Sincerely,

HOWARD ROBB,
*Chairman, Missourians for National Security.*

---

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.,
*May 15, 1969.*

Attorney General JOHN N. MITCHELL,
*U.S. Department of Justice,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL: Sex education courses have been introduced into the curriculum of the State of Illinois School District #41, County of Rock Island, City of Rock Island, public schools.

These sex education courses and the instructional material used in said courses has been approved by the office of the Superintendent of Education and the Board of Education of said public school district.

Staff members of the Superintendent of Education Office and duly elected School Board of Education members have publicly stated that the sex education courses are permissive; that parents of minor children are informed of the content of the instructional material being used in sex education courses; that they are permitted to view all audio-visual, visual aid and textbook material used in the sex education course before any part of it is used in the instruction of their minor child.

These same persons have publicly stated that no Religious Morality Guidelines are taught, nor can they be, since by law, No Religion can be taught in public schools.

Having given careful consideration to the above statements, I, Frances H. Purcell, citizen of the United States of America, State of Illinois, County of Rock Island, City of Rock Island, do herewith petition the Attorney General of these United States for a redress of grievances in behalf of my minor child, Mildred E. Lawrence, for the following reasons:

(1) I was not afforded the opportunity to preview ALL sex education instructional material being used in the eleventh grade of the Rock Island Senior High School before said material was taught my minor child, a duly enrolled student of said grade in said school.

(2) I did not receive a notice from any member of the Rock Island Senior High School administrative staff, faculty, superintendent of education staff or from any member of the Illinois Public School District #41 prior to the sex education course being taught my minor child, *nor did other eleventh grade students' parents.*

(3) I did not know my minor child was receiving said sex education instruction until two days before the completion of a six-week presentation of said instruction in a required course of study, physical education.

(4) I was not afforded the opportunity to have my minor child excused from the sex education course.

(5) Since my minor child was given the sex education instruction *without my knowledge or consent,* I have viewed the audio-visual and text book material used in said instruction and have found them to be offensive, objectionable, and completely contrary to the biblical Christian religious morality guidelines in which I believe and have instilled in my minor child.

(6) In the textbook, *Toward Adulthood,* by Alice M. Call, I find the morality guidelines set forth by Miss Call, humanist religion promoter Lester A. Kirkendall, who is a director of the *American Humanist Association* listed in Gale Research Company's book, *National Organizations of the U.S.,* under "Religious Organizations", and Irving Tebor completely unacceptable, therefore protest these having been taught my minor child without my knowledge and consent.

(7) I find the series of six "Basis for Sex Morality Series" filmstrips narrated by "convinced Humanist and unashamed of it" Dr. Bryan Green of Birmingham, England, offensive, lewd, suggestive, off-color, atheistic, anti-Holy Biblical, and immoral according to my religious beliefs. I therefore protest this series having been shown my minor child in a public school without my knowledge or consent.

Whereas atheistic, anti-Holy Biblical Humanist Religion indoctrination has been forced upon my minor child in a public school without my knowledge or consent, I do

Herewith charge any and all persons, individually and collectively, who are or have been performing the teaching of, causing the teaching of, supplying material for the teaching thereof, and publicly promoting the teaching of humanistic religious morality guidelines to my minor child in the State of Illinois Public School District #41 Rock Island Senior High School with a flagrant violation of my God-given parental rights to prevent the Humanist Religion Morality being taught my minor child, and I

Further charge any and all aforementioned persons, individually and collectively with a flagrant violation of the religious freedom rights of my minor child as set forth in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

I respectfully request you, Mr. Attorney General, to hear my petition for a redress of grievances as guaranteed under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America in behalf of my minor child, Mildred E. Lawrence.

I further respectfully request that you use all powers of your office for the purpose of issuing an immediate injunction forbidding the teaching of the humanist religion mo-

rality under the guise of sex education, family life, sociology, psychology, physical education, and/or any and all other courses of elective and/or required curriculum now being used or ever to be used in taxpayer-supported public schools located in any and all fifty states of these United States of America.

Respectfully submitted in behalf of my minor child, Mildred E. Lawrence, this 15th day of May, 1969 A.D.

FRANCES H. PURCELL.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 27, 1969]

ABOUT 700 HEAR CRITICISM OF SEX COURSES LAW

About 700 persons crowded into a Rockville junior high school auditorium last night and listened with approval to indictments of a 1967 Maryland law requiring sex courses in all public schools.

Two ministers, two Baltimore physicians and a suburban newspaper publisher criticized the law as a moral and political encroachment on parental duties.

They said it preempts a parent's right to teach his child about sex when, where and how he chooses, and dispenses with moral strictures.

The Rev. Richard Grammer, pastor of a Glen Burnie Baptist church, said the sex program is part of a "new morality" that has become "a raging cancer eating into the structure of our nation."

He said public school sex education is related to the "topless and bottomless bars . . . the see-through dress . . . and erotic publications—from Playboy to hard-form pornography."

Although the law stipulates that sex programs be taught in all grades, even kindergarten, some school boards have taken time in implementing the courses. Dr. James Sensenbaugh, superintendent of Maryland public schools, last month urged administrators to be flexible in administering programs.

Howard Moses, a neurologist at Johns Hopkins Hospital, attacked the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) as infiltrating the schools and encouraging the "amoral" system.

He said some SIECUS officials help operate Sexology Magazine, which he described as "the worst smut and grime that you've ever run across." School libraries, he maintained, are loaded with SIECUS materials.

Grammer and Leo D. Paulin, publisher of a chain of Montgomery County newspapers, said an original rationale of the program—that it would reduce illegitimate pregnancies and venereal disease—has been discredited elsewhere.

Washington has had sex education in its schools since 1959 but promiscuity among teenagers is on the increase, Paulin said.

Two speakers recommended that children be withdrawn from sex classes, as the law allows. But Moses said every course is "imbued with sex education" and that the program would inevitably affect children.

He said qualifications of those who teach and plan the program are a serious problem.

The audience at Julius West Junior High, asked to provide funds for literature to appeal the law, donated more than $426.

---

## WISDOM

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, every now and again one of our younger constituents writes to us to share a wisdom which transcends their age.

This month I received a striking letter from Miss Ann Hederson, a sixth-grade student at Wildwood School in Piedmont, Calif.

Ann Hederson addressed herself to the pollution of San Francisco Bay, but it could just have well been any other bay in the country. In six short lines she conveyed just about all that needs be said on why we must immediately act to bring an end to the pollution of our environment.

I commend these few lines of verse from my sixth-grade constituent to the Members of this House and to the readers of this RECORD, and include her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

DEAR MR. COHELAN:

Soon all the people on this earth,
Will very likely die of thirst,
For we were not made to live this way,
With polluted water in our bay,
Write this poem is all I can do,
So then the rest is up to *you*.

Sincerely,

ANN HEDERSON,
*Piedmont, Calif.*

---

## MRS. JOHN CURRY, OF GREENWOOD, IND., SUGGESTS TRIBUTE TO EISENHOWER

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many suggestions have been made for memorials and tributes to General Eisenhower and one of my constituents, Mrs. John Curry, of Greenwood, Ind., has come up with an idea I wish to bring to the attention of all our citizens.

Mrs. Curry's suggestion could quite easily be put into practice without legislation, by communities, groups, and individuals. Raising the flag on Father's Day as a special tribute to General Eisenhower would be most fitting, I am sure, and I am happy to commend her idea to everyone. Her letter follows:

MARCH 28, 1969.

DEAR SIR: Fifteen minutes ago I heard about the death of President Eisenhower over the television. I must say that it was a shock to hear about it. I was praying for a speedy recovery for him. For as a young citizen he meant a lot to me. I don't know why I have waited so long to do what I am going to ask of you now.

It all started back 10 years ago in 1959, when I was in grade school. I wrote a letter to the President about a clipping that I had seen in the newspaper concerning Fathers Day. The article was about the flag being raised on Mothers Day and all other National Holidays, but why not on Fathers Day? I was only eight at this time, but it had me wondering why this was so.

On October 6, 1959, I received my answer from him. He said that he appreciated my interest in writing to him about the flag. He inclosed a White House card with his letter. On the card it read, with best wishes, Dwight D. Eisenhower. I can't tell you how thrilled I was with that.

I then wrote back to him and asked him how I would go about having this day be placed on the National Calendar. On July 8, 1960, I received another letter from the President. He said that it would be necessary for it to receive the endorsement of the Congress. He also suggested that I might write to the Representative from my district or to one of the Senators from my State about my request.

So now is the time for me to write. It may seem very, very small to you, for I know that he will have monuments erected in his memory, but I want the world to know that there are some real devoted young Americans left.

I'm trying to ask you if you can have this day put on the National Calendar, and have the Flag raised on this day in Honor and Memory of this wonderful, wonderful man? If you could have this done for me I would be so grateful. It would be a tribute to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, from a young but very proud American. I'm proud to be living in a country like this, and it is men like this man that made it this kind of a country.

Thank you.

MRS. JOHN CURRY.

Greenwood, Ind.

---

## PROF. ROBERT EISNER OF NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY OPPOSES TAX SURCHARGE AND INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 6, 1969*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Robert Eisner, professor of economics at Northwestern University, has prepared a cogent statement on fiscal policy in which he sets forth his reasons for opposing the extension of the tax surcharge and of certain excise taxes, and for supporting repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit. I commend his statement to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT EISNER

I am happy to explain my opposition to extension of the 10% tax surcharge and certain excise tax rates and my support of repeal of the 7% investment tax credit.

The essential considerations in coming to a decision on any tax proposal must be the following: 1) For what will the resources transferred as a consequence of the tax be used? 2) What will be the overall effect on the general levels of employment, output and prices? 3) Is the proposal equitable in the light of reasonable alternatives? A decision cannot, however, be based on economic judgment alone. We must accordingly be realistic and accurate in our appraisal of other governmental actions likely to be influenced by tax actions and we must be open and frank with regard to our political or ethical preferences and prejudgments.

We start from the economic argument that extension of the surcharge and certain excise tax rates are not economically indicated unless we presuppose continued high and even growing levels of Federal expenditures. If Federal expenditures are cut significantly, extension of current high tax rates would prove both unnecessary and harmful.

Now, it is a useful exercise in college courses in the principles of economics to elucidate the likely effects of tax rate changes upon the economy on the assumption that "other things" and, particularly, the rate of government expenditures, are unchanged. In our real political economy, however, it is essential to recognize that government expenditures need not be and are not likely to be unaffected by changes in tax rates. A much more realistic assumption on which to base

our analysis would be that higher tax rates would give this Administration (and any Administration) more opportunity for higher government expenditures.

Here we must be frank about our political preferences. There are certain types of increases in government expenditures or subsidies to private expenditures which I would welcome. There is very much to be done, and the hour is late, to meet pressing domestic needs. Each of us may differ somewhat as to exact orders of priority, but there is widespread recognition of pressing needs to solve the devasting problems of our cities, to educate our youth, to improve transportation, to combat pollution, and to house this generation and the next. The extents to which these and other tasks should be undertaken entirely out of government revenues or via tax incentives and subsidies to private enterprises are largely, or though undoubtedly not entirely, technical questions which can be reasonably well resolved once there is common agreement as to purpose.

The current surcharge, however, has not been imposed as a means of raising revenues or freeing resources to meet domestic needs. It has rather been imposed as a consequence of the demands of our military venture in Vietnam, and its proposed continuance is clearly associated with the continuance of that venture. It behooves all of us who are anxious to see this costly drain on American lives and fortunes ended speedily to do nothing to facilitate its continuance. The American people were told that the surcharge was a one-year measure when it was enacted. President Nixon indicated in his campaign that he would end the surcharge. He has also indicated his intention of bringing the war in Vietnam to an end. There should be no two ways about it. The surcharge should end and the war should end. Continuation of the surcharge runs a grave risk of facilitating the endless continuation of the some thirty billion dollars per year of spending in connection with the war which has brought our economy and the American people to so many of their present difficulties.

I am in fact hopeful that the war will be rapidly diminished in scope and soon ended. This Committee and the Congress have the responsibility to take economic measures to encourage that outcome. It will be argued in some quarters that the proper place to curb expenditures not deemed in the public interest is at the expenditure or authorization level and not in tax policy. I find this argument at best politically unrealistic and at worst hypocritical, where advanced by those who lack any real concern for curbing the expenditures in question. As the Congress well knows, it is difficult to cut specific expenditures and all the more difficult in a period of war tension to cut expenditures in a way that many voters would believe, however falsely in my opinion, would injure our brave fighting men. The American people are upset at high taxes and there is a real political opportunity now to act in a way which will both relieve them of some of their tax burdens and exert pressure to end the painful and unpopular war which has done so much to create them.

While on sober reflection, one would base the case of the connection between taxes and government expenditures on fundamental political and economic considerations, it is worthwhile to note that the Secretary of Defense asserted recently that our B–52 raids in South Vietnam are being curtailed somewhat out of budgetary considerations. If, in his judgment, such budgetary considerations can limit the level of violence in Vietnam, despite the huge amounts of money that have been made available to pursue the war, refusal to renew the surcharge, which has been clearly recognized as tied to the war, should be an effective way to bring about the speedy end to hostilities which almost all of us desire so urgently. When as free private individuals we decide that we do not want to have something we do not spend the the money for it. At the level of government we should act no differently. The surcharge can be supported only as a means of financing continued high levels of military activity in Vietnam and corresponding American casualties.

The Secretary of Defense has made another recent statement which is relevant. He has argued that even with the end of the war our extremely high levels of military expenditures, by far the highest in the world, should be maintained. There is proper concern in the Congress and in the nation at large at the amount of our military budget. We have all paid too little attention to the warning of the late President Eisenhower against the dangers of a powerful military-industrial complex. If we believe that our military expenditures, even aside from Vietnam, have exceeded all bounds of efficient provision of security for the American people, it is important again that our tax policy be consistent with efforts to bring our defense expenditures and, with it, our general military posture into conformity with our real self interest. Extension of the surcharge would only encourage those, in and out of the government, including many with their own private fortunes at stake, to move quickly to take any savings from the reduction and end of hostilities in Vietnam and dissipate them in a new, exceedingly costly and dangerous escalation of the arms race.

It is widely claimed that extension of the surcharge is necessary to combat inflation. I argued repeatedly [1] that enactment of the surcharge would do little to curb inflation which was consequent upon past escalation of the war and was sustained by continued expenditure in its pursuit. Continuation of the surcharge now, if coupled with continuation of the war, will again do little to curb inflation. The one sure and quick way to end inflation is to end the war. And with this we will end the painful distortions in our economy, such as high rates of interest, with which we are concerned.

There are indeed other arguments against continuance of the surcharge with which I am sympathetic. These relate to the uneven and inequitable nature of our tax burden. It is improper to continue a surcharge on the ordinary income of the great mass of the American people and of all of our business corporations and hence, indirectly, those who own them and those who buy their products, when tax loopholes and what amounts to cost-plus government contracts permit a significant minority to make huge gains and pay very little in taxes. This is apparently not the occasion for any extended analysis of the problems of tax reform, but I should call attention briefly to two matters close to my own past and present research, with which I am particularly familiar.

First, I must point out that high rates of taxation along with the availability of loopholes have encouraged wealthy individuals to take increasing portions of what economists would recognize as true income in forms which are not taxable and frequently not even counted as income for tax purposes or in our measurements of personal and national income. Most conspicuous and substantial are the huge amounts of income now enjoyed in the form of capital gains, both realized and unrealized. While these vary from year to year, it is clear even from preliminary estimates that they have been averaging proportions of our national income which could lead to current magnitudes in the neighborhood of 50 billion dollars and more. Additions to wealth on the part of most of us, whether to be spent soon or not, come in the form of highly taxable income. For those who take the capital gains route of earning money, taxes are of course minimal, and actually less than many seem to recognize. First and foremost, there is no tax at all on capital gains except insofar as they are technically "realized." This does not mean that individuals pay taxes on capital gains only to the extent that they spend amounts equal to their capital gains. For one can spend his capital gains quite effectively by spending more out of other income and allowing the capital gains to continue to accrue, "unrealized." One can further spend one's capital gains by borrowing against capital without ever selling or "realizing." And even, to the extent one does sell off the gains of, for example, $10,000 on original capital of $100,000, one pays only a minuscule tax. For if capital has increased in value by 10%, from $100,000 to $110,000, and one sells $10,000 of the capital, in the form of shares of stock, for example, one is liable to taxes only on the capital gains on the $10,000 of securities or assets sold. In this case that would amount to only some $900 of capital gains (10% of $9,091, to come to the total of $10,000 value of assets sold). The tax then even at maximum rate would be 25% of $909 or some $227 on a total capital gain of $10,000! That, one can readily see, is a rate of taxation of 2.27%, even on realized capital gains!

The argument and example above makes clear that improving the treatment of realized capital gains will only scratch the surface of the huge mass of untaxed income enjoyed in the form of capital gains. A small step in the right direction would be correction of the failure to tax at all the capital gains passed on at death. Taxation of capital gains at death would not only remove the aggravated inequity of complete avoidance of capital gains taxation on the part of those who, as a consequence of the current tax structure, do not sell assets during their lifetimes. It would also improve capital markets and substantially increase the Treasury's tax revenues by reducing the "lock-in" effect which discourages individuals from selling assets when in their own financial interests, aside from tax considerations, they would prefer to do so. In this connection, I might add that a publicized proposal to relate the tax on realized capital gains even more closely, but inversely, to the length of time which capital assets are held is, I believe, a step in the wrong direction. For this, like the loophole in realized capital gains taxation at death, would encourage people to hold on to assets and discourage them from freely selling and buying in the capital markets.

Secondly, particularly because this matter has also been under discussion in connection with the investment tax credit, I should like to express my strong opposition to any further "liberalization" of tax depreciation. There is a case, more constitutional perhaps than economic, in favor of tax depreciation allowances which would prevent our income taxes, particularly at the business levels, from becoming taxes on capital. To allow tax depreciation to exceed real economic depreciation is, however, merely to create a new loophole in the amount of tens of billions of dollars in the form of true economic income which is not considered taxable income because of excess depreciation charges which correspondingly reduce the figure finally considered taxable income. Knowledgeable economists, I am sure, point out that the major liberalization of tax depreciation by the Congress and the Treasury beginning with the new tax code of 1954 providing for additional forms of accelerated depreciation, and continuing through such other very substantial measures as the shortening of acceptable lives and corresponding increases in rates of depreciation

[1] See, for example, "The Proposed Income Tax Increase," *Illinois Business Review*, November 1967, pp. 6–8; "War and Taxes: The Role of the Economist in Politics," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, June 1968, pp. 13–18.

permitted in connection with the new guidelines, have already made tax depreciation far more than the true economic depreciation to be deducted in arriving at a correct measure of income. The tax loophole here is hence already tremendous. It should be reduced, not enlarged.

All of the arguments advanced above against the surcharge apply equally to extension of the excise taxes under consideration. I should add in addition, however, that excise taxes have further disadvantages in terms of equity and resource allocation which are well known to economists and, I believe, to the Committee. But receiving surprisingly little attention is the point that to the extent that higher taxes in the current situation are justified as a move against inflation, excise taxes must be recognized as a conspicuous exception. Increased taxes on income, other things remaining the same, can be expected to reduce upward pressure on prices by reducing the effective demand, that is, the purchasing power, which can be applied to goods and services. Higher excise taxes will reduce real purchasing power only and precisely to the extent that they raise prices paid by the purchaser. To combat inflation, by which we mean rising prices of goods and services, by tax legislation which raises the prices of goods and services is clearly contradictory.

Finally, I should like to turn my attention to the investment tax credit. First, it must be acknowledged, the arguments against tax increases which will facilitate continuation of high war and defense expenditures apply in principle as well as to a real tax increase in the form of repeal of the investment tax credit. In the instance, though, I believe, that questions of equity and allocation of resources may properly be viewed as dominant. On this topic, again, I have done a great deal of research and have argued, with the support of my research findings, that the investment tax credit is in large part an inequitable tax loophole. Its avowed purpose, according to its original sponsors, was to offer an incentive for greater business investment and consequent technological advance and contribution to economic growth. I confess to being dubious initially that this form of intervention in the economy is economically justified. The free market and business enterprise should normally be trusted to decide upon the proportion of resources to be allocated to current consumption as opposed to investment for the future and as to one form of investment against another. Before asking government to encourage a particular form of investment, that in eligible equipment, as opposed to investment in plant, in research and development, in human beings generally, a clear case should be established that the market mechanism has somehow broken down and that a correction to the bias or disfavor introduced by the market with regard to this particular form of investment is necessary. No such case, in my opinion, was ever demonstrated.

Further, the particular form of the investment credit for equipment, as finally enacted, offered relatively little advantage or incentive to those who might, as a consequence of the legislation, invest more than they would have invested otherwise. It is rather offered most of the benefits for investment which unquestionably would have been undertaken anyway. Merely to clarify this point, rather than to endorse any particular alternative, a measure which would have offered no tax credit for investment not above the average investment of the previous five years but, say, a 14% credit or even a 21% or 28% credit for investment above the previous average, would have been much more effective in stimulating new investment. It would have brought about a much higher ratio of dollars of additional investment to dollars of lost tax revenues than what has been accomplished with the current act.[2]

The investment tax credit thus constitutes in large part a "give-away" of particular benefit to those businesses and their owners that normally invest heavily in equipment. If the level of business taxation has been considered too high, a more appropriate method for reducing that level would have been a general reduction in income tax rates for corporate business and corresponding appropriate reductions in individual income tax rates from which unincorporated business would benefit as well. An investment tax credit for equipment which offers disproportionate tax savings and benefits to those businesses and their owners which normally purchase large amounts of equipment is precisely the type of tax loophole that this Committee should be committed to eliminate. While I would have favored eliminating the tax credit at any time, its elimination now is particularly called for in the light of concern that the high levels of projected business investment demand are particularly harmful to efforts to contain inflation and to keep down our currently very high rates of interest. For while I have argued that the investment tax credit constitutes in much larger part a pure tax reduction, rather than an incentive for greater business expenditures on equipment, there is no reason in the current situation to offer any stimulus to such business spending. And at last, on the subject of the investment credit, its removal at this time may perhaps facilitate the application of selected credits or tax incentives, along lines apparently under consideration by the Administration, which would encourage particular business expenditures, whether for manpower training, urban rebuilding or other purposes, where there are cleary compelling reasons for government intervention.

In conclusion, I may reiterate that I oppose extension of the surcharge on the grounds that it is a war-related measure which can only facilitate continuation of our costly military venture in Vietnam and the new escalation of the arms race which some would apparently favor as the war and spending directly related to it are ended. Since continuation of these high tax rates will be associated with continuation if not expansion of the high government expenditures for war and defense, extension of the surcharge, far from proving a measure to combat inflation will actually, as I have argued previously with some confirmation from subsequent events, do nothing effective to combat inflation. Continuation of special excise taxes is undesirable for the same reasons and also because it will actually contribute diretcly to inflation in the higher prices to be paid by purchasers to cover the taxes. I also see merit in opposition to continuation of both the excise taxes and the surcharge so long as major tax loopholes contribute to such an inequitable tax structure and concentration of tax burden on the great mass of individuals and businesses which earn their incomes in forms which do not permit ready tax avoidance. And lastly, despite recognition that repeal of the investment tax credit is in effect a tax increase which might also contribute to excessive war and military expenditures, other considerations of equity and resource allocation lead me to favor its repeal.

[2] I have set forth some statistical results of analysis of this subject in "Tax Policy and Investment Behavior: Comment," *American Economic Review*, June 1969, galleys currently available.

## NEED FOR SAFEGUARD

## HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of the Army, in an address to the Union League Club's public affairs luncheon in New York City on April 28, 1969, outlined in his remarks the need for the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

In a very definitive statement he points out what Safeguard can do and cannot do. In pointing to the need of this system, he outlines very clearly the work of the Soviets' antimissile program, as well as the development of their nuclear strike capabilities. His speech clearly draws on the geopolitical considerations, and shows that the Safeguard system is designed to prevent, rather than start, a nuclear exchange. It is designed as a measure to insure peace rather than a step toward war.

For the reasons mentioned above, I would like to bring it to the attention of other Members of the House:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE STANLEY R. RESOR, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNION LEAGUE CLUB'S PUBLIC AFFAIRS LUNCHEON, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y., MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1969

SAFEGUARD

I want to talk to you today about what seem to me to be the major considerations involved in the current debate over the President's decision to continue deployment of a thin ballistic missile defense system. The facts of the thermonuclear age, and even more of the prospect of a possible thermonuclear war, are horrible to contemplate. Yet technology and certain irrevocable decisions have made these facts and that awful prospect inescapable today. The debate over whether or not we should deploy an anti-ballistic missile system cannot be conducted without taking into account of those facts, and the decision must be one which offers the greatest hope of reducing the prospect of such a war.

I want first to describe the nuclear environment within which our judgments must be made. I will next describe certain trends in that environment which cause serious concern and which we believe require the deployment of the Safeguard ballistic missile defense system in order to preserve stability in that nuclear situation. Finally, I want to give you my views of the most significant reservations which have been expressed by those opposing deployment.

Let me describe briefly the nuclear arms environment in which we live. I do this knowing that it is generally familiar to most of you, but I believe that an informed discussion of defense against ballistic missiles must proceed from a common understanding of the facts of the nuclear environment in which we can now live. We cannot unilaterally or quickly change the fact that we live in a world where peace is ultimately preserved by the mutual capability of the major powers to assure one another's destruction in the event of war—a delicate nuclear balance.

We and the Soviets each have large arsenals of nuclear warheads. Some are affixed to missiles which are either land-based or carried in submarines, and some are intended to be delivered by bombers. Our land-based

missiles, most Minutemen, are buried in hardened silos. Our nuclear submarines, the Polaris, are virtually impossible to locate when on station. And some of our bombers are on alert and prepared to take off on short notice. For these reasons our nuclear striking power could *today* survive an attack by *all* of the missiles now in the Soviet inventory and still retaliate with a blow which would destroy the Soviet Union as a nation, killing millions of its people and eliminating much of its industrial capacity. Our confidence in this ability to retaliate derives not solely from the number of weapons we have, but also from the fact that with three basically different weapons systems we are confident that many weapons will penetrate any defense which the Soviets might erect. The Soviets know this and their behavior is influenced accordingly.

The Soviets also have the capacity to absorb a first strike by our nuclear forces and in retaliation inflict destruction on the United States sufficient to end our existence as a nation. I am sure that they believe it vital to their national interests to retain at least that capability.

What I have described is mutual assured destruction, the doctrine which has been the basis of our deterrence since the Soviets first deployed large numbers of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

None of us prefers to see the world this way. But it is the world we live in. In the absence of another way to offset the Soviet threat and to provide the nation a means to ensure its survival, reliance on retaliation as our deterrent has been affirmed by every President since General Eisenhower. And in all likelihood we will have to continue to rely on our assured destruction as our deterrent until, either by agreement or by parallel action, we and the Soviets move to some other basis for our security.

Because deterrence is the foundation of the very survival of our nation today, we must make every reasonable effort to protect our retaliatory forces. And it is because we see certain trends in Soviet deployments and activity in the development of nuclear forces—trends which if continued could lead to substantial threats to our nuclear forces—that we have taken the steps we are taking in the deployment of the Safeguard ballistic missile defense system.

Let me describe for you, insofar as time and security requirements permit, what it is that has caused us to take these steps. First is the continuing deployment of the Soviet SS–9 intercontinental ballistic missile. The SS–9 can carry a warhead with a yield of up to 25 megatons, that is powerful enough so that if it hits within one mile of a Minuteman silo that missile is very likely to be rendered useless if not destroyed. One SS–9 can also carry three separate smaller warheads of about 5 megatons each. These would have to impact within about one-half of a mile of a silo to be effective. There are no insuperable technical barriers to achieving that accuracy, and if it is achieved, the threat to our Minuteman force would grow rapidly with the continued deployment of the SS–9. We have seen as recently as two weeks ago evidence of Soviet testing the SS–9 with multiple warheads and we have reason to believe that that testing will continue.

Why do we regard the SS–9 as a potential threat to the Minuteman? Principally because we can see at this time only one military use for such large missiles in such great numbers, and that is to erode the Minuteman deterrent force. The nuclear weapons which leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki were one-one-thousandth the yield of the single SS–9 warhead. No strategist or planner believes that a weapon meant for attacks on all but the largest cities needs to be any larger than about one megaton, one-fifth the yield of each of the SS–9 multiple warheads which are under development. We assume from the warhead size of other Soviet missiles that they understand the sufficiency of smaller explosions. What the continuing deployment of the SS–9 represents then is a growing capability on the part of the Soviets to destroy our ICBMs, which are a key element in our deterrent.

At the same time we are faced with a rapid growth in the Soviet nuclear powered missile-carrying submarine force, comparable to our Polaris. The Soviets have been building such vessels for several years, but at a gradual rate. Recently the rate increased noticeably, and if it continues the Soviets will have a force equal to ours by 1975. How does this bear on our ability to guarantee retaliatory destruction of the Soviet Union in case of an attack? Submarine-launched missiles would pose a grave threat to our bomber forces. At all times some of our bombers are in an alert position. If the Soviets launched land-based ICBMs at us today, we would have enough warning time to enable those alert planes to take off before their airfield were hit. But if the missiles were launched from submarines off our coast, that warning time could be cut by half or more. Short of keeping an adequate number of our bombers aloft at all times—and that would cost about $1 billion per year—we know of no way to get an adequate number of them off their airfields in time to avoid a submarine-launched missile. This then is another potential threat which faces us—a growing capability on the part of the Soviets to destroy or severely damage the bomber component of our retaliatory forces.

If these threats materialize we would be left to rely primarily on our nuclear submarines for our retaliatory force. This is a formidable force, and one which we are confident is safe *now* from detection and destruction by the Soviets. But just as we are constantly working on ways to counter the Soviet submarine threat, so we too can be sure they are seeking ways to counter ours. Thus if the emerging threats described above materialize, we are left to depend on a system which may suddenly become vulnerable to a Soviet development which we cannot immediately counter. It would be unwise to rely on any single component of our nuclear force to ensure our survival—and it has long been our practice not to do so.

In view of the threat to our ICBMs which the SS–9 can pose, and the threat to our bomber force which the Soviet submarine force can pose, we need to find a means to counter those threats should they emerge and thus preserve our retaliatory capability. The Safeguard ballistic missile defense system is such a means.

Basically, Safeguard is a relatively thin defense against ballistic missiles—thin in the sense that it will not possess the capability to protect our cities from a massive Soviet attack. Protection from such attack is not technically feasible under present circumstances. Moreover, we recognize that the Soviets see it in their national interest to preserve their retaliatory capability against us. A thick missile defense of our cities would probably appear to them as a threat to that capability and in all likelihood cause them to add additional offensive nuclear forces.

Safeguard will, however, protect a minimum essential number of our missile sites from a Soviet first strike. It will also provide added warning time for our bomber forces on alert. These two contributions will help to preserve our nuclear deterrent.

In addition, the Safeguard ballistic missile defense system is designed to protect the United States from any small ICBM attack, the kind which Communist China might be capable of launching in the 1970's. Communist China is developing an ICBM capability. It is not progressing quite at the rate we once thought it would, but it is progressing. We expect that by the mid-1970's Communist China will possess the capability of killing ten to twenty million Americans in a nuclear strike. The Chinese Communists should be deterred by our retaliatory capability, but we are sufficiently uncertain of how they might react in a crisis that it seems prudent to protect against a Chinese nuclear attack if at all possible. Additionally, our Asian allies will have greater confidence in the credibility of our commitments if they know that we can come to their aid, when it is in our interest to do so, with little risk to us of a nuclear attack from China.

Finally, there is the problem of an accidental launch. I would hope that the other nuclear powers, like ourselves, have established procedures and designed devices to prevent the accidental launch of any of their nuclear weapons. But with a thousand enemy nuclear warheads deployed, the chance of such an accident nonetheless exists. If it should happen, at the least there would be great destruction; at the worst, it might lead to misunderstandings as to motive and to the initiation of further nuclear exchange. The protection that the Safeguard System will provide against an accidental launch alone provides substantial justification for the cost of the system.

One aspect of the President's decision to deploy the Safeguard system has not received the attention which I believe it deserves, and this has led to misunderstanding. The Safeguard plan has been approved in principle, but insofar as execution is concerned only two installations have been recommended to Congress for authorization—one at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana and one at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota. Before further deployments are approved, the intelligence estimates on which the potential threats described here are based, will be updated and reviewed and at the highest levels of government. If those estimates reveal a change in the development of the threat as we now see it, the Safeguard deployment will be modified accordingly. The progress of deployment will also be governed by the status of any arms control discussions we may be having with the Soviets. In short, Safeguard will be deployed only as the threat against which it is designed to protect develops and only if it is not inconsistent with any progress we might be making in arms control talks.

In this connection, some have asked why it is necessary to begin deployment now. Why not wait until more facts are available on the Soviet SS–9 deployment and the growth of the Soviet submarine fleet and until we have tested Soviet intentions in arms control? If we proceed now with the deployment approved by the President last month our first sites will not be operational until 1974. If the Soviet developments continue at the current rate they could at that time pose an unacceptable threat to our nuclear forces, and the Chinese threat may have begun to materialize. If the decision to deploy is postponed for even one year we would have to disband our present manufacturing and construction preparations, and the readiness of the first sites would be delayed approximately two years. The first sites then would not be operational until 1976.

This, then, is the case for Safeguard. It is a carefully measured response to a potentially serious threat to our national security. It is a response which can be tailored as the threat evolves or fades, and as we learn more of our chances to reach arms control agreement with the Soviets.

Why, then, is it the subject of so much controversy? I believe that its critics are driven by three concerns. First, there is concern that our deployment will lead to a further escalation in the arms race, increasing the burden of the cost of arms. Secondly, there is concern that it will diminish the chances for an arms control agreement between us and the Soviet Union. And thirdly, there is a concern that the system will not work, and that the money to be spent, which is indeed a large sum, will be wasted. These are matters which should concern us, but I

believe on careful analysis that they do not drive us to conclude that we should not deploy the system.

First, as to whether the deployment will escalate the arms race, I think the answer there is clearly no, unless the Soviets are unalterably determined to gain a first strike capability against us. Because Safeguard is not a city or population defense against the Soviet's capability to inflict intolerable fatalities on the United States, Safeguard will not impact on the Soviet deterrent. Therefore it should not evoke a reaction from the Soviets, if they intend to continue to rely on their retaliatory capability for their deterrent. The best evidence of the limited purpose of the Safeguard system lies not in our professions of its purpose but in the deployment of the Safeguard missile sites. They are deployed initially near two of our major Minuteman fields, and subsequently near other such fields, near major air bases and generally along both coasts of the mainland. The fact that Safeguard is designed only as a protection for our deterrent forces from the Soviet attack and for protection against a light Chinese attack, is evident from the sites chosen for the system. These are sites from which an effective defense of our cities against a large Soviet attack could *not* be undertaken, even if such a defense were technically feasible.

Turning to the second concern, I do not believe that the deployment of Safeguard will lessen the chances for an arms control agreement with the Soviets. In fact, it may even increase these chances. We should first recall the events of last year. In May Congress debated the question of the deployment of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system. In that debate the argument was made, as it is now being made, that a ballistic missile defense deployment would frustrate the chance for arms control talks with the Soviets. Nonetheless, Congress then authorized deployment, and it was *after* Congress' decision that the Soviets suggested that we begin arms control talks.

The Soviets have, as you know, *already* deployed a ballistic missile defense around Moscow. On the basis of current intelligence we believe that they intend to continue the development and deployment of that system. They also have the Tallinn defensive system which is now believed to be primarily directed against bombers. But it is not clear that it cannot be upgraded to obtain an anti-ballistic missile capability. Moreover, they have stated that they do not regard defensive systems as provocative. It seems clear then that the Soviets do not believe there is a necessary inconsistency between the deployment of defensive systems and arms control talks.

I mentioned the chance that our deployment of Safeguard may improve the likelihood of arms control negotiations. There are two bases for this. First, by merely responding to the recent Soviet developments described above we are serving notice that we are prepared to take the necessary steps to ensure our security. If there was ever any doubt in the minds of the Soviets, this should provide further evidence of our determination to prevent them from obtaining any advantage in strategic nuclear arms, thus adding incentive to negotiate an arms control agreement. Second, by responding to those Soviet developments with a defensive system designed so that it should not escalate the arms race, we have served notice on them that we seek the kind of stability which would be achieved in an arms control agreement.

Finally, as to the effectiveness of Safeguard, it is important to recognize that the system we contemplate does not embrace any unproved technological features. Each of the components, the radars, the missiles, the communications, and the computers, is within the current state of the art. Our testing program has provided satisfactory results thus far and we will continue an intensive testing program. Through the production, deployment and operational manning of the first two sites, the system will be given an even higher confidence by assuring that any minor unforeseen problems are identified and remedied.

In closing, I would like to make some observations which, while they do not relate directly to the decision to deploy Safeguard, do seem to me to underlie in some respects the debate in which we are engaged and which are matters for all of us to think about in the long term. Our nuclear strategy rests today on a delicate nuclear balance. This will be so as long as we rely on nuclear weaponry for security and so long as offensive weapons dominate. I do not believe that we should be prepared *now* to consign *future* generations to live under this delicate nuclear balance unless we see that it is absolutely necessary. We should strive, and we should be willing to spend, in an effort to find our way out of that uneasy world. This is of course the focus of our arms control efforts. But in the beginning at least, arms control arrangements will merely stabilize the condition of balance of nuclear destruction, not eliminate it.

One can conceive of long-term developments, either in the arms control field or outside it, whereby the defense is allowed to overtake the offense, and our security is preserved not because of our evident willingness to destroy our enemies and be destroyed ourselves in the process, but because of our ability to protect ourselves in the first instance from those enemies. Safeguard does not promise us this. Because it is designed only to protect our deterrent capability, it is not in itself going to lead to this kind of readjustment in the nuclear world. But it is a step in that direction, for it represents a decision to choose an option involving defense instead of additional offense in the continuing quest for our security.

---

## INDUSTRY AND DEFENSE: A TIMELY INDICATION OF THE U.S. MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL RELATIONSHIP

---


### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. J. B. Colwell, U.S. Navy, has delivered an interesting and timely commentary on the U.S. military-industrial relationship which I think should be called to the attention of the Congress. It was delivered before the New York chapter of the American Ordnance Association on April 10, 1969, and will appear in the July-August 1969 issue of Ordnance. I submit these remarks for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

INDUSTRY AND DEFENSE: A TIMELY VINDICATION OF THE U.S. MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL RELATIONSHIP

(By Vice Adm. J. B. Colwell, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Fleet Operations and Readiness)

The United States today has a very large military establishment. It is sizable in manpower, numbering over two million men. It is sizable in real property holdings, both here and abroad. It has a sizable inventory of aircraft, vehicles, and ships.

The cost of maintaining this force also is sizable. This year some 60 per cent of our governmental budget or 12 percent of our gross national product will be spent in support of our defense establishment. Without debating the adequacy of this outlay, past and current, it is an obvious fact that military preparedness is an expensive business.

This military force is built upon and sustained by the largest industrial economy the world has ever known. To defend our Nation in today's environment, we must have the most advanced, most effective weapons which can be produced, and we must have them in sufficient numbers. There is no second-place prize in a military contest.

It is our industrial technology and production capacity which make it possible to put such weapons into the hands of our troops. The resulting military force safeguards our economy. Our economy, thus secure, maintains for our society the world's highest standard of living with its rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This, simply stated, is the military-industrial relationship which exists in our country.

Certainly there is a so-called "military-industrial complex" in this country! Our military forces could not exist without it, and, in the international environment in which we find ourselves, our country could not long exist without the means to achieve military security.

There are those, however, who would have us believe that the military and industry operate in an entirely different manner from the normal manufacturer-consumer relationships which are accepted in other sectors of our economy.

The country has been warned of an insidious Military-Industrial Complex, controlled by an oligarchy of military and industrial leaders. The necessary teamwork between industrial management and members of the Defense Department is alleged by some to represent a form of conspiracy, generated not in the Nation's interest but for the purpose of personal power and immense profit.

The existence of this complex, we are warned, will lead to the ruination of our economy, the reduction of our democracy to a garrison state, and, finally, to our destruction through irrational war.

I am not so naive as to forget that there are historical incidents of illegal activities and collusion in the past, nor to deny that there are people in the military and in business today who would turn a dishonest dollar. But I would emphatically deny that such activity is widespread, and I submit that the possibility of activity so extensive as to approach a conspiracy is indeed remote.

Let me develop the strange kind of logic which leads to an erroneous conclusion about the military-industrial relationship. It begins with the establishment of demand which, in this supposed case, is generated by an aberration in the desires of the military leader whose mind is fixed on war and who demands all the things with which to wage war. It is never satisfied with the capability or quality of the weapons in the arsenal and is constantly striving for more and better arms.

Industry, so the story goes, always interested in a good market, responds to fill this demand. Going further, industry applies the professional hard sell, playing on the fears and egos of the anxious and easily convinced military.

By elaborate advertising and lavish entertainment, the fable continues, industry generates artificial demands for useless weapons. Once this cycle is established, the military and industry join forces and control this process for their mutual advantage. The middlemen are the retired military officers employed by the defense contractors.

How is it that such business can be carried on despite governmental controls and con-

gressional checks? How can it be done right under the noses of a suspicious press and public? Again, the explanation is the military mind.

However, this time the critics have transformed the character of this mind. It is no longer slow and easily persuaded. The point is now made that military opinions and advice prevail because the military has produced an unending supply of distinguished, capable articulate, and effective leaders.

Their skill, energy, and dedication make them dominant in almost every government or civic organization they may inhabit, from high position to the local PTA. They are able to dazzle the Congress by their intricate budgetary footwork.

The public at large is supposedly hoodwinked by a vast public-relations campaign (referred to in the complex as propaganda) and by what might be called the military-industrial auxiliary. This includes all those who have ever served in the military and a number of organizations and persons who are just sympathetic.

They lobby for the complex, supplement the propaganda with periodicals extolling the merits of a strong defense posture, and generally subvert the population by encouraging youth to enlist, making patriotic speeches, and organizing Fourth of July parades.

However, this is *not* the way it works in real life. You know it, I know it, and I think the great American public knows it.

Let us look at the structure which militates against the feared unholy alliance. In the first place, each service has a limited budget which it will not knowingly waste on unneeded weapons or inflated prices.

Secondly, anyone remotely familiar with Government contracting procedures knows that the restraints, checks, audits, and requirements make it extremely difficult for any collusion to take place. Also, the contractors are competing among themselves.

One might ask a contractor who has just lost a major contract-formulation/contract-definition bid, after having spent millions of his own money, what his opinion is of the military-industrial complex!

What about those retired senior officers who are employed by industry? The real reasons are very evident. It is good commonsense for a company engaged in building weapons to hire individuals conversant with the operational employment of those weapons. Oil companies employ petroleum engineers, drug firms employ physicians, defense firms hire military professionals. To do otherwise would result in less effective designs and a less capable military arsenal.

If there were such a thing as a highly polished smoothly functioning military-industrial complex working for the mutual benefit of both parties, would our shipbuilding industry be in the shape it is in today? Would 58 per cent of U.S. naval combatant ships be 20 years old or older? Would our aging and overworked fleet be on the verge of obsolescence?

Consider these figures: in 1963, the gross national product was just under $600 billion—the Navy shipbuilding account was $2.8 billion; in 1966 the GNP had risen to $750 million but Navy ship construction had dropped to $2 billion; in 1969, with a near-$900 billion GNP, the amount allocated to building new men of war had dwindled to $1.2 billion.

I ask you, what has happened to the smoothly effective operation of the military-industrial complex?

And then there is the charge of militarization of American society. I would submit that in a society which permits citizens dressed as Viet Cong to march on Easter Sunday, overemphasis on the military virtues of loyalty, patriotism, duty, discipline, and service to country is hardly the problem. If the culture is so geared to the military, if the military is so respected, admired, powerful, and influential, why is retention of officers and men one of our most serious problems?

No, I think that those who are so concerned with this danger not only have overlooked our long history, they have closed their eyes to the present opposition to the draft, dissension over the Vietnam war, and disillusionment with structured power.

Of all of the fallacious arguments, the one which personally distresses me most is the allegation that the military man essentially wants war. The charge is leveled from time to time that the leaders of the complex deliberately plan wars because war justifies the existence of the establishment; that war provides experience for the military novice, challenges for the professional, and the field to exercise, prove, and perfect the industrial products. Thus war is not only welcomed but actively sought.

Well, what of these charges? What about this mythical beast?

First let me say that there is no such thing as the military mind. Military men as a group have similar inclinations, feelings, and general codes, but to assume that they think differently from any other segment of our society is ridiculous. They are products of the same schools, live in the same neighborhoods, read the same literature, and are exposed to the same pressures of domestic life as are other Americans. And as Americans they differ among themselves in their thinking just as do their neighbors.

In point of fact, the military man historically has opposed reckless, aggressive, belligerent action. He may argue that the danger of war requires more armament, but he will never argue that increased armament makes war desirable. He dreads war.

Concerning the professional associations, it is a significant point that these organizations serve a vital purpose in bringing together professionals who are engaged in a serious, expensive business critical to our national survival. Such liaison has been vastly beneficial in maintaining our defense.

I have attempted to show that fear of a massive military partnership with industry is without basis in fact. Such a thing does not now, nor did it ever, exist. Under our form of government, under the leadership of wise men imbued with an abiding love of country, it will not come to pass.

We cannot return to a simpler time when the problems of world leadership and the complexities of technological warfare did not rest upon our shoulders. The threat which we face is real, and we must have a modern strong military establishment in order to defend ourselves.

I view the military-industrial complex, if we choose to use that term, as an essential element of our national survival. An occasional self-serving individual there may be, for infallibility is a scarce commodity. But patriotism is in rich supply, and our loyalty and integrity are not for sale.

---

## FANNING THE FLAMES

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, those who are familiar with the day-to-day happenings in New York City are aware, of course, of the conflicts that have been waged on the college campuses. Of equal concern is the inciting of high school students in the area who are much more susceptible to the arguments of the radical elements. No issue among students is too minor if dissension between administrators and students can be created.

The New York Daily News of Tuesday, May 27, carried an article on radical, underground high school publications by its education editor, Judson Hand. As Mr. Hand observes, the tone of most of the underground publications is blatantly revolutionary, and one or more of them has appeared at virtually every public and private high school in New York City. Needless to say, the problem of maintaining a peaceful atmosphere in the schools is compounded by the dissemination of incendiary literature exhorting impressionable young minds to rebel against those in authority.

The situation in the New York City area is no doubt being repeated in other schools in the country and should be the subject of possible corrective action. I submit the above-cited article, "High School Students Turn to New Texts—On Rebellion," by Judson Hand, for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TURN TO NEW TEXTS—ON REBELLION

(By Judson Hand)

Schools throughout the metropolitan area are being flooded with underground, revolutionary newspapers and do-it-yourself manuals for student rebellion.

The publications range from crudely mimeographed tirades against the school establishment, published, mostly on an irregular basis, by teenage radicals and their older allies, to The New York High School Free Press, which claims a citywide circulation of more than 50,000.

Dozens of school and city officials, including Mayor Lindsay, have cited the underground press as a major factor in the student disturbances this spring in the city's public school system.

As much as most principals would like to curb the excesses of the radical high school press, virtually all agree that this would be difficult, if not impossible, because of protections to free speech under the First Amendment.

Sometimes, the underground newspapers compete directly with authorized high school publications. For example, The Hickory Hog appeared at Andrew Jackson High School in Queens, where the school paper is called The Hickory Log.

"Hog" is the code word in underground newspapers for school officials and cops.

The tone of most of the underground publications is blatantly revolutionary. Cartoons of students holding pistols to the heads of principals are not unusual. And school authorities are reviled in the most obscene terms.

Because of the inflammatory material, many high school principals have banned the publications inside their schools, but it's perfectly legal for students to distribute them on sidewalks just off school property.

"There's nothing we can do about this," said Louis Shuker, principal of Jamaica High School and an outspoken critic of the underground press.

Another principal, Edward Kolevzon of Columbus High School in the Bronx and president of the High School Principals Association, believes that the high school underground press should be investigated by authorities.

"We've asked the mayor, the Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools Bernard Donovan to conduct such an investigation, but so far all three have declined to answer our letters," said Kolevzon.

The mimeographed papers, one or more of which has appeared at virtually every public and private high school in the city, are passed furtively from student to student in school hallways and washrooms even though, in many cases, the students risk disciplinary action from their principals if they are found with the publications on them inside the schools.

By far the most popular of the high school radical papers is the High School Free Press, which students call "the Freep."

The Free Press is sold on some newsstands (for 15 cents) and is hawked outside schools by students (for five cents). It includes advertising for rock records, movies, mod clothing and radical political groups. An agency called Vulture sells ads for the "Freep" and seven other publications, some radical and some devoted to rock music and mod art.

Much of the newspaper, which usually runs to about 20 tabloid pages, is devoted to dispatches from radical students, mainly at high schools in the city but some from as far afield as Atlanta and Santiago, Chile.

The tone of many of the dispatches is that of an article against student suspensions which appeared on page three of a recent issue of the "Freep."

"This year suspensions have been mostly political in nature," declares the correspondent. "The Board of Education is training plainclothes cops for permanent assignment to troubled schools. We'll have to show them that that ain't enough to stop us. Onward the struggle! Student power!"

Later on, the dispatch speculates that "the enemy" of the student movement may be no "obviously discernible person, but possibly your own mother!"

Another dispatch allegedly came from a student at Dalton, one of the city's best known private schools. Since the correspondent remained anonymous, however, this cannot be checked one way or the other.

"We are moving into a new stage with the capability of winning," said the correspondent. "In a large measure, we have been successful. Even the kids who were last year's gutless liberals (or worse) are demanding power."

The writer said that the radical movement in private schools was now concentrating on repeal of dress codes, the right of radical students to have their own bulletin boards and a school discipline committee which would include students. To promote these ends, the correspondent continued, "we have been using the existing student government to the utmost, stacking various committee meetings when necessary."

According to Shuker, the underground high school publications tend to break down into two groups—those produced by white radical students and those published by black students. However, the two groups of papers overlap, with white radical papers urging black power and black-oriented publications calling for more student rights and blasting the establishment.

Most parents, Shuker said, oppose the radical line of most of the underground papers and are horrified by the obscenities that they include.

"But a few parents actually support and applaud their children's participation in the underground press," he said. "Sometimes these parents are doctors and lawyers living in $60,000 homes. In one case, a mother and her son collaborated to produce their own underground paper against the administration of my school."

Shuker and other principals agreed that, though most of the high school underground papers were revolutionary in tone, they did not follow any discernible party line from Peking, Havana or Moscow.

"Many of the underground writers just aren't smart enough to have such an ideology," said Shuker. "But ideology or not, the incitements to rebellion are contagious and tend to discredit and undermine school administrators.

"Sometimes the stock-in-trade of these papers is outright lies," he added. "For example, I was accused falsefy of sending the names of all members of the senior class to draft boards."

In addition to underground newspapers, manuals outlining how to participate in student demonstrations are distributed widely at schools. One such manual lists "basic rules for avoiding useless arrests and injuries and for handling it when you get busted."

The Partisan, published by Youth Against War & Facism, is carrying an analysis, from a leftist point of view, of last spring's rebellion at Columbia University.

Rat, also widely read in the city's high schools, features "subterranean news," including a detailed account of recent student uprisings at Berkeley, California. The Movement, though published in San Francisco, has many readers in New York City and currently is carrying an article on dissent in local high schools and elsewhere entitled "Who's Against the Wall?"

The Guardian, which describes itself as "an independent radical newsweekly," includes tightly written news stories presented from a radical viewpoint.

Such papers as The Black Panther, The East Village Other and The Student Union Voice also are widely read among high school students.

"Where do you draw the line between obscenity and legitimate freedom of expression?" asked one principal. "And how do you decide when a student is advocating violent overthrow of the government?"

Most principals interviewed predicted that the underground press would continue to plague them—at least for the immediate future.

"Students are excited by it," said Shuker. "Some want to jump on the radical bandwagon."

## H. CHAPMAN ROSE, CLEVELAND BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT, SAYS LAWBREAKERS HAMPER WAR ON POVERTY

## HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, H. Chapman Rose, has legions of friends and admirers in the Nation's Capital who will be as pleased as I am to know that he has just been installed as president of the Cleveland Bar Association. It is an honor long overdue his brilliant record as lawyer, civic leader, and citizen. It also carries with it great responsibility, which Chappie Rose, as a proven leader, is well equipped to handle. His installation address is a promise of the excellence we can anticipate from him as head of the Bar and I would like to share it, prefaced by a biographical sketch from the May 15 Plain Dealer, with my colleagues in the House:

[From the Plain Dealer, May 15, 1969]

ROSE LEFT MARK IN MANY PLACES

H. Chapman Rose, who was graduated magna cum laude from Harvard law school, was installed last night as president of the Cleveland Bar Association.

Rose, a partner in the law firm of Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, also had the distinction during his undergraduate days at Princeton of introducing the silk hat and cutaway coat to the baseball diamond.

The departure from the usual baseball garb was the forerunner of a tradition that established "Chappy" Rose as the mediator in the break in athletic relations between Harvard and Princeton.

As a junior at Princeton and president of the Daily Princetonian when the break in athletic relations between the two schools occurred, Rose revived competition by challenging the Harvard Crimson staff to a "spoof" baseball game.

As captain and pitcher of the Princeton nine, Rose walked to the diamond garbed in silk topper and cutaway coat and proceeded to laugh the bitterness out of the minds of both colleges.

He was one of the outstanding Princeton college journalists and a leader in the student peace movement, the National Student Federation.

He was chosen by Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes as his "young fellow," an honor that went each year to an outstanding student.

After a year in Washington, Rose was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1933 and joined the firm of Tolles, Hogsett and Ginn of Cleveland, predecessor to the firm of Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis of Cleveland and Washington, D.C.

He joined the Army as a captain in July 1942 and was assigned to legal work in the office of the undersecretary of war and the headquarters of the Army Service Forces. In 1943, he was assigned by the War Department as an assistant to Bernard Baruch and John M. Hancock, then consultants to the Director of War Mobilization.

He was assigned in 1944 to the office of contract settlement, which had been set up under the Contract Settlement Act as a result of a report filed by Baruch and Hancock. He left the Army in December 1945 as a colonel to become director of Contract Settlement.

He returned to his law firm in 1946 and during 1948–49, he acted as counsel to the Industrial Advisory Committee of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which studied reparation problems.

In January 1953 he resigned from the law firm and his corporate offices to become an assistant secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower administration.

He was confirmed as assistant secretary Jan. 27, 1953 and assumed office Jan. 28. He served in this capacity until President Eisenhower nominated him to be an undersecretary of the Treasury on July 14, 1955. He was confirmed by the Senate on July 20, 1955 and took office Aug. 3.

On Jan. 10, 1956 Rose submitted his resignation as undersecretary to be effective Jan. 31 for "personal reasons," and in March, he rejoined his law firm in Cleveland.

Rose is a director of Basic Corp., Brush Beryllium Co., Clevite Corp., Cleveland Trust Co., and Jack & Heintz, Inc. He is also a trustee of Princeton University, Defiance College, Hotchkiss School, Western Reserve Academy and of the Cleveland Area Heart Society, the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, and the Musical Arts Association.

He and his wife, the former Katherine Cast, have one son, Jonathan Chapman, and live at 12407 Fairhill Road S.E.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Members of the Cleveland Bar Association, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I want to do on taking over from Burns Weston is to speak my gratitude for the honor you have done me, and to promise to do my best. The second is to recognize what has been accomplished by Burns and his predecessor, Jim Davis. This is not to overlook in any way those who went before; it is in simple recognition of the fact that the turmoil of the last years has changed the character and content of many jobs—university presidencies and trusteeships, for example—and Jim and Burns have risen to the heightened challenge magnificently well.

The civil rights controversies, as well as the continuing possibility of civil disturbance, have imposed a special responsibility on lawyers, which this Bar Association, under their leadership, has moved to meet. Legal aid has been materially strengthened; cadres of lawyers have been organized on a stand-by basis to act in the event of civil disturbance either as defense counsel, or to assist the prosecution, or to act as observers to insure that legal rights are protected. We have cooperated with the Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation in projects funded by it and by the Ford Foundation seeking to upgrade our police force and its procedures. The Presidentially-sponsored lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, which as you recall provided lawyers and funds to try civil rights cases in the South in the early sixties, has now, again supported by a Ford Foundation grant, turned its attention to urban problems in the North. But instead of forming a separate Cleveland committee, as it has done everywhere else that it has gone, it has agreed to work here through the Bar Association; and our Committee on Law in Urban Affairs was formed for this purpose. Under the chairmanship of Jim Davis, and with Tom Gray as its Secretary, it is hard at work on various projects where lawyers can help to improve the racial climate of Cleveland. These are a few of the projects in this field that have been begun and will vigorously continue. It's a good record.

Much of this would have been impossible had not the necessary physical facilities for the Bar Association been created by the move to our new headquarters in the Terminal Tower, and, most important of all, had not the invaluable Peter Roper come on board as Executive Director.

One project of a broader nature that has had its beginning in this same fruitful period I want to talk about in a little more detail, because I mean to give it major emphasis in the coming year.

In cooperation with the Growth Association and with the approval of the judges and other public officials, we have had a leading firm of management consultants make a preliminary study of the functioning of our system of administering justice in the city and the county. This points to the feasibility and the necessity for a study in depth. We want to know why the dockets are as far behind as they are; whether the present division of jurisdiction between the Common Pleas Court and the several municipal courts in the county is the most efficient; where more modern administrative methods would help; where lawyers contribute to court delays; and so on.

Hand in hand with this study must go a campaign, in which the lawyers must take a leading part, to provide the necessary physical facilities for our system of justice. Even as remodeled, the County Court House on Lakeside is far too small; our county jail is an obsolete disgrace; our prosecutors' and probation officers' facilities are scattered and inadequate; the list could go on and on. It is neither fair not realistic to expect top performance from judges and other public officials who are forced to work with obsolete or inadequate tools. We as lawyers know this, because we are face to face with the problem in our work in the courts; it is our job to bring the facts home to the public, so that the needed funds will be voted.

To accomplish this is important far beyond the needs of the legal profession for more efficient tools with which to conduct its affairs. It is important because only so shall we move toward improving respect for law. When the likelihood or certainty of delay in a civil case tilts the scales against the poor man who can't afford to wait; when a poor man is held in an obsolete jail till trial, while a Wolfson is free on bail for years of appeals before he spends a night in prison—thus do we provide a superficially attractive basis for the SDS to argue that the law is a tool of what they call the military-industrial complex, and that it does not deserve to be respected. We must work ceaselessly at the hard and often dull job of removing these and many other flaws in the legal process, so that the law, and its processes, by being worthy of respect, may be respected.

And so I come to my final point, which relates also to respect for law. In my opinion there is nothing more dangerous in our national life today than the beginnings of an attempt at a philosophical justification for law breaking as a means of protest. By this I mean the violation of laws of undoubted validity, like those against trespass or assault, to get attention for a point of view. Here we as lawyers have, I am convinced, a responsibility that we have not so far fully discharged to challenge and rebut fuzzy, fallacious doctrine that is being heard too often from some undergraduates and some faculty voices on our campuses, and even from some pulpits.

This problem began with the very sound position taken originally by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which was this: There is every justification for a non-violent disobedience to discriminatory laws whose constitutional validity is open to doubt. That in this case the doubt was well founded was held by the Supreme Court in due course. To disobey a doubtful law in order to test its validity, with a recognition that the legal penalty must be paid if the law is upheld, has always been the right of a free man in our society.

But the next step, taken not by Dr. King but by others, has led many people astray. Their heresy is this: Because they condemn the Vietnam war on moral grounds, and because the draft sends some men to the Vietnam war, they deem it proper to disobey the draft law. But there is no real doubt about the validity of the draft law; it has been sustained over and over again. Here begins the heresy: You may disobey a valid law because you disagree with a related government policy. You then wrap it in Dr. King's mantle by calling it civil disobedience.

But others have then gone a long step farther, to the position that, because there are evils on the campus or in the ghetto, it is all right to bring pressure to bear for their correction by breaking and entering, by occupying and holding buildings, by trespass, by malicious destruction of property, by assault, and by interfering forcibly with the rights of others to go about their lawful affairs.

I know of no one outside of the SDS or certain other extremist groups who would uphold the ultimate proposition stated this boldly. But the other day the President and the Attorney General both asserted that it was only a tiny minority on our campuses that was generating this turmoil. Then the president of one of our well-known colleges felt called upon to advise the President of the United States to expect the unrest to continue until the President and others of his administration addressed themselves more effectively and massively to the injustices of our society, including the poverty, the Vietnam war, and the inequities of the draft. In the context, it was almost, but not quite, a prediction that illegal conduct would continue on the nation's campuses, and almost, but not quite, a justification for it.

I detect something of the same atmosphere in the calmness of some of the ecclesiastical reaction to the demand of James Forman for half-a-billion dollars in what he calls reparations from the American churches. He has backed up this demand by the threat to disrupt church activities. As Erwin Griswold said in a lecture on dissent at Tulane last year: "I cannot distinguish in principle the legal quality of the determination to halt a troop train to protest the Vietnam War . . . from the determination to fire shots into a civil rights leader's home to protest integration." Similarly, I cannot distinguish in principle the legal quality of Mr. Forman's demand from that of the racketeer who threatens to damage a dry cleaning establishment unless the owner pays protection.

To put it that way oversimplifies the issue; but I think a little oversimplification is needed. People will say we have always recognized the *moral,* as distinguished from the *legal,* justification for disobeying a law that totally outrages one's conscience, if one were willing to pay the legal penalty. They will say that we have always recognized a special status for the religious conscientious objector. People will point to the war crime trials after World War II, which assumed a duty to disobey orders to commit the crime of genocide. Finally, people will cite the American Revolution, and other revolutions, bottomed on the right to overthrow a regime that has become intolerable. It would take all evening to reconcile these things—and I shall not attempt it, though it can be done—with this obvious truth: In the complexities of modern civilized life, no one can be allowed to arrogate to himself the choice of which laws he will obey and which he will flout. Modern western civilization, with its miracle of productivity, depends wholly on assurances given only by a system of law—upon predictions that people will perform their contracts, that people and their property can rely on certain minimum protections, that free speech is for everybody, that violent minorities on campuses or elsewhere will not be allowed to coerce majorities or other minorities, that changes in the rules can be made only in accordance with the rules, and so on.

To recognize that these things are true is, to be sure, no guarantee against lawlessness, either on the campus, or in the ghetto, or elsewhere. But I cannot help feeling that we make lawlessness more likely when we explain it, excuse it, and by soft impeachment seem to sanction it in the ways that I have mentioned. We as lawyers know this better than anyone else. Moreover, from our proximity to the industrial world, we know some things that are not as obvious to our friends in the colleges and the churches:

First, the incredible productivity of the American economy, which makes it possible for the first time to consider as a serious proposition the abolition of poverty in this country, derives from and depends on a commercial and industrial complex founded upon law, in which obedience to law is assumed.

Second, the belief that each man's conscience tells him what laws he must obey and what he can violate can threaten the productivity and abundance which underwrites the only hope of abolishing poverty.

Third, productivity and material sufficiency for the abolition of poverty are derived from and go hand in hand with the increasing complexity of our economy, the increasing urban concentration of our population, and the increasing vulnerability of our civilization to disruption.

Fourth, the theories that urge seizing class rooms to shut down a college could argue for seizing a power plant to shut down a city. As always in such a disaster the poor suffer most.

Knowing these things, we owe to ourselves and the community the duty to speak out.

I was glad the other day to see a quotation from Bayard Rustin, the organizer of Dr. King's March on Washington in 1963, and a philosopher of the civil rights movement. He was quoted last week in the *New York Times* as saying:

"A multiple society cannot exist where an element in that society, out of its own sense of masochism and guilt, permits another segment of that society to hold guns at their heads in the name of justice."

Our motivation to build a better world should not and does not derive its urgency from any sense of guilt. Visiting the sins of one generation upon another is dubious reli-

gious doctrine. It has the further vice that it impairs the balance and the wisdom of our response to the demands of the disadvantaged.

The urgency that we feel derives and should derive from the fact that for the first time in the long history of mankind upon this earth, this materialistic society of ours has acquired the material means to abolish poverty and hunger, at least in our own country; and justice requires that if we can do so, we must do so. Our urgency derives also from our national sense that we are indeed our brother's keeper and are therefore obligated to help him as far and as fast as we possibly can. As a nation we can do more than we are doing, and we must do more.

But if we yield to the demand of any generation or any group for speed at the cost of fairness, speed at the cost of trampling on the hard-won equal rights of others, speed, in short, at the cost of law, then, on the brink of success in the age-old struggle of mankind with poverty and hunger, we could indeed see our progress brought to a grinding halt. We lawyers are better able than almost any other discipline to insist on a historical perspective; to remind a confused America that it was a Supreme Court decision fifteen years ago in the school desegregation cases that made the largest single stride toward equality since the Emancipation Proclamation; that it has been the law and the courts that have been largely instrumental in pressing the country farther and farther toward this goal; and that real progress can come only through striking a national balance between means and ends in which respect for law is maintained and strengthened and not lost.

H. CHAPMAN ROSE.

---

## REMARKS BY HON. JAMES D. HITTLE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS, AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER, VALLEJO, CALIF., MAY 15, 1969

---

## HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1969, it was my pleasure to attend the Armed Forces Day dinner in Vallejo, Calif., with the Honorable James D. Hittle, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. We were honored that General Hittle was able to spare his valuable time to come to my congressional district and deliver the major address.

General Hittle has had an illustrious career serving our country in many capacities. He served with distinction in the Marine Corps, and upon retirement served as advisor to former Secretary Gates, counsel to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and is presently Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

I would like to include, for the benefit of my colleagues, a copy of Secretary Hittle's remarks made at the Armed Services Day dinner at Vallejo, Calif.:

Ladies and Gentlemen: It's a pleasure in more ways than one for me to be with you for Armed Forces Day in Vallejo.

I am glad especially to bring you the good wishes of the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, and the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John H. Chafee. I can assure you that the role that Vallejo is performing in supporting our national security efforts is recognized and appreciated in our Nation's Capital.

Since this Navy Yard's first Commanding Officer, Commander David G. Farragut assumed command on 16 September 1854, Vallejo has made a continuing and large contribution to the development and maintenance of United States seapower in particular, and to the enhancement of our national defense in general.

It takes no long and involved general staff study to realize that our Nation's security is better because of the people in the Vallejo area. It takes no prolonged strategic analysis to realize that if it were not for what the people in the Vallejo area are doing, our Nation would not be as strong as it should be in these troubled times.

It also is a pleasure for me to be with you for personal reasons. Vallejo has a lasting meaning to me. Sometime ago—more years than I care to itemize—but I might as well admit that it was 30 years ago this coming July, I reported in to the Mare Island Naval Yard for my first operational assignment. The heavy cruiser, USS *Portland,* was then in drydock for overhaul and I went aboard as the junior Marine officer in the ship's detachment.

My stay in Vallejo was for a couple of months. During that time I learned some of the things that any Marine officer going to sea for the first time should learn as quickly as possible.

One of the first things of lasting value for my service career that I learned was that the best steaks aren't in wardroom country but down in the CPO mess. Another thing I learned real early was that with so many of the ship's officers going on leave while the ship is in drydock, a Marine lieutenant is welcomed for a very good reason—from their standpoint: He is a new addition to the watch list and obviously, in order for him to qualify he must stand more than the normal rotation of assignments. Consequently, it became evident to me very soon that if I didn't have some reason for getting the Marines off the ship for drill and for firing on the range, I was going to meet myself coming off Officer-of-the-Deck watch in port.

But probably one of the most unforgettable things that I learned during my stay in Vallejo was the goodness of the people of this area, their hospitality to servicemen, their understanding of their problems, and also that the people of Vallejo who are so intimately associated with defense activities considered themselves, and rightly so, part of our national security organization.

Today, on this Armed Forces Day I am not going to try to give you a strategic analysis of the multiple problems facing our Nation. I am not going to try to tell you of the great advances that have been made in defense managerial techniques through electronic computerization. These things are important.

But I want to talk with you about the most important single part of our national security. I refer to the people in our Armed Services.

I think that there has been too big a tendency by some to look upon our national defense in terms of materiel and not in terms of personnel. But I want to tell you that one of the most reassuring aspects of the new leadership that Secretary of Defense Laird and Secretary of the Navy Chafee have brought to the Defense Department and the Department of the Navy has been a renewed and enhanced emphasis on the importance of the individual fighting men in our Armed Services.

So for the time remaining to me this evening, I would like to tell you about some of the things that some of these patriotic, devoted people in our Armed Services are doing for our Nation, for you, for me, and for the cause of freedom every minute of every day.

Because South Vietnam is where the action is, that's where our Nation's attention is focussed—and probably rightly so.

But in watching the critical events of that far away, bitter, and crucial conflict, we must not forget those who are manning the rampart's of freedom in the distant skies, in distant lands, and on distant seas.

Today, there are approximately 1,200,000 United States fighting men serving outside the continental limits of the United States. Of these, over 500,000 are in the Southeast Asia area of conflict. The remaining 700,000 are protecting America's security and joining our Allies and protecting the cause of freedom elsewhere in the world. Many of these are serving in NATO. And, I would like to mention, specifically, the contribution of NATO: It has become fashionable for some who oppose our national secruity efforts to say that NATO has done its job, and that it's work is finished; so dissolve NATO and bring the boys home.

Nothing could be further from the strategic or moral truth. NATO has done—and is still doing—an historic and indispensable job. Since NATO was established soon after the end of World War II, not one single square inch of NATO has been surrendered to Communism. But, that job has not been finished. NATO's job will not be finished until the danger to the cause of freedom from the Mediterranean to the Arctic is ended.

And so those today in our Armed Services who are serving in that great arc of NATO's protection from the strategic borders of the Mediterranean northward along the Iron Curtain to the high seas of the Arctic are truly manning the ramparts of freedom. To them on this Armed Forces Day—an on every day—we owe our thanks for what they are doing to preserve freedom and our Nation's survival.

There is another type of indispensable, sometimes forgotten service that is being performed every minute of every day. You in Vallejo are well acquainted with it because of the work you are doing on our nuclear submarines. I refer to the crews of the nuclear submarines that today are on patrol deep below the surface of distant seas. Their tireless vessels are roving underwater guardians of peace.

Our Nation's fighting men are today in Korea guarding the freedom which American fighting men helped save from Communist aggression almost two decades ago. Let us not forget either our servicemen who are on duty in distant and unpublicized places such as the soldier serving at the isolated Kagnew Station in Ehtiopia; or, the airman facing the long cold nights at Thule Air Force Base in Greenland; or, the sailor at the Communications Station on the remote North West Cape of Australia. There may not be much glamor in such duty stations, but there is great necessity for them. Each fighting man in his own way is making his contribution to the security our Nation must have to survive.

And, let us not forget those servicemen who are at this very moment languishing in captivity as prisoners of war. To them and to their loved ones at home, our Nation owes a deep responsibility and a deep gratitude. And for them and for their families whose every moment of separation is an epoch of heartbreak, we must keep them in our thoughts and in our prayers.

But, let us talk for a moment about military personnel, not as a group or Service, but as individuals. Because that's what they really are. They are individual young men. Each has left the warmth and comfort of his home and is separated from those who are dear to him.

In these days of placard-carrying demonstrators and riots against the military, it is a constant source of reassurance to me to learn from our individual fighting men how

they feel about the job they are doing in defense of our country.

I'd like to relate to you just a few of the comments that have been made to me personally over the past few years by our men in uniform.

Prior to my appointment to my present position, I traveled in a newswriter and radio correspondent status extensively throughout Southeast Asia and to other parts of the world. I always welcome the chance to talk privately with our fighting men. I learned long ago that if you want to get a common-sense, unsophisticated answer to a complicated and difficult problem, ask the man who is doing the job.

Soon after the decision was made to openly enter the Vietnamese conflict, I visited Vietnam. The Marines had gone ashore from the fleet at the strategic coastal location of Chu Lai. I arrived there while the Marine operations were still continuing against surrounding enemy units, and while the Seabees were still constructing the expeditionary aircraft runway. I wanted to know what our young men in Vietnam who were doing the fighting thought about the anti-war picketing and protesting back home. I asked one young Marine, about 20 years old, in embattled Chu Lai what he thought of those carrying posters "We won't fight in Vietnam."

He said: "I wish I had one of those smart protesters here. I'd like to take him with me on outpost duty tonight. There's a V.C. (Viet Cong) sniper who's been trying to get me for the last three nights. But I haven't been able to nail him yet." He paused and smiled. "I'd sure like to get him in my foxhole when that sniper starts working on us. I want to see how much that poster-carrier will wave his cardboard then."

His speech finished, he trudged through the sand back to his platoon. In a few hours he'd be back on outpost duty, trying to nail the Communist Viet Cong sniper before the sniper gets him. I was sorry he couldn't take along a placard carrying protester.

The war there is one of ambushes and close-quarter, small unit firefights. I asked a sergeant in our Army's Special Forces, a veteran of some bloody patrol actions, what he thought about the picket lines and demonstrations protesting U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

He didn't have to ponder over a reply. He'd obviously been thinking a lot about it. "We're in a war," he said. "What those people are doing helps the enemy. And, I don't think any American has the right to do that."

North of Saigon I spent some time with the tough and combat hardened troops of one of our Army's divisions. While going up to the forward positions, I was accompanied by a Negro master sergeant carrying a shotgun for protection against an unexpected attack. He was, I could quickly appreciate, a real professional, dedicated soldier.

We talked about many things. Finally I asked him what he thought about the American youngsters who were protesting against the draft, against our involvement in Vietnam, or anything else it was handy to protest and riot against.

He thought a moment and what he said, in a simple way, stuck with me as one of the wisest evaluations I have ever heard about our youth today. He said, "Those kids really don't know what they're doing. They are listening to a lot of people they shouldn't be listening to; you know that, if I could get hold of them, talk to them and have them in my outfit, I know that almost every one of them would turn into good soldiers and good citizens."

What he was selling me in an unforgettable way is that we are often too quick to write off as failures our younger generation. The proof of his wisdom has been the performance of our Nation's young men who do get into the Armed Forces.

Time and again, I have been told in Vietnam by the older NCOs and the officers who had commands in Korea in World War II that today's troops are better than any we had in the past. That may be a somewhat bruising realization for those of us who have put in a career that extended back to World War II. But, at the same time it should be reassuring and comforting reflection as to the intrinsic goodness of our young people today who have gone from the picket line to the firing line. Truly, once again, it has been demonstrated that military service is, in the most fundamental sense, a school of good citizenship.

If there's anybody who has earned the right to complain about fighting in Vietnam, it is the man who has been wounded in that fighting. He has paid for that right with the high price of his blood and too often his limbs.

But I can report to you now on the basis of personal knowledge that if you want to hear gripings, complaints, and criticisms about the stand our Nation is making against Communism in Vietnam, then don't go to the hospital wards and visit the wounded from the Vietnam battlefront. Those who have borne the brunt of battle are not the ones who are beefing about it.

A few days ago in Pearl Harbor I visited the battle casualties who have been flown in for treatment to Tripler General Hospital. Among the wounded I talked with was a young corporal. One leg was in traction, an arm was in a cast, and he had machinegun holes in his stomach. He hadn't obviously yet reached his 20th birthday.

I stopped and chatted with him. I asked him how long he had been in Vietnam before he was hit. He said he had been there almost two years. I asked him why almost two years, as the required tour was one year. He replied that he had twice voluntarily extended his duty. I asked him why did you do that?

He replied, "I was assigned to train and fight with a local village militia platoon in the northern hill country." He continued, "I found out how much these people wanted to be able to defend their villages, their families against Communism. I knew what I was doing was important, and I wanted to keep on doing it." And, then he added, "I believe that those village militia men would stand and die rather than surrender, or let me be captured. I found out I was right. I would have been killed or captured if they hadn't stood by me when we were hit by a big V.C. unit."

A few days ago, I visited the Vietnam casualties at the Great Lakes Naval Hospital just outside Chicago. Above the bed of every Vietnam casualty was a United States flag. Each wounded fighting man, when he leaves the hospital can take the flag from over his bed with him. And, they do. And, when a new casualty comes in, he wants a flag over his bed without delay. This, again, is a reflection of the genuine patriotism, devotion, and inherent goodness of those who know what it means to defend their flag and what it stands for.

One more short account of a recent meeting with a Vietnam veteran. Recently while flying to a conference at Pearl Harbor, I noted a young corporal a few rows back from me in the plane. During the flight, I walked back and sat down and told him that I had served in the Marine Corps and started chatting with him.

He was, he told me, on his way to Vietnam. I asked him, "Is this your first time out?" He said, "No, I'll be going in to my second extension." I said, "Why have you served one full year, extended for a six-month period, and now extending for another six months?" He said, "Well, the first time I extended I did it because some of my close friends had been killed in action, and I wanted to get revenge. I got it, but I also, during that added six months, I realized how necessary and important our job is that we are doing in Vietnam, and I want to keep on doing more of it."

But probably the best and most lasting explanation of duty I have ever heard came from a young Negro Army sentry on a lonely observation post overlooking Cam Ranh Bay. I stopped in the course of a visit to talk with him. I asked him if he had a family. He said, "Yes, I'd just been married a few months before I came out here again." I asked, "What does your wife think of your coming to Vietnam a second time?" He said, "She agreed when I told her that I believed I should be back here. I volunteered for a second tour." I said to him, "Why did you volunteer in spite of the fact that you had been married only a few months?" He thought for a moment and said in very simple language, "I think that it is every American citizen's duty to do what he can to help his country when it is in trouble."

This young man is not alone in this feeling. When I was in Vietnam some few months ago, I learned that 17½ per cent of the U.S. fighting men in Vietnam are voluntarily extending their duty beyond the minimum required period.

It is these kind of devoted American young men wearing the uniform of our Armed Forces that we honor today. We should honor them every day and say a prayer of thanks that our Nation still has the kind of young men who serve with such efficiency and dedication in our Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. They are the ones who in their time, as every generation must do in its turn, are accepting the responsibility of fighting to defend the freedom and the way of life which previous generations of American fighting men have defended.

And yet, the paradox of our times is that these brave fighting men, manning the ramparts of freedom along the Iron Curtain in Europe, the DMZ in Korea, the wooded mountains and fertile valleys of Vietnam, in distant skies and in far away waters are subject of slurs by some of those at home who spend their time sniping at the military.

It is high time, I believe, that those who criticize our men in uniform should reflect for a moment on the fact that it is our fighting men who, in the final analysis, are preserving the very freedom that those who cast slurs on our military are so grossly abusing.

And, so, I want to thank you for the privilege of being with you tonight and joining with you in honoring our fighting men whose indispensable services we appreciate and whose devotion and patriotism we should constantly strive to emulate.

---

## MICRONESIA: UNCLE SAM'S STEPCHILD

---

### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Milwaukee Journal carried a series of articles by a staff reporter, Mr. Don C. Trenary, on the Trust Territory of the Pacific, more commonly called Micronesia.

In my judgment this series provides an incisive and informative description of the situation which currently exists in those Pacific islands, mandated to U.S. control as a strategic trust by the United Nations.

Although a number of newspaper stories have appeared on Micronesia recently, Mr. Trenary's articles, in seemingly greater measure than others, have

provided a coherent and insightful account. In particular he has appreciated the military significance of Micronesia in the future security planning of the United States.

At the same time, he does not gloss over the sometimes sorry record of America's stewardship in Micronesia which has brought matters there close to a crisis state.

The title which has been given Mr. Trenary's series—"Uncle Sam's Stepchildren"—conveys the neglect of the population's welfare which has characterized the past.

Mr. Trenary, however—as do I—takes comfort from the recent pronouncements by Secretary of the Interior Hickel that a "new deal" is in store for the inhabitants of these Pacific islands.

Having raised the hopes of the Micronesian population, our Nation must now follow through in providing the opportunity for economic and social development to the Micronesian people.

Otherwise, the disillusionment may mean a period of turbulence in the Trust Territories which, at best, would be an embarrassment for the United States. At worst, it could mean a serious weakening of our Pacific defenses.

Mr. Trenary has said what should be said about Micronesia. I urge my colleagues to read his articles and take them to heart.

The articles follow:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 20, 1969]

UNCLE SAM'S STEPCHILDREN—MICRONESIA TO VOTE SOON ON POLITICAL FUTURE

(By Don C. Trenary)

CHALON KANOA, SAIPAN.—Sometime in the near future, quite probably within the next three years, the Trust Territory of Micronesia is going to vote on whether to continue an affiliation with the United States, or to go it alone in independence.

The choice will be of national and international importance far beyond the smallness of the islands and the fewness of their inhabitants.

The territory lies in the tropical Pacific—the romantic and overrated South seas—between Honolulu, the Philippines and the equator, but more toward the Philippines than Hawaii.

MUCH WATER, LITTLE LAND

Its boundaries enclose a bit more area than that of the United States. Its land area is somewhat less than that of Waukesha and Milwaukee counties combined. Its population is about that of Racine; its 93,000 inhabitants could be put at one time into Camp Randall and Milwaukee county stadiums and have seats left over.

The islands are remote, scattered, largely unproductive of cash crops and, from all present knowledge, wholly without minerals. They also are stepping stones between Hawaii and the orient and contain sites of considerable military value. This fact has not escaped the attention of either the United States or the Micronesians.

On these islands live Uncle Sam's stepchildren.

They are a remarkable race.

NORTH ON RAFTS

Some 5,000 years ago, about the time the Egyptians were experimenting with pyramid building and 2,000 years before Homer's heroes fought at Troy, they started traveling northward on huge rafts from somewhere in Indonesia or Malaysia.

They were then the world's foremost navigators (others of the same race journeyed to Africa and conquered Madagascar). They navigated by charts of sticks, which showed the cadence of the waves. The art was passed from chiefly father to princeling son, often in a secret language. The boy was taken to sea and made to float for hours, until he could recognize the wave rhythm on his own body.

To begin to understand Micronesia, one must realize first that there are no Micronesians as such. Micronesia is a catchall term which means "little islands" and refers to a slab of geography.

A PACIFIC BABEL

The islanders came to their present homes in small groups, at various times and by different routes. Along the way, they picked up the blood and words of other races. They differ in skin color, physique and language.

In the islands, there are eight or nine different languages, depending on whether you class one as a separate tongue or a dialect.

The district of Ponape, population 18,500, has three different languages. Its principal island, 129 square miles, speaks six dialects.

As to the old myth of the dreamlike, always peaceful life of the South sea islanders, forget it. The history of Micronesia is as bloody as that of the Scotch highlands. Until it was put down by the Germans early this century, warfare someplace was almost incessant—island against island, district against district, village against village or even clan against clan.

The old differences linger.

A RACE APART

The Chamorros of the Marianas islands consider themselves a race apart. A strong and lively political party there advocates cutting away from Micronesia and joining up with Guam, which is Chamorro in race but politically separate, due to a historic accident.

The Yapese, whose fierce warriors once levied tribute on other islanders for a thousand miles around, consider themselves superior. The Trukese look down on the residents of the other islands around them to the point where, administration officials say, the outer islanders shun the Truk High School and prefer their own at Ulithi.

Instances can be multiplied.

Except among the Chamorros, who have adopted a western outlook, the clan system holds sway. In most of the territory, kings and nobles are powerful. Many of the Marshall islands have a well knit caste system.

TABUS, BLACK MAGIC

The islands are ostensibly Christian, but in places tabus and scared animals remain. There are black magic and white magic and witch doctors, some of them concededly good.

These are products of environment and do not in the least reflect on the brainpower of the Micronesians. They, in all their variations of race, have a reputation for intelligence, which I can attest personally after talking with some of the leaders.

Neither have the differences between islanders overly hampered the working of the active, if pretty impotent, congress of Micronesia.

Within a single life span, the islands have been under four governments:

The Spanish, who had ruled weakly for centuries.

The Germans, who bought the area after the Spanish American war, ruled in heavy handed fashion and brought about some advances, mainly economic.

The Japanese, who took the islands in World War I, used them as a forbidden kingdom for colonization and military bases. Under them, the islands made great economic strides, not all of which necessarily benefited the islanders.

The Americans, who took the islands in bloody fighting in World War II and were confirmed in occupation as a United Nations strategic trust.

In the quarter century since, we have governed Micronesia in peculiarly whimsical style. At times we have wholly overlooked it; at times we have breathed benevolence, the cashless kind. At present, we are ballooning generosity and buddy buddyness. The Micronesians—no fools—connect this with military needs and are waiting for the commercial.

The trust under which the United States holds Micronesia is unique, the only one which allows the military use of trust territory. For its husbandry, the nation is answerable to the UN security council. In reality, this is no control at all, for America has veto power there.

Nonetheless, the overlordship of the United States is reviewed yearly by the UN trusteeship council. This review is to be made within a few days. Harsh words will be said—they always are—especially by the Soviets and the African nations. Some of them in the past have seemed justified.

NEVER CAN WIN

Some administration officials, though, contend that the council review is a game the Americans never can win—if we do little, we are accused of neglect; if we pour in funds, we are charged with imperialism; if we try to set up new industry and ideas that change the traditional way of life, we are called guilty of the subversion of the indigenous population and of neocolonialism.

The trust territory arrangement always was intended to be temporary. Micronesians for years have been restively asking for a permanent solution. This may come soon.

Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel said after his recent visit here: "I can see no reason to wait until 1972 for a vote on the territory's political future."

Before that, though, conferences are certain to take up the vexing question of American military bases.

---

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 21, 1969]

UNCLE SAM'S STEPCHILDREN—ISLANDS WANT MORE SAY, MORE PAY FOR BASES

(By Don C. Trenary)

CHALAN KANOA, SAIPAN.—You can, if you like put the thing two ways. For one: If the Trust Territory of Micronesia chanced to fall into hostile hands, the state of Hawaii and possibly the west coast could be in danger. Even in times of peace, communication routes between the United States and the south orient might be cut, and ships and planes subject to possible harassment.

On the other hand: What have 93,000 people, living on 2,141 small islands in the Pacific, to do with the security and problems of a great power, with which they are not allied by race and culture, and at present only temporarily by political ties, even though they have already found they have much in common?

GEOGRAPHY IS FACTOR

Scratch Micronesia how you will, sooner or later the matter of military bases comes up.

Geography does it. The chains of islands that have been thrown into a geographer's grab bag and labeled Micronesia lie between Hawaii and the friendly Philippines. Great circle routes, beloved by navigators, air and water borne, run through them. In an area where land is scarce (one early Spanish captain sailed through the whole group without seeing an island), they have capabilities for airstrips and harbors. For 5,000 miles, there is nothing else.

SEIZED BY JAPANESE

The matter of military bases can be overstressed. There are, happily, many other affairs on which Americans and Micronesians are in concord. But the bases will be what the Micronesians will use to put pressure on the

United States when they sit down to confer about the trust territory's future political status—the pitchfork they will use to prod Uncle Sam.

Here is the situation:

The Japanese took Micronesia from Germany in World War I. Wholly illegally under League of Nations mandate, they made it a secret colony, closed to outsiders, and filled it with military bastions. The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor originated in the Marshall islands, the easternmost Micronesian chain.

American forces took the area. Many islands were by-passed or lightly defended and so escaped ravage. But in others—Kwajalein, Saipan, Peleliu, Babelthuap—war was written in blood and destruction. Fortress Truk, perhaps impregnable, was never taken, but was devastated by repeated air raids.

After the war, the United States continued to rule the area under a one of a kind, United Nations strategic trust, which gave the nation the right to use the territory for military purposes.

Entirely legally, whatever you may think of the methods, the military took over Kwajalein atoll, which contains the world's biggest lagoon, for missile research. The residents were moved out to Ebeye, another island on the same atoll.

LUXURY AND SLUMS

Among people who have visited it—and they are few because Kwajalein now is very hush, hush, shh—the atoll has become a scolding point due to the contrast between the luxury in which American technicians live on Kwajalein island and the slum conditions in which Micronesians live on Ebeye.

Eniwetok and Bikini were used for open air atom bomb tests. The residents were moved away. Atomic fallout, by a whim of wind, fell on persons living on Rongelap.

The military also has some military "retention" areas. These are areas the military can take over on Saipan, Kwajalein and Tinian.

SUBSTITUTE FOR OKINAWA?

Recently, military interest in Micronesia has quickened and you can whisper that it is due to a probable forthcoming loss of Okinawa as a United States military base. Japan wants that island back.

Gen. Lewis W. Walt of the marine corps went through parts of the territory in April, looking, he said, for marine training bases. He said that Babelthuap and Peleliu had good terrain.

The army started negotiations for use of the Roi-Namur complex of islands at Kwajalein atoll. Gold braid of the navy, according to the Marianas Star, has started appearing for visits on Saipan.

To the appearance of the military, Micronesia has had a varied reaction. After Gen. Walt's visit, the district legislature of Palau, in which Peleliu and Babelthuap are situated, said it wanted no marines, and cited World War II experience.

On the other hand, the legislature of the Marianas district, which includes Saipan, has said it would welcome military installations.

CONGRESS WANTS ROLE

The congress of Micronesia, representing the entire territory, has passed a resolution saying that no further land should be taken for military purposes without its consent and full consultation with the inhabitants.

It is the belief of American administrators here that the Micronesians object not so much to the establishment of bases as to the cavalier manner in which their land was seized in the past. This was also affirmed by Sen. Lazarus Salii of Palau, one of the most powerful Micronesian political leaders. The policy is changed—maybe, but efforts to find out facts take on a dreamlike quality here.

"If the military comes here for bases, it will have to get title from the Micronesian government or private owners," said Joseph F. Screen, commissioner for administration.

HICKEL'S VIEW

"I don't think military bases are opposed too strongly," said his boss, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. "I think the opposition comes because they want to be consulted and do not like the way we have been doing it. This probably is not under the department of the interior, but we could consult with the department of defense over means."

In his Micronesia talks, Gen. Walt stressed spinoff benefits from the presence of the military in the form of roads, bridges, public works and a lift to the economy. Hickel in an interview also stressed the inpouring of money.

This is not entirely just mouthing. As one example, the prime industry of booming Hawaii is its military.

As to past seizures and use:

The Rangelap residents hit by atomic fallout have been given compensation.

Material still radioactive is now being cleaned off Bikini atoll. In a few months, replanting will start. The residents will be moved back in stages from their present home on Kili, which most of them do not like. The move will take six years.

"Something also is going to be done for the people of Eniwetok," said administrator Screen.

An agreement on general war damage claims has been reached between Japan and the United States. It is not yet approved by either congress or the Japanese diet. Under it, each nation will pay $5 million to be divided among Micronesians. The American portion will be in cash, the Japanese in goods.

Some Micronesians, Hickel said, contend that the Japanese will actually pay nothing at all, because by the agreement they get the right to use two Micronesian ports for their fishing vessels and the right to salvage some war sunken ships. They might wind up making money, he said.

This supposed weakness of the United States at the conference table will be remembered by the Micronesians when it comes time to talk about their future status. That will be no matter of a big guy shouting down a little, defenseless fellow. The Micronesians already have proved themselves canny bargainers.

PRICE GOES UP

After the takeover of Kwajalein island, the matter of compensation was let lie for years. Then a Micronesian delegation headed by Amata Kabua, a Marshalleze nobleman and a remarkable man, euchered the Americans into conference.

The Americans offered $600 an acre, an unheard of price for atoll land.

Without a word, the Marshall islands people walked out. Final settlement: $1,000 per acre for past and future use; land to be held on lease and revert to Kwajalein folk at the lease's end.

Already a Truk spokesman has said that, inasmuch as the presence of military bases may risk the lives of Micronesians, a higher price should be paid for future ones.

If by this you infer that the Micronesians are grasping and only interested in money, that implication is wrong. In a far broader way, they are interested in territorial administration and the welfare of their people, especially in getting a greater voice in their own management.

---

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 22, 1969]

UNCLE SAM'S STEPCHILDREN—MICRONESIA PLEDGED A "NEW DEAL"

(By Don C. Trenary)

CHALAN KANOA, SAIPAN.—By a 20 minute speech in a high school auditorium whose tin roof had been whirled away by a 1968 typhoon, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel has changed the concept of the relationship between the United States and the Trust Territory of Micronesia.

To the 93,000 persons who live in the 2,141 islands of the territory, which lies in the tropical Pacific between Hawaii and the Philippines, he promised:

More Micronesians in high ranking positions in the territorial government, with a training program to start within 90 days.

Full and equal participation with American personnel in planning and decision processes.

Efforts to eliminate differences in pay schedules now existing between Americans and Micronesians doing similar work.

In the last two years, the territorial government has trained and hired 240 Micronesians for clerical and administrative posts, but the pay differential has been a very sore point.

The report for fiscal 1967 shows that, without even counting her 25% bonus for overseas work, a clerk typist in one of the three lowest American pay brackets was earning more than all but 20 Micronesians, all of them classed as senior professionals or executives.

Formation of a budget committee by the congress of Micronesia which would recommend priorities for public works and other plans within the territory.

Introduction of legislation which, if approved by the United States Congress, would eliminate tariff duties on the importation of Cicronesian products. (Although Micronesia has been an American trust territory for more than two decades, the United States still charges tariffs on its products. Principal products affected would be copra—dried coconut which is used as a base in cosmetics and many food products—and processed fish, almost entirely tuna. Because of the tariff, tuna caught in Micronesia waters now are quick frozen and sent elsewhere for canning.)

Removal of travel barriers. Americans going to Micronesia now must obtain a permit card from the Micronesian capital on Saipan; the process takes about five weeks.

Encouragement of capital investment.

The program was greeted by the Micronesians in the audience with cheers, hope and blotches of skepticism. The overall record of America's guardianship of the territory's people is not such as to set them dancing in the streets.

"It is the best statement in years," said Amata Kabua, an influential Micronesian senator from Majuro. "The situation could not be worse. We have hit bottom."

"Our record has been disgraceful," said a high American administrative official. "We are just starting to go now; it should be showing soon."

"We have done more construction work within the last year than in the previous 22," said Joseph F. Screen, commissioner for administration.

HIGHER BUDGETS

The quickening pace now is made possible by higher budgets. A decade ago, budgets ran around a million dollars, almost all of it devoted to salaries for American administrators.

For the present fiscal year, the budget is $30 million, of which $9.5 million is being spent for construction. The rest goes to operate all territorial government activities. Administration expenses cost a bit less than 10% of the budget.

For the next fiscal year, which starts in July, a budget of $41.6 million has been requested, carrying a larger allowance for construction.

For practical purposes, control over expenditures has been wholly in American hands.

A congress of Micronesia was set up in 1965. It has two houses, occupied by delegates democratically elected in the territory's six districts. It is an excellent sounding board for opinion, but has little real

power. It has no control over budgetary matters and its acts are subject to absolute veto by the high commissioner. If an act is passed and vetoed twice, the Micronesians can appeal to the secretary of the interior.

POLITICAL APPOINTEE

The high commissioner is an American political appointee. The last one was William Norwood, a former Honolulu newspaperman with some political experience as adviser to the Hawaii governor. The new one is Edward E. Johnston, a Honolulu insurance man with some political experience as Hawaii's lieutenant governor.

With more money in the last few years, the territory has been able to do more for an area once almost wholly neglected. Some of the accomplishments:

Regularly scheduled, although not daily and sometimes not direct air service to the major islands, operated by a subsidiary of Continental airlines. In its first year, the line has drawn triple the projected passenger volume. The airline is pledged to build six tourist standard hotels on the islands; the territory now has two.

Micronesia considers the new air service wonderful, but travel among the widely scattered island groups is still, by American standards, tedious and frustrating. Witness the case of the congressman from Kusaie, a major but outlying island, who could not get to Hickel's address.

The congressman had been underway for two weeks when the Hickel speech was postponed and he was told to go home again. When the date was reset, the congressman could not be reached in time to come.

At some of the minor outlying islands, a ship may not touch for months, and even this service must be subsidized.

A shipping line operating between the territory and the west coast; previously goods were transshipped in Japan. The line, however, reported a loss in its first eight months of operation.

More schools and health facilities. (Micronesians are very susceptible to western type diseases; tuberculosis is the greatest killer. However, the population has nearly doubled since the Japanese left.)

Increase of new cash crops. Pepper exportation from the island of Ponape is expanding, but the growing of cacao there has suffered a setback from the swollen shoot-disease.

Setting up of a bureau of commercial fisheries research facility in the Palau islands to study the fishing potential of the waters and establishment of a branch of a sea food company there. (The private firm ran into unexpected difficulty—the Micronesians, although once great navigators, now, it is said, dislike going to sea. The company had to bring in Okinawans for the heavy fishing work. Latest payroll figures: 109 Okinawans for an annual $300,000 payroll; 78 Micronesians for $89,604.)

Sometimes the professed aims of the Americans are at odd variance with what goes on.

Item: Emphasis is being put on vocational education. However, the agricultural vocational school on Ponape has been closed. One explanation: Not enough students. Another story: The school has 60 students and a budget of $60,000. The head asked a budget increase to $110,000, was cut to $50,000, closed up the school.

---

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 23, 1969]

UNCLE SAM'S STEPCHILDREN—SAIPAN KEEPS SCARS OF WAR—AND PEACE

(By Don C. Trenary)

CHALAN KANOA, SAIPAN.—From the shallow bay water in front of the excellent Hotel Royal Kaga jut the turrets of two American amphibious tanks, knocked out in the ferocious fighting of the American conquest of Saipan in June, 1944.

Off a highway now bumpy, the last Japanese command post remains, a knife edge cleft in a vertical stone bluff. Field guns and a tank have been lugged from elsewhere to the flatland at the bluff's base and stand as a sort of war memorial.

Suicide cliff and Banzai cliff can be reached by road.

These were scenes of horror. From them frenzied Japanese civilians, told that rape and murder would follow surrender to the Americans, flung their children and themselves to death while below Japanese speaking American soldiers pleaded with them over loudspeakers not to.

SHRINES ON CLIFFTOPS

There are small shrines on each clifftop—small, upright wooden sticks carved with Japanese characters, left there by Japanese visitors in remembrance of what was.

Along the beach at the north end of the reef, the remains of an American half track still lie, now overgrown by trees. An exceptionally low tide disclosed the rusted metal parts of a Browning automatic rifle.

The visitor can go inside pillboxes, where Japanese defenders saw death coming to them from the sea. Magicienne bay still sparkles blue; white fangs of breakers still batter the north shore of Tinian island, from which Superfortresses took off to bomb Japan.

JAPANESE CITY GONE

Apart from that, there is little to remind those of us who touched this tropical island 25 years ago of the Saipan we then saw.

Garapan is gone. Under the Japanese it was a city of 12,500.

The status of Haruji, the Japanese sugar king, still stands, along with some of the shrines and outbuildings that once graced his estate. But the statue is riddled with bullet holes.

Trees grow in the grim, roofless Japanese jail. Tropical growth overlaps the ruins of the imposing stone Japanese hospital. Moldering walls of the wards are scrawled with graffiti. One of them starts: "A story of Jeseus. Jeseus is a good boy. . . ."

Parts of the former city area are occupied by new housing, America and Chamorro. But the old streets cannot be discerned or they crawl away, dimly visible, under the intruding growth of tropical plants.

You cannot tell where Garapan began or where it ended.

SHRUB TAKES OVER

Of the lush fields that greened the western side of the island when the Americans stormed ashore, no trace remains. They are overgrown by tangan tangan.

Tangan tangan is a spindly tropical weed shrub, its height about twice that of a man, its trunk about the size of a woman's slender wrist, its leaves like those of the locust tree.

After the Americans took the island, they found that tropical rain was eroding the exposed agricultural land. They seeded tangan tangan from airplanes to halt it. And tangan tangan has taken over the island, except for blotches where housing has been built and for one magnificent and peculiar exception.

The exception lies on the top of what is now known as Capital hill. The department of the interior, which now rules the island and the Micronesia trust territory, is not responsible for it.

ROLE OF THE CIA

After Chiang Kai-shek's defeat in China, so the story goes, the CIA was seized with abnormal delusion. It decided to train Chinese soldiers on Saipan for an invasion of the Chinese mainland.

Let John C. Santos tell about it. Santos is a Chamorro, now a driver for the Saipan Bus Co. but then was one of the drivers for the Chinese trainees.

"They were put into enclosed trucks and driven to the north end of the island," he said. "The north end was fenced off. It was all very secret. We knew something was up: They had skins like ours and we knew they were Chinese, or maybe Filipinos."

HILLTOP NOW CAPITAL

For the American heirarchy in charge of the training program, the CIA built on the hilltop a fine administrative building and an array of excellent, California style homes. The cost is said to have been $28 million (some say $30 million). The Chinese bivouacked elsewhere.

In 1962, the CIA gave up and pulled out. The hilltop was taken over by the government of the trust territory of Micronesia. It was the first time Micronesia had a capital actually inside its own borders. Previously, it had been ruled from Honolulu and then Guam.

The residences now house families of 92 high officials, 80 American and 12 Micronesians.

The fine homes form a startling contrast with the housing of some of the Chamorros on the flatlands below.

Many of these are emergency buildings, made necessary by a devastating typhoon last year. They are of wood, built on sort of an X frame, with the X fattened at the crossing. It is said high wind can't tip them over.

Others have survived the typhoon. They are of many materials, some of them of corrugated iron. A clutter of stuff is often in the yard.

Now, a person who has been long in the tropics is not shocked by poor housing or clutter. With very few exceptions, they seem to be always there.

WHAT HAS UNITED STATES DONE?

But there are some things that stick with the taste of bile to the back of the throat.

When we Americans took Saipan from the Japanese, it had thrifty fields and a fishing industry. Now it has neither.

When we Americans took the island, it had about 30,000 people. It's population now is somewhat less than 10,000.

Saipan has a fine, recent hotel, well up to mainland standards. It gives employment to 63 of the native population. Its principal owner is an American millionaire.

Saipan has two big construction projects under way.

One involves $1 million worth of housing for government staff members. The houses are nice but not elaborate. Some have split cedar shingles from Oregon. They say the shingles will not blow away in high wind.

The other project is an $850,000 community administrative center, to house the fire department, police department and such.

Both probably are needed.

WHAT OF LITTLE GUY?

But, emergency housing aside, what have more than two decades of American rule done for the little guy, the man without a government job?

Officials are talking about the possibility of a plantation system to grow truck farm crops. The United States has given AID money to help nations in other parts of the world break up their plantations.

There is tangan tangan and there are discarded beer cans.

But it is nice atop the hill. It must be wonderful in a tropical night, when the stars come out in plum sized splendor. It could make a man feel out of this world . . . way, way out of this world.

## HONOLULU CHIEF OF POLICE DAN LIU RETIRES AFTER 37 YEARS OF SERVICE TO BECOME A SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE U.S. POSTMASTER GENERAL

---

## HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Honolulu's Police Chief Dan Liu will leave shoes that will be extremely difficult to fill when he retires next month after 21 years of service in that capacity to become a special assistant to the U.S. Postmaster General. Honolulu has been fortunate indeed to have had the services of such a dedicated public servant who, for the past 37 years, has worked unceasingly to improve the quality of law enforcement in the Islands.

We in Hawaii are sorry to see Chief Liu leave his post, for his stalwart character and the widespread community respect he commands have become an integral part of police administration in the city and county of Honolulu. As a man of the highest integrity, of compassion and humor, and yet of steel when the need arose, Chief Liu not only established but also followed his terse motto: "Service. Honor. Integrity." It is this motto that he leaves behind with the men in the Honolulu Police Department, and it is this same motto that he will undoubtedly bring with him to Washington as he answers the call to a high office in the national administration.

It has been an arduous trek for the high school business student who climbed his way up through the ranks from patrolman during Honolulu's early "Mamie Stover era" to chief of a highly efficient and respected island police force that today numbers 967 commissioned officers and 200 civilian employees.

At 61, and on the eve of his retirement, Chief Liu offered these remarks to Gardiner B. Jones, associate editor for the Honolulu Advertiser:

You always hear the trite thing about mixed emotions. After so many years of associations, you have left your life here with these men. There is a feeling of sadness but the new job is a challenge and I hope to be of service to the postmaster general and to the country.

As a tribute to Chief Dan Liu and the high type of public servant he personifies, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Jones' article, "Liu Tells of Early Days: No Rules, No Training," which first appeared in the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser of May 18, 1969.

I am also privileged to offer for inclusion in the RECORD Senate Resolution 204, adopted by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii on May 14, 1969, expressing appreciation and congratulations to Chief Liu.

The article and resolution follow:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, May 18, 1969]

### LIU TELLS OF EARLY DAYS: NO RULES, NO TRAINING

(By Gardiner B. Jones)

From high school business student to nationally famous chief of Honolulu police . . . from the Mamie Stover era through politics and corruption to molder and leader of a modern, efficient force, a task he took on reluctantly . . . 37 years an officer, 21 of them as chief . . . and always the motto: "Service. Honor. Integrity."

There in a capsule is the life story of Chief Dan Liu as it emerged in an interview on the eve of his retirement at age 61 to become special assistant to the U.S. postmaster general.

"I joined the department in 1932," he said. "I had read about the sheriff's system being abolished. They were going to institute a chief of police system under a commission appointed by the governor."

#### OUT WITH THE POLITICS

"We had elected the City-County sheriff before. The change was the result of a study by Attorney General Homer Cummings. "The study found too much politics. And actually, it flowed out of the Massie case."

Liu at 22 was working for the Union Trust Co. He had been graduated from St. Louis High School where he studied business.

One of the men setting up the new police department was C. L. Howell, sent to Hawaii by the Berkeley, Calif., department, whose chief was a recognized authority on police administration.

Liu's boss—A. D. Castro—was on the police commission and he urged Liu to join the department.

"I went to see Howell," Liu said, "and he told me about police work and I became intrigued. I took the exam. In that group there were three university men, two locals and a retired Navy chief. We were the only ones that came out. They hired every man.

#### A DETERMINED GUY

"But I still was not sure I wanted it, but Howell was a determined guy and he kept calling at my home and each time I tried to be absent when he came.

"Finally, my mother said he was interested and kind enough to call and if I didn't want to accept I should go down there and decline. So I went down one evening about seven and Howell was cranking the mimeograph machine.

"So somehow I said could I give a hand and he said, by all means. As I am making 100 copies, he's telling me about the great challenge of police work. By 10 that night I thought I'd take a try at it."

In those days, Liu recalled, radio was in its infancy and the department had a few radio-equipped, two-man squad cars. Liu was assigned to one of the cars.

"We had no training then," he said. "You were assigned to an officer and you learned from him. Another thing that was haphazard, they did not issue any rules. I was sent on my first duty without even a badge and I was not even told how to make an arrest.

"I was sent on a domestic case, an affray between two brothers. All I thought was to go in and stop it. I found myself on the ground and a chair being swung over my head that missed by inches. A radio car came over just when one of the brothers was coming at me with an automobile crank.

"This experience showed the need of training and that's why when I became chief I was so determined we were going to have real and vigorous training—not just for recruits but for experienced officers, too."

Liu also worked in the records division and the detective division. As a detective he was under the tutelage of the tenacious John Jardine, whom he describes as "a conscientious and dedicated officer."

#### ANOTHER PROMOTION

After four years on the force, Liu was assigned to the office of Chief W. A. Gabrielson, who left the department after the police graft scandal broke in the mid-1940s.

Liu recalled the rectic war years, when Honolulu's population was swollen and the city governed by martial law.

"It was pretty orderly and the men were well disciplined considering the circumstances," he said. "We did not have the violence you might have expected.

"At that time, the houses of prostitution were running—they felt it was a social necesstiy, and the military maintained tight control. The police did not have too much to do with it because of martial law. They enforced their military regulations, including the curfew, on the civilians. Even burglary took a drop.

#### IT WAS NECESSARY

"Personally, I thought it was necessary during a period like that. I feel that if it weren't for martial law our problems would have been greater. Yet you have to recognize it was rather infamous, but people realized the situation demanded control."

As for the graft case, Liu said:

"It sprang from gambling and prostitution. Defense workers came back from the southern islands and they had a lot of money. It was easy come, easy go. In one case, the officers afforded transportation to a gambling place.

"When the graft broke it was a surprise to many of us. It involved only members of the vice squad."

By this time, Liu was an assistant chief.

"To me," he said, "it meant scandal, and so many of us could not understand. You would think there is this honor and integrity. That's why all along I insist we need to serve with honor and integrity and why we have this slogan posted: 'Service. Honor. Integrity.' "

#### HE TURNED IT DOWN

With Gabrielson out, the police commission sought to persuade Liu to become chief but he declined; he was unwilling to give up the security of his civil service status.

The commission tried on and off for two years to get Liu to accept the top post, but the security concern got in the way. Interestingly, having accepted, he served under six governors—Poindexter, Stainback, Long, King, Quinn and Burns. It happened like this:

"I have taken no vacation during the war," he said, "and I had 90 days coming and decided to go to the Mainland. Warren McDermott of Sears was on the commission and he told me to think things over.

"He said he wanted to straighten out and strengthen the department and it made me feel very humble. Chief Horrall in Los Angeles had worked with the patrol division here and I visited him. He told me to accept.

"He said, 'If I hear of you refusing, I'll come over and kick your ass.' "

#### THE FINAL DECISION

"Then word got into the papers that I was being considered and I got to thinking that the community might think that I was afraid and that's what finally persuaded me."

Liu became chief on Aug. 1, 1948, and set about immediately clamping down on vice—gambling, prostitution, opium and heroin—and sprucing up the department.

He said:

"It was a problem because you had holdovers from the sheriff days and many did not even have a high school education. It was partly that they could not adjust to the new ways.

"One of the first things was to raise the standards of entry and one of those was a high school education. There is still a need to upgrade and in the next two to three years we'll have a requirement for at least two years of college.

"Enforcement is not only equipment. An officer should be able to handle the social sciences. He must have knowledge of human behavior. It's going to take more than physical prowess and technical police skill. He has to be a generalist."

THE FUTURE OFFICER

Liu foresees the time when police officers will all be college graduates and will draw minimum pay of $10,000 a year.

Asked what he considered the major accomplishments of his years as chief, he listed these:

Institution of a police science program at the university, the police activities league, a cadet training program, the development of a crime laboratory, the installation of a computer system and the formation of a community relations division.

Also, he considered it important that the police had switched from the old olive drab uniform to blues. The old uniform, he said, reminded people too much of the martial law days.

"And," he smiled, "I changed the badge from that old seven-point star so the officers could not be called Pepsi-Cola cops after a radio show for kids."

Looking ahead to immediate needs, Liu said the department needs a helicopter patrol, more centralized communications, a training academy—and, above all, more men.

NEED 197 MORE OFFICERS

The force today numbers 967 commissioned officers and 200 civilian employes. Liu believes there is an immediate need for 197 more officers to cope with the problems of a growing city.

Liu was asked what criteria he would set for the man to succeed him as chief.

"He should have the basics of any police officer," Liu replied. "In the 19th century the needs were the same as far as traits go: integrity, character, dedication. And there is something you can't measure, and that's bravery.

"Naturally, he should be honest. He should be physically fit and willing to work long hours. He must provide vital leadership in the department and have good relations with the mayor, the council and the commission and represent the department to the public."

And what of his feelings on departure?

"You always hear the trite thing about mixed emotions," he said. "After so many years of associations, you have left your life here with these men. There is a feeling of sadness but the new job is a challenge and I hope to be of service to the postmaster general and to the country."

---

SENATE RESOLUTION 204

(Resolution extending deepest appreciation to Dan S. C. Liu, chief of the Honolulu Police Department, for his service to the community and congratulations and best wishes for continued success in his new endeavor)

Whereas Dan S. C. Liu, internationally acclaimed Chief of the Honolulu Police Department, has resigned to accept a position in Washington, D.C. as Special Assistant for International Relations to the Postmaster General of the United States; and

Whereas from humble beginnings, Dan Liu joined the police force in the midst of the great depression and by dint of perseverance, intellectual ability and personal integrity, steadily rose through the ranks to become Chief in 1948; and

Whereas for the more than 20 years he has led the Honolulu Police Department, Dan Liu has won honor, respect and public esteem for himself, the men of his department and the State of Hawaii; and

Whereas Dan Liu's record of public service has not been confined to law enforcement; but extends to active and effective membership and participation in national and international police organizations, his church and numerous organizations, largely connected with serving the youth of Hawaii; and

Whereas in recognition of his outstanding achievements, Dan Liu has now been appointed to a high office in the national administration: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969,* That this body express and extend to Dan Liu its appreciation for his service to the community, its congratulations and best wishes for continued success in his new endeavor, and its admiration for a great son of Hawaii; and be it further

*Resolved,* That duly certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to Dan Liu, to the Postmaster General of the United States and to Hawaii's Congressional Delegation.

THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF HAWAII,
*Honolulu, Hawaii, May 14, 1969.*

We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969.

DAVID C. MCCLUNG,
*President of the Senate.*
SEICHI HIRAI,
*Clerk of the Senate.*

---

## THE FAMILY PLANNING AND POPULATION ACT OF 1969

---

## HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of introducing, along with several of my distinguished colleagues in the House, legislation calling for the creation of a National Center for Population and Family Planning.

If established, this Center would be an innovative step toward solving the monumental and critical problems inherent in the population crisis—which in an important sense, are at the core of the poverty problem in the world. Statistics indicate a direct relation between poverty and family size: one of every five American children live in poverty; one-third of all families with five or more children live in poverty; 49 percent of all children living in poverty live in families of five or more children.

The Social Security Administration determines "poor" and "near poor" status on the amount of money a family has to spend for food per person per day. Continuous increases in family size without a corresponding increase in family income will force many families into a poverty existence, and will keep those already there from rising out of a poverty level.

Virtually all middle-class American families practice some form of family planning during the course of their reproductive years. However, low-income families without access to private medical care are often denied the opportunity to determine the number and spacing of their children. In this country 5.3 million low-income women in the childbearing years need family planning services, but less than 15 percent are currently receiving such services. Present efforts will reach only 800,000 low-income women this year.

In view of the urgency of the world's population problems, current research efforts are totally inadequate. There is presently no completely satisfactory contraceptive method available to the public. It is of the utmost importance that research facilities and activities be extended so that contraceptive methods that are safe, low in cost and suitable for various population groups in varied circumstances here and abroad be developed.

The high degree of infant mortality and birth defects is another area worthy of our consideration. Studies have shown that family planning is the most cost effective method—between $30 and $50 per person per year—of reducing infant mortality and the incidence of prematurity, mental retardation and birth defects. For every 500,000 women with three or more children, birth control services would prevent 2,173 infant deaths.

Our present efforts in these areas have been practically minimal and totally inadequate. Current family planning programs are scattered through various sections of HEW and as a result have become victims of disorganization and poor administration; further, they suffer from insufficient funds and a shortage of personnel.

The National Center proposed by this legislation would be under the direct supervision of the Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and as such would provide for more centralized administration and organization. The Center would serve ultimately to coordinate and consolidate all current domestic population programs; in addition, it would serve to seek new avenues of solution to existing problems and would work for the prevention of the development of new problems.

The services to be offered by the Center are encompassed in a six-point program:

First. To administer all HEW project grants relative to family planning services;

Second. To administer and be responsible for all population and family planning research carried on by HEW or through HEW grants or contracts;

Third. To act as a clearinghouse for information on all domestic and international programs;

Fourth. To serve as a liaison with the activities carried on by other agencies of the Federal Government relating to population and family planning.

Fifth. To provide and/or support training for the manpower required to implement our domestic and foreign family planning programs and research; and

Sixth. To coordinate and evaluate other HEW programs related to family planning and population.

The bill provides for a much needed development of a comprehensive family planning program, requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to submit a 5-year plan to Congress, not later than 6 months after the bill's enactment, setting forth guidelines and goals regarding the extension of family planning services to all who desire them, and expanding needed research and manpower training programs.

To expand and improve the services and research activities of public and private nonprofit agencies and institutions,

the bill authorizes a total of $89 million for fiscal year 1971, to be utilized as follows

First, $30 million in special project grants for family planning services;

Second, $10 million in formula grants to State health agencies for planning, establishing, maintaining, and evaluating family planning services;

Third, $35 million in research grants to promote biomedical, contraceptive technology, and behavioral research related to population and family planning;

Fourth, $12 million in grants for construction of population research centers;

Fifth, $2 million in grants for training personnel in the family planning field.

This bill proposes to put responsibility for family planning and population control under the Medical Health Services Branch of HEW; in doing so, it would provide for more centralized administration, unification of existing programs, and the development of more comprehensive, all-inclusive programs designed to remedy one of the most pressing problems facing all of us today.

## HONORARY DOCTOR DEGREE RECEIVED BY HON. CLEMENT ZABLOCKI

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, recently received an honorary degree from Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wis.

I include a copy of the college's citation and diploma awarded to him, as well as Mr. ZABLOCKI's acceptance speech:

CITATION OF MERIT

Of the many mansions that house a free people in a democratic society, the school is an important one for the statesman of responsibility and concern. For ultimately to be a true statesman is to feel responsible for education. It is to feel that the art and science of politics is part of the total educational process of humanity on which the building of the world depends. It is to know that although laws are made to free men, it is the truth under law that finally frees a man. It is to understand that concern for the democratic process demands education in that process.

Clement J. Zablocki's involvement in national and local educational programs make him an architect in such a process. He has helped to build through initiation and support of progressive legislation the edifice that houses for a free society the sources of freedom, justice and peace. He believes in education because he believes in man, knowing that education makes men easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave.

Given on the occasion of the awarding of the honorary degree, Doctor of Laws.

KATHRYN F. CLARENBACH,
*Chairman of the Board of Trustees.*
Sister JOEL READ,
*President of Alverno College.*
Dated May 11, 1969, Milwaukee, Wis.

DIPLOMA

Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in recognition of Distinguished Achievements, the Board of Trustees of Alverno College has conferred upon Clement J. Zablocki the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws with all the rights and privileges pertaining to that degree.

In witness thereof, this diploma is given at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on the eleventh day of May, in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, bearing the signature of the President and the seal of the College.

Sister JOEL READ,
*President of Alverno College.*
KATHRYN F. CLARENBACH,
*Chairman, Board of Trustees.*

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, ELVERNO COLLEGE, MAY 11, 1969

Words are never so weak as when they are supposed to express gratitude. I think I had best say therefore as simply and as sincerely as I can—thank you for the high honor you have conferred upon me today. I say it joyfully and with great pride. I say it also with humility, knowing full well that many have made it possible for me to be here.

Gratitude is an old word with a long history. I use it here to express my determination to carry this honor *with honor*. That resolution is the more a challenge because of the prestige and renown of Alverno College, the distinguished quality of its faculty and administration, by the dedication and zeal of its students.

To be included in the noble purpose of this community of scholars will provide reassuring strength in the days ahead. In my own work as a Member of Congress there is a direct relationship with the pursuit of truth which is the happy, but sometimes no less burdensome, opportunity which is your daily task.

In fulfilling that role Alverno College is making a distinguished contribution to this community, state, and the entire nation. That contribution is all the more significant, however, because of the diversity of educational opportunity which Alverno represents as a *private* institution.

The urgency of preserving such diversity must be recognized and responded to. As the cost of private education soars the burden becomes more difficult.

A partial answer to this problem has come from the Federal government in the form of grant and assistance programs. Alverno and its sister colleges and universities throughout the country have been sustained to some extent by such programs.

Th fact remains, however, that other forms of governmental assistance must be provided if the private institution of higher learning is to thrive.

In view of the higher tuition costs which private schools must necessarily charge, one possible added source of assistance should be that of allowing tax credits to the parents who pay those tuitions.

An alternative solution might be that of providing direct grants to the students who attend private schools to help offset the higher tuition they pay. Such a program would make possible the full exercise of freedom of choice in education.

It seems to me that those who oppose such moves have lost sight of two essential factors—one essentially philosophical, the other involving certain practical realities.

The first of these considerations is the fact that institutions at every level of American society are built on the foundation of diversity. In the most important of these institutions, however, our educational system, we are told that the private school is "divisive", that it is "undemocratic." What could be more against the American character?

The second of these considerations involves a degree of practical common sense. The question to which opponents stay blind is one to which most taxpayers today remain painfully aware. If the private school is forced to curtail its operation and its students transfer to public schools from where is the added tax money to come?

These and many more questions must be answered honestly and realistically if meaningful solutions are to be found. Finding those solutions will not be easy; in the working out of the democratic process it may in fact entail a struggle.

While that effort may give us cause for dismay it must not make us despair. Against the tendency of cynicism and moral indifference toward those things in this country which are good, there is a strong countertendency of support for the principles of decency and fair play.

My own faith and hope is that, in the context of American traditions and the American character, these principles will prevail.

There is much good in the American body politic. Democracy is not a static system; it entails conflict. But most of all it depends upon an unflagging belief that good and just and honorable men will prevail.

To this struggle of regenerating America Alverno College commits its graduates today. I trust that this outstanding institution will continue to play its vital role.

I rejoice that through this honorary degree I have formally been given a place among you and a chance to share in that struggle.

## SCIENCE ENDORSES IGNORANCE

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Jenkin Lloyd Jones has now joined the pioneer squad of truthseekers. He most certainly joins a small and select minority who, in their continuing search for the truth, may well reap the condemnation of their timid contemporaries who seem more content to rest on their Nobel laurels than seek honest answers to questions which may well prove the difference between survival and extinction of our culture.

For certainly, the secret closed door vote by which the National Academy of Sciences rejected Nobel Laureate Dr. William Shockley's suggestion that it encourage scientific inquiry into possible inherent or genetic differences in intelligence among groups of Americans can only be interpreted as fear of politically unpopular inquiry or prejudice against what they know may be the truth.

Mr. Jones' column follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 24, 1969]

GENETICS TURNS OFF THE SCIENTISTS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

On April 29, by a show of hands in closed session, members of the National Academy of Sciences voted 200 to 10 against conducting any inquiry into possible inherent or genetic inferiority of intelligence among groups of American children, most particularly the children of "hard-core" chronic reliefers and apparent unemployables.

This is the third straight year that the national academy, composed of 850 distinguished scientists chartered as advisers to the U.S. government, has turned down such a proposal. Is the academy in this matter exhibiting a spirit of free scientific inquiry or is it putting on a display of inflexible dogma?

In supporting the turn down, Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the academy, said, "It is essentially impossible to do good research in

this field as long as there are such great social inequities. And such research is also so easily misunderstood in these times."

Well, what does he really think—that the subject is not capable of being scientifically investigated or that the results might be misinterpreted? There's a vast difference.

The investigation was proposed by Dr. William Shockley of Stanford, one of the inventors of the transistor and a Nobel Prize physicist. He wanted to know if there is danger in down-breeding the American intelligence average through the proliferation of children of parents who represent the second generation of chronic relief-getters and who seem to have great difficulty in coping with their environments.

Dr. Shockley's question was received with all the cordiality that met a heretical question before the Spanish Inquisition. He was lucky to have escaped the pit and the pendulum.

For it is the current dogma of "liberalism" that while there are undoubtedly individual differences in intelligence, no one who loves his fellow man can entertain the unthinkable thought that there can be any genetic differences involving groups.

You can't be a humanitarian, according to this theory, without embracing as an article of faith the conviction that all general differences are the result of environment and the great leaps forward can be achieved by simply improving the environment.

Oddly, this is a very new idea. Until a generation ago most scientists were willing to concede that since both the Australian bushman and the Children of Israel came out of roughly similar environments something else must explain the vast difference in their contributions to civilization and their ability to grasp new ideas and new technologies.

Contrary to Dr. Seitz' plea that this question cannot be propery investigated because of "social inequities," there is no reason why the effect of improved housing, improved neighborhoods and improved schooling upon the IQs of children cannot be measurable.

If environment is as important as the dogma doggedly maintains, then these offspring of the hard core who have been moved into dramatically upgraded environments should show quick improvements. If long-standing social patterns of thought and behavior are the cause of the trouble, then these control groups should show slower but still steady increases in mental power.

The refusal of these eminent scientists to even look into the matter has a hollow ring.

There is no kindness in perpetuating delusion, however kindly it is meant. The mother who is told that her dull child may become bright if it is bused across town could be the victim of a cruel fraud. The professors who seem masochistically eager to see their colleges deluged with unprepared students from the ghettos may be promoting disappointment.

These professors have traditionally demanded higher and higher entrance standards. Now, if they are sure that the very environment of college will automatically prepare for the disciplines of college work ill-prepared black newcomers, then they are guilty of discrimination against generations of ill-prepared white students whom they cheerfully kept out. And if the new ghetto students stare blankly at the blackboard, explode in frustration and burn Old Main, whose fault is it?

The way to uplift and social progress does not lie in schemes based on rigid preconceptions which the proponents are unwilling to have tested.

The medieval alchemists were convinced that by the proper incantations base metal could be turned into gold. Modern science didn't begin until men were willing to test the nature of materials.

Is the National Academy of Sciences going back to alchemy?

## THE CAMPUS IN TURMOIL: BY M. STANTON EVANS AND WALTER W. MEEK

---

## HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the best and most interesting roundups of information and observation on campus turmoil appeared in a 12-part series appearing in the Indianapolis, Ind., News, April 21–May 3, 1969. Written by Mr. M. Stanton Evans, editor of the News, and Mr. Walter W. Meek, assistant city editor of the Arizona Republic, each writer contributed six articles, written in consultation with the other. They visited more than 30 campuses from coast to coast to complete their series. The articles follow:

SIGNS POINT TO COOLING OF STUDENT REVOLT

(By Walter W. Meeks, with M. Stanton Evans)

College and university officials across the country have braced for the expected "spring offensive" of the radical left.

But as spring 1969 unfolds, there are hopeful signs—no more than that—that the student revolt has cooled from its worst levels of violence in 1968.

There are indications that the new left vanguard, the revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society, has slipped in effectiveness.

Among several developing trends, two in particular seem to be changing the course of student dissent. One is that moderate forces are rallying against the destructive tactics of SDS and its allies. The other is that the dissident minority has split into separate thrusts, white and black.

Two recent incidents at ultraliberal Harvard University illustrate the trends:

On a cold day last January, an all-white troupe of about 40 SDS members picketed in the snow to protest a course in riot control offered by Harvard's Graduate School of Design.

Inside the bulding, a sit-in was in progress by another 150 students, all black. A spokesman told the instructor firmly that Harvard's Afro-American students would not permit a course designed "to suppress the only forms of protest remaining to black people."

While SDS kept its separate vigil in the snow, the protagonists inside decided to compromise. At last report the instructor had dedicated his course to the causes of riots instead of their control and was looking forward to a sizable black enrollment.

The issue evaporated and so did the SDS pickets. It was the second consecutive day that SDS was left in the cold.

The previous day, the Harvard faculty voted to strip ROTC of its academic standing.

SDS, covering the issue with moral bombast related to its dogmas on Vietnam and the U.S. military-industrial complex, demanded that ROTC be ejected from the campus.

But the faculty pointedly made its decision on academic grounds presented by student leaders who had researched the question for months. The moderates had taken the issue and the initiative away from SDS.

That is one approach being used by campus moderates. Another is the coalition counterattack to insure that the majority voice is heard along with the radical outcry.

At Harvard on April 9, SDS revived its demand for immediate ROTC eviction as one of the issues behind the seizure of an administration building by about 200 radicals.

According to moderate student sources, the SDS action was condemned by most of the Harvard student body and would have collapsed from lack of support. But the use of police to oust the radical occupation force turned the majority against the administration.

"Now we're just trying to keep the place together," said a moderate spokesman. "Most people here are thoroughly disgusted with SDS and the administration."

At colleges across the nation, elements opposed to the new left are beginning to speak and act with conviction.

Some agree with new-left goals but not its tactics; others disown the goals as well. But all are determined that the violence must stop.

BLACK STUDENTS GO SEPARATE WAY

The black students, bound up in racial pride and solidarity, have turned to their own leadership and counsel.

Under various banners across the country—Third World Liberation Front, Black Student Unions, Afro-American Student Associations—they are going their separate way.

A typical attitude of black student leaders is that of Yusuf Kaurouma, Afro-American Student Association president at the University of Colorado: "I'm not going to involve black students in anything that isn't good for black people."

"In effect, the blacks have said, 'Go do your own thing,'" lamented Dennis Stovall, former SDS chairman at the University of Oregon. "Of course it's reduced our effectiveness."

The sweeping goals of white revolutionaries don't always mesh with the concrete aims of black students, Stovall concedes. "The blacks, after all, are basically trying to get a piece of the action the white society has denied them."

The point was driven home last month when SDS launched its "spring offensive" at Columbia. Although this year's strike involved several items designed to appeal to Negroes, there was almost no black support for it. An SDS picket line in front of Columbia's Hamilton Hall featured only one black student, while several Negroes crossed the line to get into the building.

FEAR STATE AID JEOPARDIZED

At Michigan, the Black Student Union has criticized the student newspaper there for, among other things, taking too radical positions, creating an unfavorable university image and jeopardizing appropriations from the legislature.

With more and more universities listening attentively to the demands of black militants and moving to meet them, minority students generally are taking a tense wait-and-see attitude. This is depriving white radicals of much of their moral appeal and protective coloring.

"SDS has been scrambling for months and months to find some sort of coalition issue with the black kids," said Harvard senior Ken Glazier, outgoing chairman of the student-faculty committee that fashioned the ROTC decision.

Scrambling for issues is a fair description of SDS activities at most campuses today. For reasons that aren't completely clear, the energy that was available for Vietnam war protest a year ago seems to have been dissipated by the bombing halt, the Paris peace talks and all of the dramatic events that led finally to the election of President Nixon.

"It may be part of the national wait-and-see attitude toward the Nixon administration," offered a Boston University coed, "but a typical antiwar rally or draft card burning won't even draw the radicals out anymore."

To keep the movement moving, campus radicals are grabbing at whatever provocations are handy: The presence of ROTC, campus recruiting by the armed services and

defense industries, defense-related research on the campuses, grape boycotts and demonstrations against "objectionable" speakers.

At most campuses these issues don't excite many students. Where such issues do have radical potential, the trend among administrators and moderate student leaders is to deal with them before the radicals can magnify them into confrontations.

At the University of Washington, for example, SDS has taken up the cudgels against ROTC, but the program is already under open review by the university. The same is true at Columbia. At Stanford, SDS is faced with a student referendum supporting ROTC firmly.

Some universities, such as Washington, are cutting ties with campus laboratories that specialize in classified military and defense work.

There is strong evidence that excessive violence such as that at Columbia a year ago has discredited SDS with many faculty and student liberals who instinctively are sympathetic to its aims.

"This is a pretty liberal place," said Harvard senior Steve Kaplan in a massive understatement. "It's the kind of place where you could get 50 or 100 kids to occupy a building for any cause that makes sense. But most of the kids here wouldn't stand for another Columbia. They care too much about this place."

CONFRONTATION OVER ROTC

At the University of Washington last month when SDS announced plans for a confrontation over ROTC, about half of the full-time faculty members produced a statement supporting in advance whatever action the administration might have to take to keep order. Student body leaders, whose cast is decidely liberal, loudly condemned the SDS tactics and students demonstrated against SDS.

At several campuses, students complain the SDS would suffer near anonymity if it weren't for the attentions of the media, nervous administrators and angry politicians.

A reporter for the University of Colorado campus newspaper declared, "SDS would be nothing on this campus if the university and the legislature wouldn't insist on making them an issue, making martyrs of them."

Whatever the trends seem to be, it's also true that the student revolution is in as many stages as there are colleges and universities. It has barely started to surface at some places.

As a dean at fairly-placid Arizona State University said, "I don't think I want to be sitting here at this desk the day they decide to abandon the Paris peace talks."

His counterpart at another Southwestern school added, "I'll never say this place can't blow up. I just keep my fingers crossed."

---

THREE MAJOR KINDS OF ISSUES ON COLLEGE CAMPUS

Behind the turmoil that has gripped American campuses in recent months is a complex of issues, large and small, real and imaginary.

There are at least three major kinds of issues on the campus and as many kinds of collegiate groups pursuing them.

Issues and groups are not always neatly matched, however, so it is hard for an outside observer to disentangle what is going on.

A survey shows that the principal issues, each with a different kind of importance and backing, are:

1. Traditional student-administration squabbles over social rules, such as dorm hours, possession of automobiles, alcoholic beverages, and dress regulations.

2. Relatively-new campus disputes concerning nonsocial areas such as curriculum, grades, finance, admission policies and composition of the faculty.

3. Openly-political issues deriving from the Vietnam war, military recruiting and civil rights disputes.

The students involved in hashing out these things include the much publicized New Left, the less talked of but considerably more influential group of "reform liberals" on campus, and a smaller but increasingly active group of young conservatives.

These factions together add up to a minority on campus, each contesting for the sympathy of a nonpolitical majority.

Debate is spurred by a general mood of discontent among the politically active. Acting Chancellor John W. Snyder of Indiana University says campus turmoil is in large part a protest against things beyond the campus.

Controversy over ROTC supports this—a "campus" issue whose real locus is the war in Vietnam.

When the categories are rolled together—when the question of paternalism can be identified with some particular political cause—it is possible to get a real movement going.

Nearly all students, from new left to new right, are anti-paternalist on social rules. This is a traditional stance for collegians and the present effort differs from previous ones chiefly by its association with other questions.

When the paternalism question is cut out, student opinion fragments sharply, with the conservatives the first to go to their own way.

New leftists and liberals often are agreed on policy goals such as curricular "relevance," greater civil rights activity and opposition to the Vietnam war, but disagree on tactics. Conservatives have other views altogether.

The usual statement from "reform liberals"—and they are represented heavily in campus governments and newspapers—is that "I agree with some new left goals but oppose their methods."

This is the position taken by Steve Kaplan of Harvard, student body president Randy Gurie of Louisiana State, moderate student leader Jeff Kunz of Wisconsin and Jessica Josephson of Skidmore.

Jim Stovall, editor of the University of Tennessee Beacon, says that "just because someone wants change doesn't mean he is necessarily a radical."

Tactical divergence between liberals and the new left has loomed importantly as violence on campus heats up. Resort to force by Students for a Democratic Society and other radical groups has offended collegians who favor change but don't like disruption.

This has in some instances created a kind of de facto alliance on procedures between liberals and conservatives.

At Columbia, for example, the "Students for Columbia" organization, an anti-SDS group, is carefully nonideological except for its opposition to violence. At Wisconsin, conservatives and liberals have co-operated in anti-New Left activity.

At Indiana University student body president Edward Najam, a liberal, had conservative support in his election victory over a radical opponent.

A vivid example of such ideological mergers is the United California Students for an Academic Environment, which is battling the new left radicals in San Francisco State and other schools.

The C.S.A.E.'s attempt to counter radical disruption embraces political faiths from Eugene McCarthy Democrats to the conservative Young Americans for Freedom.

The question of violence has become so important, and new left insistence on "confrontation" so steady, that this question has tended to blot out the others.

California Gov. Ronald Reagan observes that "when demonstrators take to the streets in violence . . . that becomes the only issue." Until threats of force are halted, Reagan says, "you can't even treat with their demands."

Some liberals, such as Prof. Sidney Hook of New York University, agree. Others are not so sure and back away from a Reagan-like stance.

There is a body of liberal opinion which thinks the violence may have done some good—"it gets results"—or that new left confrontationists can be bargained with. This latter outlook has been particularly notable at Columbia.

From the new left point of view, however, there seems to be only one real issue, bringing American society to its knees. Many of the political questions agitated by the new left are in fact "nonissues," pretexts of getting at the nation as a whole.

Thus Mark Rudd, the Columbia S.D.S. leader in 1968, confessed the issues there were "manufactured," "nothing," "bull." The real purpose of the '68 strike, he said, was "an insurrection against the repressive structure of this society."

The pretexts chosen for this spring's SDS "offensive" at Columbia are even more obviously nonissues, excuses for kicking over the furniture.

Concern about such topics and majority reaction to them vary from campus to campus. Although certain patterns persist, the picture tends to change according to geography, size of school, public or private status, whether the legislature is in session, and the political outlook of the surrounding community.

The constant factor, on almost every campus, is that students are talking more than ever about the things which affect them and the American system of higher education.

---

SILENT CAMPUS MAJORITY OPPOSES NEW LEFT

The new left on American college campuses today is not only a minority, it is a minority within a minority.

Most students do not view the campus as a political institution and are not motivated strongly toward politics.

They are concerned about grades, careers, athletics, dates. Among those who are political, many are conventional liberals and others conservative. Still others are interested in politics but don't think the campus is the proper place for it.

Even at the hot spots of leftward revolution, interest in student politics is slow to ignite. In the last election at embattled San Francisco State, less than 12 per cent of the student body voted. Activists from all points on the political compass complain that the mass of students is apathetic toward political causes.

David F. Hull Jr., president of the Interfraternity Council at Louisiana State, speaks for a broad middle group in campus life.

He believes an increased student participation (although an undergraduate, he works as assistant dean of men) and opposes excessive paternalism, but is also a strong believer in the fraternity system, an energetic supporter of compulsory ROTC, and a critic of the new left.

Like many other moderate students, Hull says he agrees with some new left goals but opposes violent tactics. He thinks "the silent majority" of LSU students is not political and is mainly concerned with studies and athletics. This widely-held view is not always considered a reproach.

A large number of students agree, for example, with the Columbia senior who says "if I want to get involved in politics, I'll do it elsewhere." Dale Stark, a sorority leader at Indiana University, says: "I'm going here to be educated . . . I participate in other activities, but they come after my studies."

Bob Misko of the Penn State branch campus at Sharon, Pa., says: "Primarily I come here to get an education so I can prepare myself for an occupation."

Such nonpolitical students are a latent source of new left opposition. Robert Henry of Youngstown University, who works the

night shift to put himself through school, voices disdain for troublemaking-students.

"When you have to work," he says, "you don't have much time for demonstrations." He has a little sympathy for undergraduates who swarmed the Democratic National Convention last summer.

Reaction against new left use of force is evident in campus polls, rallies, petition drives. Open recruiting by military services and others on campus was supported by 67 per cent in a referendum two years ago at Columbia and by 6,000 petition signers last fall at Purdue.

At Michigan State, more than 10,000 students have signed a petition opposing "intimidation, violence and disruption" on the campus.

During the 1968 strike at Columbia University, students voted by better than 3-to-2 against amnesty for the strikers and by 4-to-1 in disagreement with SDS tactics, even though similar majorities favored the New Left position on two substantive issues. At Stanford, students voted 3,924 to 1,695 in condemnation of SDS tactics, 3-to-2 in favor of retaining academic credits for ROTC.

When Dean Rusk spoke at Indiana University in the fall of '67, SDS and other leftists tried to disrupt his appearance. Non-new leftists staged a counterdemonstration. According to I.U. sophomore Baron Von Kannon, "there were about 1,000 leftists outside the hall shouting, 'hell no, we won't go,' and about 2,000 of us saying Rusk had a right to speak."

Wisconsin's Committee to Defend Individual Rights is one of many groups waging ideological warfare against the left. Fred Weiss, Gerry Lachmund and other members of the group publish literature denouncing SDS for asserted totalitarianism. Members of Young Americans for Freedom and a group calling itself the "Hayakawas," after San Francisco State President S. I. Hayakawa, breached picket lines thrown up by militants.

On the San Francisco State campus itself, new leftists are opposed by the Committee for an Academic Environment, which has spread to more than 30 California campuses. CAE has obtained court injunctions to halt disruptive actions and gathered upwards of 2,000 petition signatures to recall student officials supporting radical tactics.

At Stanford, Young Americans for Freedom and the Young Republicans combined in a show of numbers against the SDS. "Once we started something," says the Young Republicans' leader, Bill Boyd, "we tapped the pent-up feeling of hundreds of people. It just took a handful of activists to bring out the true feelings of the majority."

Majority coalitions or similar groups exist at:

George Washington University.
Penn State.
Monmouth College in Illinois.
Arizona State.
Columbia.
Tennessee.

The Columbia group threw cordons around SDS-occupied buildings last year to prevent the movement of food or supplies to the leftists. Successor to this group is "Students for Columbia," now battling SDS at Morningside Heights as the left undertakes its "spring offensive" for 1969.

The "coalition" at Tennessee was formed to oppose liberal critics of the school administration. Chairman Jim Duncan says "our group is composed of concerned students who wish to demonstrate support for the U.T. administration in its efforts to maintain a truly free academic environment on this campus."

At Purdue University, the Semper Fidelis Society conducted a blood drive to combat new left antirecruiting efforts. "We're not a "right wing group," says organizer Allen Force.

"We more or less represent the middle of the road. Our blood drive allowed the average student on this campus to express his opposition to the new left tactics," he said.

At Los Angeles City College, a group called VIVA (Voices in Vital America) took direct action against a new left strike. Militant students had blockaded entrances to the schools, and VIVA members moved in and dismantled the barriers. The campus was opened up and the college continued to function.

Emergence of this countervailing force has stirred faculty concern about physical clashes. An official at Indiana University says, "I think if we snapped our fingers we could have enough kids out on the streets to eat the new left for breakfast. Our problem is to keep that from happening."

At Columbia during the '68 strike, many faculty members expressed their fear that athletes and others would tangle with the SDS contingent.

HOW MUCH SUPPORT FOR THE NEW LEFT

The extent to which antileft efforts represent majority opinion is also debated. SDS spokesmen at Columbia say the "majority coalition" did not represent the prevailing drift of student sentiment. Sophomore Fred Lowell, a leader in the coalition group and its successor organization, Students for Columbia, replies:

"We make no claim to represent anybody's views on broad political questions one way or the other. Our membership includes moderates, liberals and conservatives. We simply claim, on the evidence, that our stand against violence and disruption represents by far the majority attitude on the Columbia campus."

---

HOW UNIVERSITIES FIGHT CAMPUS REVOLUTION

They prayed for rain to wash out the student revolution at the University of Washington.

March 6 was the day picked by the radical Students for a Democratic Society for the first big test of strength on the Seattle campus.

SDS announced it would mass its forces for an anti-ROTC rally and a parade through an ROTC classroom building with the object of general disruption or worse. Its goal: An immediate end to ROTC.

Instead of rain the 32,000-student campus was bathed in sunshine and balmy air and the revolution began on schedule. For a tense 90 minutes Washington hung on the edge of national notoriety on the scale of Columbia a year ago.

All the physical elements were there: A radical core of from 600 to 700 enough to "liberate" any building on campus; a milling throng of 6,000 other students some openly hostile to SDS most simply curious and not a policeman in sight.

At the end of the march, on the steps of the administration building, a tiny knot of "crazies"—teenage radicals recruited from local high schools—begged the leaders to storm the buildings.

Instead, the SDS leaders eulogized their followers, warned darkly of what they might do next time and dispersed.

The teen radicals raged at the peaceful turn of events. "You blew it! We could have taken it. You blew it!" One of them screamed over and over at one of the SDS spokesmen.

"The people weren't ready for it. We're only 600 against thousands. You don't start a minority revolution," groaned one of the senior revolutionaries.

The crisis had passed without a cracked head or a broken window. SDS had refrained from any real disruption or violence, contrary to its announced intentions. Why?

In the last analysis, some observers thought, SDS was seized by acute indecision in the face of the huge student turnout.

But the University of Washington's response to the threat also was very special, a rare display of campus elements pulling together to prevent violence and disorder by a noisy minority.

Well in advance of the SDS rally, Charles E. Odegaard, university president, issued a statement making it clear what the university would and would not tolerate as free expression.

The rights of the majority and the university's functions would be protected from disruptive students and faculty, he warned.

Significantly, he didn't threaten police intervention or predict the university's exact response, even under pressure from the press to tip his hand.

In a totally-independent action, about half the tenured faculty members signed a declaration that they would support the administration's efforts to keep order. In fact, the statement was drawn up before the SDS rally was announced, said Prof. Arthur Bestor, one of the sponsors and a recognized campus liberal.

"Many of us personally advised the president that the use of force should be the very last resort," he said, "but we decided it was up to the faculty to give the administration a clear statement of where it stood."

A second faculty group of about 200 thought the statement was too broad an endorsement of police intervention. They issued a separate statement urging restraint after the pattern of Brandeis and Chicago universities, where radical sit-ins were allowed to run out of steam.

SMALL PRICE IN DISRUPTION?

In fact, the two groups privately were telling Odegaard the same thing. They counseled patience and the willingness to pay a small price in disruption to avoid police force.

The important point was that Washington's faculty was not standing aloof. When the rally came, about 50 faculty wearing identifying armbands turned out to act as "observers."

Added pressure against the radicals come from the University of Washington's non-establishment student government. President Thom Gunn, whose bushman hair style would classify him as a radical for most uptight adults, denounced the SDS methods and called an opposition rally for "rational discussion of the issues."

The opposition rally drew about 1,500 students at its peak. John Mosier, student vice-president, later worried that the moderates had suffered "a prestige blow" in failing to blunt the SDS affair. But most observers felt that ordinary curiosity won out and that the student government had struck the sharpest blow at SDS with censure from the radicals' peers.

As the final constraint on radical intentions, the campus newspaper, the Washington Daily, presented a complete explanation of the issues and positions for a week before the SDS event.

The radicals could not capitalize on campus ignorance and the shock value of violence if it came.

"People accused us of playing up SDS too much," said the Daily's editor, Ray Hallinan, an originator of the opposition rally. "But we have a responsibility to keep the situation cool and by honest reporting we channeled student opinion in that direction."

The SDS rally and march, complete with portable sound equipment, could probably have been declared illegal under campus regulations, Hallinan noted, but it wasn't.

HONEST RESPONSE TO THE ISSUES

Honest response to the issues, clear ground rules for dissent and firm willingness to enforce them, faculty and student stands against minority rule, thorough and open campus debate in the press and finally, official restraint—these were the elements that combined to prevent violence and disruption at the University of Washington.

Some or all of them have been missing at

most campuses that have been convulsed and occupied by police.

Nearly all students and university personnel interviewed across the country for this series agreed, as President Nixon has said since, that America's colleges must learn to cope with student dissent on their own terms, with minimum outside intervention.

Students nearly are unanimous in terming police force the last and worst possible resort. Editor Hallinan said:

"Once the police are on campus it's all over. The university no longer has any control. Whether it's justified or not, to many students the police are symbols of repression after Columbia and Chicago. They galvanize the uncommitted into action."

There are exceptions. Moderate students at embattled Berkeley and San Francisco State College assert that the choice there was between the police and criminal anarchy once administrators had let the situation deteriorate that far.

Moderate-to-conservative students at Columbia, who opposed the '68 SDS strike, say the summoning of police helped the left. "If they had called the police at the very beginning," says conservative Dave Carpenter, "they could have stopped the strike without violence.

"But by letting it build up for a period of days and then bringing in the police, they created a status quo in favor of the radicals and made the final action much more violent."

WRECKERS CALLED A TINY CORE

As Harvey's faculty dean, Franklin L. Ford, has put it, the avowed wreckers of the university are a tiny core at the center of concentric circles of student interests and unrest. The problem is to keep the disease from spreading outward.

The academic community is glued together more by concepts of reason, fair play and moral rights than by law. Within this framework, each university must develop its own measured responses to the threat and challenge of the radical left.

But the pressures are getting difficult for many administrators who are caught between the shrill noise of the radicals on one side and on the other outraged public officials who are ready to condemn any apparent sign of weakness or capitulation.

Oddly, it's in the quieter outposts of the campus revolt such as Arizona, Colorado, Missouri, and Oregon where the political pressure is strongest for some kind of tough formula for squelching student dissent such as kicking SDS off campus, a ploy that students generally oppose.

The University of Washington's tricky, complex formula worked one day in one situation. No one there believes they've found magic. They believe you fight the campus revolution one day at a time.

---

SOME COLLEGE POLICIES AID STUDENTS' REVOLT

America's colleges and universities have contributed to the new left's revolution which confronts them.

Administrations and faculties have fostered the youth revolt both by what they have done and what they haven't. In some cases, they have allowed relations with students to deteriorate needlessly. In others, they have failed to lay down guidelines for reasonable conduct and to stick by them.

Equally important, some educators have supplied the ammunition which student rebels fire at the academic establishment.

Dean Arden O. French of Louisiana State University says, "My own personal feeling is that there is not a gap between generations. I think the gap lies in ideologies. There is very clear communication between age groups of similar ideologies, as the Cox Commission report on Columbus shows. There were numerous faculty members and others who helped the student rebels."

The report of the commission, a study, under the chairmanship of the former solicitor general, Archibald Cox, of the 1968 Columbia uprising bears out French's statement. It notes that the Columbia violence was turned into a major blowup by the delay in calling the police, "which the ad hoc faculty committee forced upon the administration."

Some Columbia faculty members tried to aid the new left openly, while the ad hoc group opposed strong action to free captured buildings from radical control. The Protestant chaplain and Jewish rabbi of the school actively aided the revolutionaries. The chaplain spoke at a new left rally this spring, using the second-favorite obscenity of SDS.

Similar problems have developed at other schools. At the University of California at Berkeley during the "free speech" controversy of 1964, faculty members refused to condemn "civil disobedience" tactics and demanded amnesty for disruptive students. Prof. Sidney Hook of New York University describes this "approval of student lawlessness" as "the most shocking aspect of the role of the faculty . . ."

Efforts to end the violent student strike at San Francisco State were frustrated when members of the American Federation of Teachers called a sympathy walkout. Prof. John H. Bunzel, a liberal and proponent of ethnic studies, calls the AFT action "cynical."

Bunzel says the faculty had rejected the union as its bargaining agent and denounced the strike by a two-thirds majority. "What AFT wanted," he says, "is recognition they haven't gotten from the faculty. They decided they could get it from the trustees by using the student strike."

California Gov. Ronald Reagan, who has clashed repeatedly with the left, says, "The weak link is at the administration level of the university . . . During all of this—and it's been going on for five years, really, since the free speech movement—there hasn't been one expulsion from the University of California, from any of the nine campuses."

Reagan adds that, "At one of our state colleges, they suspended all of the sentences—and this was one that had bonfires in the hall and that sort of thing. They had one sentence administered to two of the participants . . . and the chancellor of the campus suspended the two of them—for one day. This is laughable. They'll be back for the next fracas."

Critics of the new left believe previous shows of leniency have emboldened student radicals. Columbia student Abe Lockman, who was mauled this spring by a group of SDS pickets, traces his black eye to the administration. "The university encouraged the new left to further acts of violence by last year's amnesty," Lockman says.

ADMINISTRATION LOCKS DOORS

Steve Frank of Los Angeles City College, who led student action to break a new left strike at his school, has similar words of criticism for administrators. He charges that when the administration building was being "stormed and broken into, all the administration did was lock their doors with themselves inside. They didn't attempt to do anything."

At Berkeley, Columbia and other schools where there have been outbreaks of trouble, observers from different political quarters agree that the administrators had grown out of touch with students. Officials were inaccessible and unresponsive to legitimate concerns. The size of universities is not stressed as often as one might assume, but administrative and teaching problems related to size do pop up.

Mark Oring of Indiana University, a new left leader there, charges that 10 percent of the faculty members at his school do not teach courses but spend their time in other activities. Moderate John Peden of State University of New York complains of oversize classes. A conservative undergraduate at I.U. tells of inadequate courses, stressing, however, that there are a minority, taught over television with the instruction burden being carried by a graduate student.

Jacques Barzun, a professor and assistant to the president at Columbia University, says the schools have tried to become service institutions catering to all elements in society. Barzun thinks the present-day cry for "relevance"—urging the university to plunge into social-political questions—could reduce classes to current-events seminars. He blames the modern yen for informality and the "cult of inattention" for blurring thought processes of students.

REVOLT PHRASES LEARNED IN CLASS

Barzun also notes that the content of the curriculum is involved in the current uprising, since the phrases new leftists fling at the heads of school administrators are often things they have learned in the classroom to begin with. "All the critiques of society have been professors' work for the last half-century," he says.

Academic skepticism toward established values also seems to be involved. A student at the University of Tennessee said that when he came to the school he "equated God and the United States government and things like that," but that his education changed his outlook. "U.T. has given me a sense of weighing values or anything else and coming up with what I think is best." This student was one of the group protesting practices of the school administration.

SOME STAND UP TO NEW LEFT

A new left undergraduate at Columbia illustrates the point in economic matters. A member of the Young People's Socialist League, he says his collectivist opinions stem in part from a conviction that free enterprise was totally discredited by the 1929 depression, an idea he documented from works of Harvard economist J. Kenneth Galbraith. Many leftist students cite such things from their academic experience.

There are cases in which faculty members have stood up strongly against new left tactics—Sidney Hook at New York University, Richard Hofstadter of Columbia, John Bunzel of San Francisco. Yet the over-all verdict is that elements of the faculty, in one capacity or another, have had a key role in spurring disorder.

"I know of no case of a major blowup in a university," says Harvard's faculty dean, Franklin L. Ford, "where a fraction of the faculty has not contributed to the trouble by fudging the issues, whether moral, legal, or simply rational."

---

RADICALS DECLARE WAR ON LIBERAL PROFESSOR

Prof. John H. Bunzel knows what it's like to disagree with the radical left.

It's like war.

Bunzel unwittingly became a symbol in the violent strife at San Francisco State College just as the school itself became a symbol of victory or defeat for radicals across the country.

Before San Francisco State was convulsed by terrorism, Bunzel was known primarily as the popular and respected chairman of the political science department. He had credentials as a Kennedy liberal and an early campaigner for ethnic studies for black students.

Then last October, a time bomb was found ticking outside Bunzel's office door. Later, part of his department's offices were ransacked; the tires of his car were slashed at his home and his family threatened by telephone. At the start of this semester, he was kept from teaching for a week by radicals who raided his classroom.

Why did the radical left declare war on Bunzel?

To some extent, he said, it was part of a widespread attempt to silence liberal faculty members, who opposed radical tactics of disruption. Their political credentials put them in a unique position to discredit radical methods and inject reason where the new left wanted only confrontation.

But more important in Bunzel's case, he had questioned Dr. Nathan Hare's proposals for creating an autonomous black studies department at San Francisco State. Bunzel did it mildly, in an article published in the scholarly journal, Daedelus.

"I was an early supporter of a sound ethnic program," Bunzel said, "but I was opposed to the revolutionary, nationalistic approach that Hare proposed.

"This place became so polarized that if you didn't support Hare's proposal you were tagged as an opponent and a racist. We couldn't even talk about options or alternate proposals.

"Black studies got completely caught up in revolutionary bombast."

San Francisco State long has been a testing ground for radical tactics. It was the first and most extreme example of the inward shift of the black student revolt. Fortunately, the environment of San Francisco State, and trouble faced by S. I. Hayakawa, its acting president, aren't duplicated at many U.S. campuses, although the same issues are being raised by black students almost everywhere.

The trend at the majority of schools is to go most of the way in granting black student demands quickly, if possible. While the demands usually are couched in nonnegotiable terms, there is considerable negotiating reported from behind the scenes. In general, where blacks see progress, they have adopted a wait-and-see posture.

The blacks' demands pretty much follow the same pattern:

1. More courses emphasizing the black experience in America, preferably taught by black instructors and in a separate department.

2. More black faculty, counselors and administrators throughout the university, but especially in such areas of special concern as admissions and financial aid offices.

3. More recruiting of black students, particularly among the disadvantaged in the ghettos, under special admission policies.

4. Special or separate social and living facilities for blacks.

5. Administration of as many of these programs as possible by black students and advisers.

From Harvard to the University of Washington, schools across the country are making commitments in varying degrees to these goals, whether black students have made formal demands or not.

The reasons behind some of the black demands are obvious, but others are subjective and complicated. The whole issue is cloaked in the intense new feeling of black awareness and search for racial pride and identity that have come to dominate the black movement.

MANY YOUNG BLACKS BITTER

Integration as most liberals have understood it, that is, a colorblind society based on a white-middle-class-value system, is a dead letter as far as many young black Americans are concerned.

That's the view of John U. Monro, dean of Harvard College until two years ago when he went to Miles College, a Negro school in Birmingham, to become director of freshman studies.

Monro sees the black student today as no longer seeking traditional integration with white society, but seeking full equality and respect. Monro likens the black movement to that of labor as it struggles to become organized.

He sees black society moving toward "a great black union" with the intellectual and economic muscle to command respect and equality.

For black students, then, higher education must build union.

There are also more immediate reasons behind black demands listed by university observers:

1. Many black students are committed to return to the ghettos, which means they need skills tailored to black ghetto society.

2. Black studies also may help to bridge an uncomfortable sense of separation many black students feel from their less-fortunate brothers and sisters who don't go on to college.

3. Some college and universities in the past year or two have reached among the truly disadvantaged to increase black enrollments, but haven't prepared to deal with their special handicaps.

As Ed Wynn, a Negro graduate student at Berkeley, put it, "There are people here who simply don't belong here. When they ask for a separate department it's another way of saying they can't make it without special help."

Nearly all universities want to avoid being pushed into setting up completely-autonomous black studies departments such as Hare planned at San Francisco State. With no academic controls, Bunzel said, "The danger is that we'll create Jim Crow colleges within the Northern universities."

UNIVERSITIES ADJUST ADMISSION STANDARDS

With the middle class cream long since skimmed from the top of black society, most universities quietly are "adjusting" their admission standards to bring in more Negro students.

A University of Washington administrator declared, "As long as the exit requirements remain the same, it doesn't make a tinker's dam what the entrance requirements are."

But almost every new black enrollee today requires financial assistance and extra effort and preparation to keep him in school. And that adds up to a heavy financial burden, especially for schools that are already flirting with a taxpayer revolt.

The University of Washington, for example, is in the first full year of its Special Education Programs to recruit disadvantaged minority students.

The University of Washington reports a cost of about $370,000 for the program, which provides "absolutely minimal" financial assistance, according to its program coordinator. That does not include faculty costs related to black studies.

Colorado expects to need $500,000 this year to launch its new recruiting effort, involving 75 students.

Most administrators report that their funds are patched together from various sources, in some cases, faculty and students are major contributors.

$76,000 DONATED AT UNIVERSITY

At the University of Washington, for example, a black student request last year for recruiting funds brought a donation of $76,000 from faculty and graduate students. Washington's undergraduates plan a volunteer work program in May to raise more money.

At the University of Colorado, the student body recently voted by referendum to tack an extra $5 per student on annual activity fees for the sole purpose of recruiting and assisting minority students. The fee boost will provide about $500,000 over four years.

With state legislatures and the Federal government tightening belts, most black program co-ordinators see the large private foundations as their best source of funds. Here, competition looms among very unequal competitors: The state universities and the almost-forgotten Negro colleges in the South.

As more Northern schools make commitments to their black minorities and to the ghettos, the small Negro schools face a squeeze from two directions.

In a competition for private funds with prestigious Northern schools they are outclassed. In addition, they probably face a raid on their most-talented personnel as the big schools scramble to find qualified black faculty, graduate students and administrators.

---

CAMPUSES SPLIT ON STUDENT RIGHTS, POWER

"Student rights" and "student power" are phrases often used on the college campus.

What these words mean is frequently unclear to people in the outside world. In some cases, it is unclear to the students themselves, since it means different things to different people.

To the partisans of Students for a Democratic Society, student power and student rights mean the right to "radicalize" the campus, to use it as a power-base for new left action. The new left does not extend similar rights to those who disagree with it.

This attitude has been illustrated at San Francisco State College where a student government sympathetic to campus radicals switched funds from traditional campuswide activities to the political interests of the left.

Moderate students are trying to recall the governing group and in February a superior court judge ordered its assets impounded.

The radical view has been made even plainer by the shouting down of opposition spokesmen, taking over buildings and denying access to other students, and in statements of new left theoreticians such as Prof. Herbert Marcuse of the University of California at San Diego.

SDS believes it is entitled to coerce people because it is crusading for destruction of a corrupt society. Mark Rudd, the 1968 Columbia SDS leader, said that "Depriving a few individuals of their 'right' to an education . . . is certainly a lesser evil than allowing Columbia to continue its policies."

Another Columbia new leftist interviewed after the 1968 strike explained that seizure of buildings and similar activities were justified by the writings of Marcuse, who believes "tolerance" should be extended only to leftist groups and denied to others.

Charles Proctor, a general studies student from Indianapolis, is chairman of the anti-SDS Students for Columbia. He charges that the SDS version of student rights is opposed to what the majority of students want, since one of SDS's demands is to ban military recruiting from the campus. In a previous referendum, Columbia students voted overwhelmingly in favor of such recruiting.

David Keene of Wisconsin, a conservative youth leader, makes the same accusation. He says the new left is vocal about demanding that its favorites be allowed to appear on campus, but would deny this right to representatives of the Dow Chemical Co. and others.

To reform liberals on the campus, "student rights" have a different meaning. As most often used in colleges today, the phrase implies that the university is similar to a government and that the students, as the "governed," should have some say on college rules.

Another version says students picking up a percentage of educational costs should have an equal share of decision-making power.

Discussions on this subject were prevalent at every campus surveyed, and at Indiana, the major topic as "open-visitation" privileges in rooms of the opposite sex. At Skidmore, it was a demand that students sit on the board of trustees and help make rules.

Harvard students want representation at faculty meetings to observe deliberations and present their views. At some schools the issues are centered on social prerogatives, women's dorm hours at Tennessee and dress regulations at Louisiana State.

WOULD LIMIT REGULATIONS

Pam Miller, vice-president of the Student Government Association at LSU, says, "Student rights in my opinion would consist of limiting the rules and regulations which the university can make to those which are necessary for the furtherance of their stated objective, academic development."

Questions of curriculum and academic practice also arise, however. At the University of Washington, students score the refusal of tenure to faculty members who have not published sufficient scholarly material. John Mosier, student body vice-president, says the student government may mount a campaign against the academic reward system and the "publish-or-perish" rule.

A demand for "relevance" in course material, meaning emphasis on black studies or other programs connected to current problems, often is advanced. Negro students Alex Crumble of Wisconsin and Bill Allen of Claremont Men's College, whose political opinions are otherwise diverse, support this idea. So does former track star Ralph Boston, now on the staff of the University of Tennessee's Dean Tom Scott. Boston says a program aimed at establishing black identity would be helpful not only for Negroes but for white students as well.

A legalistic turn is supplied by a campaign for "due process" in disciplinary matters, has responded to this by having a former state Supreme Court justice preside at a hearing for SDS members. Student leaders Pat Stimer and Pat McGraw argue that collegiate discipline should be administered by the courts rather than by the school.

Conservative students have still another view of student rights. They do not disagree with anti-paternalism efforts, but see them in a different philosophical light. Thus, Richard Combs, a Young Americans for Freedom leader at Tennessee, says of women's dorm hours: "For a girl under 21, the parents should be the deciding factor, not the university." Sam Coyner, head of the conservative Madison Society, agrees.

These spokesmen oppose liberal efforts to use the issue as a pretext for demonstrations. They point out that the taxpayers also have rights as to what goes on at the university since they pay the bills.

Conservatives urge correction of what they charge is imbalance in course material. At Stanford, Harvey Hukari, Young Americans for Freedom leader, and Bill Boyd, Young Republican chairman, presented a list of proposals for more conservative-liberal balance in the curriculum. At USC, columnist Bill Saracino of the Daily Trojan contends that faculties are slanted to the left, while conservative leader Pat Nolan opposes compulsory fees to finance liberal programs.

A list of recommendations presented to California education officials by Young Americans for Freedom includes:

1. Creation of a free market studies department.

2. Implementation of voluntary student body fees.

3. Free election of campus newspaper editors.

4. Strict enforcement of all laws designed to maintain order on campus.

5. Opposition to consolidation of authority over state junior colleges, colleges and universities.

Conservatives do not claim the right to run the universities. They say their purpose is to get an education, not to give one, and that their foremost "right" is to receive the schooling they contracted for. Twelve students at Columbia have filed suit against the university, charging that the school's failure to prevent the shutting down of classrooms in 1968 denied them the service for which they had paid tuition.

STUDENTS HELP CHOOSE FACULTY

While college radicals shout demands for "student power" many of their moderate classmates are putting it to work without fanfare.

At the University of Oregon, for example, students in the School of Community Service and Public Affairs have just been granted one-third of the vote in the school's policy-making, general-staff committee.

Because of irregular faculty attendance at meetings, the students say it's likely they will be equal partners in setting policy.

The school, in its operation and curriculum, is putting into practice the twin cliches of campus dissent, "student power" and "relevance."

The experiment is different but not revolutionary. Across the country, moderate students are asserting new influence at every level of the college system.

Sometimes their goals aren't very different from those of the radical left. But they fight or change by working within the university system instead of trying to destroy it.

All across the college map, students are working their way into faculty and administrative councils. They are helping to choose university presidents, deans and faculty. More and more, they are taking complete charge of student affairs and budgets that sometimes run higher than $1 million.

The Oregon school, officially 1½ years old, is one of a handful of undergraduate professional schools in the country. It is preparing about 280 major and premajor students for careers in the public sector.

It also serves another 1,300 students in the university with an innovative liberal arts curriculum that many student dissidents across the country would envy for its "relevance."

"As an applied social science school, we're problem-centered rather than course- or discipline-oriented," explains Dean Norman Sundberg. That means the courses, using team teaching and other techniques, cut across traditional academic subjects to focus on social and political issues.

Sample subjects include poverty, violence, black power and urban unrest. The school has inherited much of the developing black studies curriculum at Oregon, also.

"Some of our most-interesting courses were suggested by the students," Sundberg said, adding that the school has sought students' advice on curriculum from the start.

Students are exposed to continuing field work, ending with placement for a full academic term (three months) in a social or government agency of their choice. The field work brings the starry-eyed down to earth, sometimes suddenly, according to Dr. Keith Jensen, who runs the program.

"They learn the frustration of bureaucracy in public agencies" he said. "Sometimes they're overwhelmed, but if we can communicate patience, they can become sharp social critics."

"One of this school's great potentials is to bring in the radicals and teach them how to work with the establishment," said Dave Cleveland, a 22-year-old senior from Salem, Oregon.

He added, "This school breaks down the parent-child relationship between faculty and students so common everywhere."

Another often-heard complaint involves the length of the educational experience. Liz Margoliash, a junior from Marin County, Calif., asserted, "What CSPA is saying in some degree is that what can be accomplished in an extra year of graduate school can also be done in an undergraduate school."

Another Oregon innovation, a type sought by students elsewhere, is its "search" program, a student-centered system for putting into operation experimental courses for full credit. This year's offerings included: Seminars on non-violence, political revolution, underground cinema, black theater and racism in American culture.

HARVARD STUDENT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

Crossing to the East coast for a different example of student influence, a committee at Harvard acts as student watchdog over the university's academic performance.

The main function of the Harvard-Radcliffe Policy Committee is to "audit" Harvard's academic departments, six each year. It polls and interviews students and faculty, analyzes lectures, examinations, course requirements, the working conditions of graduate assistants, etc. Its reports are taken seriously, students say.

One of the committee's members, 21-year-old Miss Kay Tolbert, is a Washington senior bound for law school. Her political views are ultraliberal, if not new left. Why does she expend her energy and time on the policy committeee's work rather than on radical politics?

OBTAINABLE GOALS SET

"Precisely because I think we can get something done; our goals are usually short range and obtainable.

"I may agree with the radicals, but I'm not convinced that SDS radical methodology is the way to accomplish anything," she says.

Besides, she says, "Education has been my whole life. SDS is not particularly interested in Harvard. I'm interested in national politics, but in Harvard also."

At Harvard, the final appeal on all issues is to the faculty, not the administration, and students know it. Harvard's faculty is probably more accessible to students than the faculty of almost any other major university.

But Miss Tolbert and other student leaders are campaigning for a stronger student voice in faculty councils where decisions are made.

"They listen to us, but we're not there for their discussion or action," she said. "Sometimes they simply misread what we've said."

The students have asked for a permanent voice, not a vote, in meetings of the full faculty. So far, they've been rebuffed, but they scored a breakthrough in January when they were allowed, for the first time, to appear at a faculty meeting and present evidence on the academic standing of ROTC.

STUDENTS USE THEIR POWERS

At the University of Washington, in Seattle, student muscle is flexed effectively by the 2½-year-old Graduate and Professional Student Senate. Its purview is "anything that affects student life," according to Bill Inglis, its first president and now an assistant to the university vice-president.

The elected graduate senate has fought discrimination in off-campus housing, prompted programs and raised funds for minority students and recruited tutors for black undergraduates. In the works are a universitywide senate and a student-faculty bill of rights.

"Protest marches aren't very smart," Inglis says, "You get what you want by doing your homework on the problems and then getting to the guy who makes the decisions. Student input is one of the most valuable resources in a university. At least 50 per cent of it is good, and that's as high a percentage as you get in any enterprise."

---

CAMPUS REVOLT SPURS NEW STUDENT LEADERS

A new breed of student leaders seems to be surfacing out of the turmoil of the radical revolt on American college campuses.

They signal an end to the popularity contests for student offices long dominated by gridiron heroes, fraternity boys and sorority girls.

The new breed is a product of the campus revolution. Its members oppose the violent and disruptive tactics of the new left, but they're definitely not wedded to the status quo.

They are critics of higher education, pledged to fundamental changes in the universities and to a strong, rational student voice in university affairs. And they're willing to work for it.

Sometimes sympathetic to the views of the left-wing minority, they invariably support the broad goals of the black student movement.

They seldom claim to reflect the views of the silent, disinterested or apathetic majority on all issues. But they are a major element of the student response to the New Left.

They don't see themselves as caretakers of hand-me-down student institutions but as lobbyists for serious student interests.

This new breed can be found taking charge at Harvard, Colorado, San Francisco State and dozens of campuses in between. They are even organizing regionally and nationally.

Here are some samples:

Steve Diaz is a 20-year-old junior at San Francisco State College, a school under continuous police protection or occupation for more than three months.

As we talked in a hallway of the BSS Building at San Francisco State, we were jolted by a sharp blast in a stairwell a few feet away, then the crash of a heavy steel trash can coming down on the floor above.

Diaz, small and wiry, hardly flinched. "Just another bomb," he said, as two other students trotted by carrying fire extinguishers. "That's why we need the police around here. What was I saying?"

Diaz is chairman of the United California Students for an Academic Environment. Born at San Francisco State last November as the Committee for an Academic Environment, it formed a statewide organization in December embracing 30 campuses.

Its short-term goal is to help end violence and disruption at California schools. Diaz said:

"We believe the radical left has been able to do what it has because of a leadership void among students and administrators. They've exploited legitimate and imagined ills for their own ulterior motives.

"The only reason these things have lasted more than two weeks on any campus is that they discovered that students don't like to have police on campus. Nobody's going to point out that you're a violent, pushy little demagogue as long as you look oppressed by heavy authority."

SAN FRANCISCO RECALL DRIVE

"We represent the people who want to go to class," added Mark Wolfe, CAE information officer at San Francisco State. He noted that CAE has mounted a recall campaign against the ultraleft San Francisco State student government.

For the embattled San Francisco State president, S. I. Hayakawa, the CAE has been the most visible evidence he's had for his claims that the vast majority of students support his stand against striking radicals. The student government supported the strikers.

But CAE's goals go beyond restoring order. "Once we eliminate the violence, the issues will still have to be solved," Diaz said. "We intend to provide a continuing student voice on academic and administrative issues in colleges and universities. We've declared war on student apathy."

At San Jose State College, 21-year-old Jack Cade is the CAE chairman. Moderates there claim success in helping to end a student strike marked by violence and imported agitators.

Cade said: "This organization's goals are not only to denounce the violent radical groups but to develop concrete, nonviolent ways to effect change on the campus. We want to dispose of the fuel that feeds violence."

Diaz, in fact, aims at nothing less than reorganization of the California college and university systems. He and other CAE members blame the root problems at Berkeley and San Francisco State on "bureaucratic, buck-passing administrators."

"They don't give a damn about students. They work mostly at remaining undisturbed in their jobs," Diaz charged. They've written their own job descriptions at $25,000 a year. Nowhere at San Francisco State is anyone finally answerable for malfunctions in any area.

"They are totally without imagination except in politicing. After this is all over and Hayakawa is gone, these same administrators will be there doing whatever it is they do."

CASE AGAINST COLLEGE SYSTEM

Diaz and CAE are busy documenting their case against the state college system. Reforms they speak of include: "More autonomy for each campus, less bureaucracy, fewer "civil service mentalities" in administrations and stronger presidents with authority to make changes.

Senstive about being used and ignored at the same time. Diaz declared, "We'll try to speak with reason and in earnest. We're not going to be put off simply because we're not violent. We're devout but not orthodox about the American system."

A kindred soul 1,500 miles to the east is Pat Stimer, new president of the Associated Students of the University of Colorado at Boulder. He fervently wishes that politicians and nervous university officials would quit focusing on the radical Students for a Democratic Society "so that we could get down to some important issues."

"The real issue is that there's a larger society out there and the university has to deal with it," said Stimer.

He plans a campaign to begin restructuring university curriculums. He wants them to be more innovative, to cut across the lines or narrow areas, to put social and political problems in human perspective for students. He wants college to emphasize personal growth at least as much as career preparation.

SEEKING BROADER STUDENTS HORIZONS

In order to broaden student horizons beyond the career and play aspects of college, Stimer plans a week of special orientation next year for incoming freshmen, using "the most exciting people at the University to show them what education can be."

To Stimer and others of his persuasion, the university is and should be a social and political crucible in which to mix and mold human values. Many other students would not agree.

At the University of Washington in Seattle, the aggressive new student government has a whole agenda of projects, including a campaign against the "publish or perish" system by which faculty members are hired and fired.

But the first concern, according to student vice-president John Mosier, is the expected spring uprising of SDS. "If there isn't an effective student government here, the radical left can throw this campus into turmoil," he said.

Effective student government across the nation is the goal of a dozen voluntary college "dropouts" who occupy a sparsely furnished suite of offices in Washington. They are the staff of the new national headquarters of the Associated Student Governments of the U.S.A.

According to Steve Snyder, 22-year-old treasurer and former student body president at the University of Alaska, the group considers its goals important enough that they quit their colleges temporarily for an uncertain future in Washington.

For himself, Snyder says, "I'm beginning to be a firm believer that American education is obsolete. Everything is squared off in little cubicles.

"I feel I can go out and get a job and live comfortably in typical middle class American fashion, but it's not enough. I'm not worried about a job like my parents were. Kids today want to get involved. We think student government can be viable in representing students and in influencing the direction the university takes."

With all of that, the political cast of ASG is mostly Republican and definitely anti-New Left.

SOPHISTICATED RESEARCH SYSTEM

James W. Blair, ASG director of research and University of Cincinnati honor student, is working to get a sophisticated research system funded through a private foundation. Its short-term use will be to keep student governments informed of each other's doings.

Over the long haul, Blair wants to contribute something important in the area of synthesizing knowledge and experience toward an understanding of what student dissent is all about, what its roots are in the American education experience.

The organized moderates are finding that community support stops short of financing. "They think we're kids playing games," says Bruce Angell, CAE treasurer at San Francisco State. Soliciting from business for the CAE cause has been a nickel-and-dime experience, he notes bitterly, while radicals can collect bail money in five figures.

It's debatable how effective the new breed can be. Ed Wynn, a Berkeley graduate student and an outspoken Negro moderate, is doubtful. "The administrations will talk but not change. The worst thing from their point of view is for a strong student coalition to arise and take some of their power."

Which leaves unanswered the fundamental question posed by the radicals: Who is going to lead campus youth?

---

RADICALS' ACTS SPUR CONSERVATIVE STUDENTS

Radical youth activity has had an unexpected result—new impetus for campus conservatives.

Although less publicized than its opponents, the new right has been making gains in recent months. Leaders of the movement attribute this in part to growing revulsion with the tactics of the left.

Conservative students have been active in "majority coalition" efforts to oppose the left on many campuses, often providing leadership and drive for such groups. The national conservative organization, Young Americans for Freedom, encourages such activity and has a detailed program for countering new left demonstrations.

This effort includes petition campaigns for an "open" or "free" campus, counterdemonstrations against Students for a Democratic Society, speaker programs, publication of newsletters and other literature, distribution of posters and buttons. The conservative theme is antiviolence.

"We do not want power in any way, shape, manner or form," says one conservative statement. "What we want is a free campus, free of any one group's control and free of disruption. . . ."

In California, YAF is distributing 100,000 blue lapel buttons signifying opposition to the new left. "This is a big project now," says YAF leader Pat Nolan of the University of Southern California. "It symbolizes opposition to terrorism. There's been tremendous support for it."

At Columbia, where conservatives John Meyer, Lou Rossetto and Stan Lehr work through the night in a walk-up headquarters cranking out manifestoes against campus violence, the conservative cause is on the upswing. Although conservatives are in a distinct minority, they feel student reaction against SDS is helping them. "We have a

broader base now than I would have thought possible three years ago," says a conservative graduate student.

YAF spokesmen report similar results at Wisconsin, Stanford, Tennessee. Alan Brandstater, executive secretary of the California YAF, says the tempo of conservative activity has increase notably this year. Conservative spokesman Mike Connelly of Louisiana says the same. Karen O'Callaghan and other YAF leaders at Wisconsin say the movement is growing there through energetic chapter programs against a background of new left disruption.

Much conservative youth activity has been channeled into the normal political process, chiefly through the Young Republicans. Rob Polack, Denny Dougherty and Debbie Benoit, Young Republican leaders at LSU, say their group is overwhelmingly conservative.

"The liberal element is sometimes vocal here," says Polack, "but far and away the most effective political work on this campus is done by conservatives, through such organizations as the Young Republicans. During the last campaign, the Young Republicans had 1,500 members."

Mike Cobb, Young Republican chairman of California, symbolizes this fusion of organization politics and conservative activism. In addition to his Y.R. duties, Cobb is a political cartoonist and contributes his work to Arena, a conservative journal published at Stanford. In general, conservative representation is strong in the Young Republicans, both at the collegiate level and among the regular Y.R.s.

Another strand of conservative youth effort is represented by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, a scholarly organization headquartered in Philadelphia. ISI officials Victor Milione and John Lulves point to a sizable number of young professors and writers who have emerged from their ranks and others who are active in the philosophical battle on campus. The group claims 35,000 members.

OPPOSE NEW LEFT AT IDEA LEVEL

ISI students Bill Allen of Claremont Men's College and Peter Schramm of San Fernando State have served as editor and publisher, respectively, of Phalanx, a journal of conservative thought. They think the struggle with the left will be won at the level of ideas rather than on the picket line.

Allen is a Negro who believes, "The alliance between liberals and black people has been miscalculated" and that the conservative philosophy, particularly as represented by the ideas of economist Milton Friedman, how much potential appeal to Negroes. One difficulty in the conservative approach, he says, is that it has been abstract rather than specific in presenting its views.

Conservatives have a harder time making campus headway than do new leftists because they have less faculty support. Charles Heatherly, a graduate student at Arizona State University, says the new Sidney Hook-S. I. Hayakawa group has had difficulty getting started because of faculty opposition to Hayakawa. Richard Theis of Voices in Vital America believes, however, that faculties and administrators can be appealed to on the antiviolence issue.

STUDENT EDITOR FLAYS LIBERALS

Harvey Hukari of Stanford, editor of Arena, regularly flays the liberal professoriate from his journalistic outpost. So do Indiana graduate student Bob Tyrrell, editor of the Alternative, and the editors of Insight and Outlook, published by students at Marquette and Wisconsin, and On the Right, published by students at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

The Columbia students who filed suit against the university for failing to maintain order also came down hard on this issue. Vincent Rigdon of the Columbia Conservative Union said, "The presence of a one-sided faculty . . . has been instrumental in radicalizing the impressionable student body and contributing to the disorders."

LIBERAL BIAS IS CHARGED

Lloyd Taylor of Salisbury State College, editor of the student paper, argues that reading materials made available at the school exhibit a liberal bias. Student Senate member Jim Bopp of Indiana says material in courses with which he is familiar are tilted to the left. So does activist Marty Kopan of Penn State.

Another handicap asserted by conservatives is the historic liberal leaning of many campus publications. At Columbia, sophomore Peter Sordillo says SDS makes it official policy to infiltrate campus media, while Kurt Rodgerson charges liberals on the campus paper don't want conservatives on the staff. The result of these feelings is the launching of conservative publications, or establishment of non-new left journals such as Purdue's Dimension, edited by graduate student Kent Painter and Fareed Nader.

On the whole, conservatives are still a campus minority. But reaction to the current turmoil appears to be aiding their cause.

---

DO MEDIA REPORT CAMPUS SCENE TRUTHFULLY?

Is the political picture on American campuses being reported accurately?

Go to any college today and you will find spokesmen from nearly every faction, administration, faculty, new left and new right, critical of the media. The major complaint is that publicity is focused on the troublemakers and that good and constructive elements are neglected.

From the press point of view, some of this criticism seems off base. There is a general effort in the media these days to publicize "constructive" youth activities, but the psychological fact remains that "news" to the human mind is generally the unusual or the violent.

Pat Korten, a Wisconsin University senior who doubles as a radio newsman, makes the obvious point: When buildings are barricaded and mass demonstrations occur, it is impossible for reporters to look the other way.

Add the fact that many demonstrators are skilled in public relations. They know, for example, that TV coverage requires movement and action and they have geared their behavior to this knowledge. Students for a Democratic Society and other new left groups have made a science of getting publicity.

Critics of the media makes charges that go beyond these technical factors. New leftists berate the press as a creature of the "establishment." SDS spokesman Mark Rudd says that, "Since journalists lack the tools to report events outside the accepted limits of action and thought, and since many newspapers are committed to an ideological position, as is the liberal New York Times, the truth of the Columbia rebellion had a hard time coming through."

Most criticisms of the media performance, however, are directed the other way. Administrators and students, liberals and conservatives, claim overexposure is given to the new left through the national media, particularly television.

Some administrators say the media act as carriers of the movement. An official of a large Southern school says: "If the media admit they have impact in the sale of products through advertising, they should admit that they have impact on the minds of young people by their constant portrayals of erratic behavior."

Jacques Barzun of Columbia says the media have helped the revolution: "In the first place, they've shown how it's done. In the second place, they've given publicity and prestige to the leaders—the establishment—of the revolution. They've made them interesting, important, and temporarily powerful. In certain cases, one of which came under my own observation, they've stimulated violence—'let's have a little action, boys, for the TV cameras.' This was on one campus where I passed through, not here."

Barzun adds that the media have reported new left doings "as if they were events on a national scale. I don't mean by that that we haven't had these things happening nationally. But a coup d'etat in Pakistan is reported as if it had the same weight as 40 students at Colgate, and I think it can be questioned whether they are the same thing."

One major concern of the administrators is that repeated attention to new left activities can hurt them with alumni or state legislators, where the money comes from. Several college officials interviewed mentioned this. Many stress the theme of Father Theodore Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, that, "the bizarre and widely publicized antics of relatively few students and relatively even fewer faculty are accepted as the stereotypes of all students and all faculty, much to the disgust of this widely maligned majority . . ."

ARE OTHER ISSUES IGNORED?

Conservative and moderate students in the San Francisco Bay area say press and television neither point out that radicals are a minority nor solicit other opinion. These students also assert that journalists ignore campus issues before trouble erupts.

Liberal undergraduates complain that overemphasis on the new left hurts their cause. Chris Whittle, student government president at the University of Tennessee, says that when the average citizen sees heavy TV coverage of campus violence, "He associates any type of reform movement at this university, regardless of how responsible it is, with what's going on at San Francisco State and then reacts very negatively to our type of approach."

At Arizona State University, student editor Jane Sims says news reports magnified SDS is a dispute over discriminatory practices by a laundry serving the school. She says that while student action on the question had broad campus backing, the media played up SDS to the exclusion of everyone else.

In a sense, the new left movement is social rather than political and some commentators believe the media have helped to sell its so-called "life style," if not its opinions. Nicholas von Hoffman, a reporter for the Washington Post, says media emphasis on psychedelic themes and use of drug-cult language has spread the new left outlook. A co-ed at L.S.U. says, "The same people who were wearing polo shirts and listening to the Beach Boys four years ago are now picking up on the new left. It's a fad."

CONSERVATIVES SAY SOME STORIES UNFAIR

Conservative students charge the media are stacked against them. Phillip Abbott Luce, a former leftist now active in Y.A.F., Young Americans for Freedom, says: "If I weren't cynical, I might be amazed at the recent issues of Esquire, Fortune and a special supplement of the New York Times acting as if the new left is the only political option open to college students. The mass media appears content to portray the campus scene as one dominated by left-wing revolutionaries."

Dave Carpenter, head of the Columbia Conservative Union says TV reporters at one session he witnessed screened out nonradical spokesmen. Another conservative calls attention to two versions of a New York paper's story on this year's SDS strike at Columbia—the first edition lead and headline indicating the strike had been a flop, the second carrying changes eliminating this impression.

CAMPUS LEFTIST SYMPATHIZERS

There is also controversy over the campus press. Newspapers such as the Wisconsin

Cardinal, Columbia Spectator, and Purdue Exponent give heavy emphasis to new left positions. In many cases, it is clear the new left has active sympathizers in editorial chairs. At Purdue, the campus paper gave extensive coverage to the new left and became a sounding-board for radical criticisms of the administration. This prompted conservatives to start their own publication, Dimension.

New left strength in the campus media creates a double feedback: It spreads new left ideas to the student body generally. And it creates the impression among outsiders that the new left is active to the exclusion of almost anything else. Many adult journalists trying to check up on campus doings often get their information from these papers.

---

COLLEGES LEARN TO MEET DISORDERS

Parents, taxpayers and other Americans who are alarmed and confused by the bad news from the campus have some reason to hope that the worst violence is over.

There will continue to be much unrest at U.S. colleges and the new left revolutionaries still are intent on tearing apart society, beginning with the universities.

But colleges are learning to cope with disruption, and a countermovement is forming among students who are repelled by violence and determined that campus issues be debated in a peaceful atmosphere.

The radical left has established positions of strength at selected schools such as Columbia, Berkeley and Wisconsin and therefore will be capable of wreaking havoc for some time to come. Its ability to disrupt can't be discounted anywhere.

Its organizers are busy in urban high schools creating new waves of hard-core radicals and this influence is yet to be felt on the college campuses.

But the new left's power to mobilize student opinion seems to be waning. That power never has been as great as the radicals' genius for publicity has suggested.

Widespread impressions that the campuses are dominated by radicals seizing buildings and shouting down opponents have been far from the mark.

Students, faculty and administrators are convinced that the universities are suffering from a worse image than they deserve. Their evidence is a nationwide barrage of public criticism, punitive legislation and threats to cut off funds to higher education.

For this, the news media must take part of the blame. They have never quite gotten across the point that the noisy minority has upstaged the vast majority who are concerned mainly about studies and careers.

Now, however, the "silent majority" is finding a voice. Public exasperation with new left's coercion is expressed on the campus, also, and at one college after another groups are being formed to combat the forces of disruption. At most major schools where the new left is acting there is also a "majority coalition" or "committee for an academic environment" advancing the cause of order on the campus.

Much of the reformist sentiment that the new left counts on for support is being directed into other channels by students and administrators concerned with peaceful change but repelled by violence.

Youthful liberals offended by the tactics of Students for a Democratic Society and similar radical groups are taking strong leadership roles in discussions over "student rights" and changes in curriculum and administrative structure.

The black student movement, which has given the new left much of its moral appeal, also has been turning away from SDS to pursue its own goals with campus officials. There is evidence that Negro student leaders feel that the SDS approach is too irrational and even counter-productive to concrete black aims.

A growing conservative movement on some campuses is helping to supply leadership for antiviolence efforts. The conservatives, in Young Americans for Freedom and other groups, battle the left at the level of ideology and occasionally with tactical responses. They frequently unite with reform-minded liberals in opposing new left efforts to shut down classes and close debate.

CALMING OF PASSIONS

These developments suggest there is hope for a claming of passions on the campus and the rise of an articulate group of leaders, ranging across the ideological spectrum, who can give tongue to the antiviolence feelings of the "silent majority."

And there is hope that in this atmosphere liberals, conservatives and all other ideological factions can discuss their differences with reason and civility.

The differences fermenting on today's campuses are real and an end to violence will not mean an end to problems there. Those who oppose violence are not necessarily pleased with the status quo. Liberal students are asking far-reaching changes in the realm of student participation. Conservatives complain of political imbalance in the faculty and urge greater representation for their viewpoint.

The reactions of administrations and faculities have been important in ballooning the new left's rebellion beyond its real proportions.

FAILURE TO ACT ON COMPLAINTS

Failure by administrators to act responsively toward reasonable complaints has given the new left a pretext and a larger pool of support for its actions. Failure to act decisively against violence when it has occurred has encouraged the radicals.

Some faculty members have spurred the new left's disruption, both by the ideas some professors preach and by their participation in radical strikes and uprisings. Others have helped paralyze administrations by refusing to support a firm line on violence, urging compromise with an adversary that declines to barter. Many other faculty members, perhaps a majority, have stood aloof, as if the health of the institutions were not their concern.

Fearing for the future of academic freedom, some faculty members recently have spoken out sharply against the radical left, but to date this group has been small and not very effective.

Beyond the violence and the reactions to it, there are issues that involve the very nature and purposes of the American university. Is there too much emphasis on building careers and too little on building individuals? Should there be more "relevant" work oriented to racial strife and other contemporary problems? Should the universities refocus their efforts to impart disciplined habits of mind?

IS SENSE OF PURPOSE LOST?

There are charges that American higher education has lost its sense of purpose, and by trying to be all things to all of society's special interests it is not performing any single function properly.

There are complaints that schools are too big, that faculties spend too much time on research, publishing, and consulting work, at the expense of teaching.

These feelings are widely shared by students of all persuasions and have given the new left a springboard for its actions. The rise of a non-new left leadership can help defuse the violence, but this leadership still wants these questions debated.

It seems certain that there will be discord over fundamental issues of education in the months and years ahead.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PHYSICS DEPARTMENT OPPOSES ABM

---

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, since late 1967 I have been outspoken in my opposition to the deployment of an American anti-ballistic-missile system. Accordingly, it is not to reiterate my opposition to the ABM, but rather to inform the Members of this House of the opposition of the knowledgeable and concerned faculty, research physicists, and students of the University of California Physics Department, that I take this time.

The basic arguments against the deployment of an ABM are that it is not necessary, that it is not likely to work effectively, that it will escalate the arms race, and that it will cost billions of dollars that could be better spent elsewhere.

Scientists are not experts on all of these questions. Scientists may, however, make informed judgments on the likely effectiveness of the system. And they can utilize their native intelligence and concern to make valuable judgments on the questions of geopolitics, arms control, and national priorities associated with the ABM issue.

Men on the Berkeley physics faculty have made these judgments and at least 43 distinguished professors, research physicists, and 81 graduate students have concluded that the United States should not deploy the Safeguard ABM.

I commend the statement of these men to the readers of this RECORD, and include the statement and the list of signatories at this point:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PHYSICS DEPARTMENT PETITION

The enclosed petition was circulated among the physics faculty, research physicists, and students at Berkeley. It has so far been signed by the 39 resident and 4 visiting professors of physics listed on the petition, and also by 19 research physicists and 81 graduate students in physics.

We physics professors, research physicists, and students of physics are opposed to the construction of an anti-ballistic missile system. Many eminent scientists have already testified to the grave technical inadequacies of the proposed Safeguard system. Even if the technical problems could be solved, there would still remain serious questions as to the advisability of an ABM system. Any defensive missiles built by one side will be negated by additional offensive weapons on the others. Thus the final result of deployment of an ABM system would be an acceleration of the arms race and a decrease in our total security.

For the United States to waste billions of dollars on an undesirable ABM system, while there are so many legitimate demands to be met for the improvement of the lives of its citizens, would be potentially disastrous and ultimately immoral.

Partial list of signers:

Prof. Kinsey A. Anderson, Prof. Korkut Bardakci, Prof. Harry H. Bingham, Prof. Owen Chamberlain, Prof. Geoffrey F. Chew, Prof. Raymond Chiao, Prof. William Chinowsky, Prof. Marvin L. Cohen, Prof. Eugene Commins, Prof. Frank S. Crawford.

Prof. Leo Falicov, Prof. Gerson Goldhaber,

Prof. Erwin L. Hahn, Prof. Martin B. Halpern, Prof. A. Carl Helmholtz, Prof. J. David Jackson, Prof. Carson D. Jefferies, Prof. Robert Karplus, Prof. Leroy T. Kerth, Prof. Arthur F. Kip, Prof. Wulf B. Kunkel, Prof. Stanley Mandelstam, Prof. Richard Marrus.

Prof. Linn F. Mollenauer, Prof. Burton J. Moyer, Prof. Forrest Mozer, Prof. Sherwood I. Parker, Prof. Alan M. Portis, Prof. Frederick Reif, Prof. John Reynolds, Prof. Gene Rochlin, Prof. Arthur Rosenfeld, Prof. Ronald R. Ross, Prof. Rainer K. Sachs.

Prof. Charles L. Schwartz, Prof. Gilbert Shapiro, Prof. Yuen-Ron Shen, Prof. M. Lynn Stevenson, Prof. George Trilling, Prof. Robert D. Tripp, Visiting Prof. Hans Bichsel, Visiting Prof. Bernd Crasemann, Visiting Prof. George Seidel, Visiting Prof. Noah Sherman.

## SONNY'S GOOD WORKS

### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, some men get a great deal of publicity for their efforts to aid others while many go quietly about their tasks. It is good to see one of the latter recognized.

A recent editorial in the Gainesville Sun paid tribute to a selfless citizen, Walter R. "Sonny" Lee, and as a tribute to him, I would like to have the editorial reprinted here:

SONNY'S GOOD WORKS

Walter R. "Sonny" Lee of Gainesville does his good works without fanfare.

But, quietly, they accumulate. So now we learn a $150,000 office building in Daytona will bear his name.

The building will house the Florida Council for the Blind. And the Lee Building will be a token of respect for Sonny Lee's extensive work in behalf of the blind.

Lee is chairman of the Florida Council's state board of directors, vice president of the North Florida Eye Bank, and projects chairman for the northeast Florida Lions Foundation for the Blind. And he finds time to serve as president of the Gainesville Chamber of Commerce.

His acts lend luster to his community, and we all benefit from his good works.

To Sonny Lee, our congratulations.

## MINIMIZE AIRCRAFT NOISE

### HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the RECORD resolutions to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to minimize aircraft noise. The General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has addressed itself to a very serious national problem.

With improvements in technology and our ability to produce larger and faster jet service, it is incumbent upon us at the same time to provide for the protection of the peace and tranquility of the citizens of the United States. As the resolution clearly points out—

The aircraft noise problem cannot be solved at the local governmental level and properly is a problem for national concern by virtue of federal statutes defining airspace as being within the public domain and subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government.

I have recently had experience in trying to ascertain responsibility for excessive aircraft noise and have met with little success in having the noise at Logan Airport brought to a tolerable level. I have written to the Federal Aviation Administration, the Massachusetts Port Authority, and I am still awaiting an acceptable response.

I am happy to introduce this resolution for the benefit of my colleagues, and I hope that the House will act to solve this pressing and vital issue.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO MINIMIZE AIRCRAFT NOISE

*Whereas,* Use of jet aircraft has created a serious national aircraft noise problem which will become more serious with the expansion of jet service and the development of supersonic service; and

*Whereas,* The aircraft noise problem cannot be solved at the local governmental level and properly is a problem for national concern by virtue of federal statutes defining airspace as being within the public domain and subject to the jurisdiction of the federal government; and

*Whereas,* Numerous bills dealing with the problem have been introduced in Congress; therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to establishing criteria for levels of aircraft noise acceptable to persons on the ground, making it necessary for civil transport aircraft to meet such standards as a condition of federal certification of airworthiness, authorizing the establishment of such rules and regulations as may be required to impose such criteria and providing financial assistance to municipalities and other public bodies which operate airports for the necessary expansion thereof to help resolve the noise problem; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

## TWO FROM MARYLAND KILLED IN VIETNAM

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Gerald L. Call and Sp4c. Richard Walter Goden, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following articles in the RECORD:

MARYLAND MARINE DIES IN WAR

A Marine Corps private from Aberdeen was killed in Vietnam Friday, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Marine PFC Gerald L. Call, who was 19, was reportedly killed during a search-and-destroy mission near An Hoa when he was fired upon by the Viet Cong.

The 1968 Aberdeen High School graduate received a Purple Heart earlier this year for an injury received when he stepped in an enemy trap.

Born in Rocks, Md., Private Call moved to Aberdeen with his family when he was 2 years old.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps two months before graduating from high school, and entered the service a few months after graduation.

Completing his basic training at Parris Island, S.C., he was sent to Camp Lejeune, N.C., for advanced infantry training.

During the summers after his sophomore and junior years, Private Call worked at the Aberdeen Proving Ground printing shop, and, during his senior year, attended printing class at Harford Junior College, near Bel Air.

Private Call was "proud of the Marines," according to his family, and never complained about serving in Vietnam.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John E. Call, of 510 Stepney road, Aberdeen; four sisters, Miss Lynn Call and Mrs. Ruth Walls, both of Aberdeen, Mrs. Joyce Noonkester and Mrs. Jean Morrison, both of Bel Air; two brothers, Ronnie Call, of Delta, Pa., and Richard Call, of Aberdeen; and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. John Maloyed, of Aberdeen.

RICHARD W. GODEN KILLED IN PLANE CRASH IN VIETNAM

Army Spec. 4 Richard Walter Goden was killed in a plane crash in Vietnam six days before he was scheduled to return to the United States, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Specialist Goden, who was 21, was a passenger in a plane which crashed and burned March 22. He was to return from the war zone March 28.

According to his father, Ervin I. Goden, who lives at 5819 Gist avenue, Specialist Goden had been in Vietnam 12 months.

A native of Baltimore, he was graduated from Forest Park High School in 1966, and attended the University of Baltimore.

In July, 1967, he quit school and enlisted in the Army. He wrote to his parents that he planned to complete college upon his discharge.

He completed basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and was sent to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., for advanced training in office personnel.

Specialist Goden was an avid sports fan, and rarely missed a Colt or Oriole game before he enlisted.

Mr. Goden said his son never wrote about his duties in Vietnam, except to say, "As for me, all is fine."

Specialist Goden is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Goden; two sisters, Mrs. Martin M. Blumberg, of Pikesville, and Miss Bonnie Goden, who lives with her parents, and a grandfather, Harry G. Horwitz, of Baltimore.

## NATURALIZATION RULE DAY

### HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important days in the life of a per-

son who chooses the United States as his country is the day he is naturalized. Each year, thousands of persons are naturalized in ceremonies in U.S. district courts throughout the country. Recently, the Honorable H. H. Grooms, judge of the northern district of Alabama, held Naturalization Rule Day in his court. I was most impressed by the remarks he made on that occasion. They were most appropriate for the new American citizens, and I feel they also might be of interest to those of us who are Americans by birth. Judge Grooms reviews the rights and responsibilities that Americans have. Too many times, we tend to expect too much from the rights we have, and tend to forget the responsibilities we have. Judge Grooms' remarks should serve as a reminder to those of us who sometimes take the rights for granted, but overlook our responsibilities as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Judge H. H. Grooms' Naturalization Rule Day address be printed in the RECORD at this point:

NATURALIZATION RULE DAY

It is the Court's duty and opportunity to address you on the forms and genesis of our form of government and the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.

This nation had a small and humble beginning. From a mere handful of Colonists who settled along our Atlantic Seaboard in the early Sixteen Hundreds, we have grown to a nation of over 200,000,000, possessing a land that spans the North American continent and extends into the far reaches of the Pacific and Northward beyond the Arctic Circle.

The larger part of those early settlers came seeking political and religious freedom. To establish these and to make homes for themselves, with determination and purpose they set about the task of conquering the wilderness, of driving back the savages, of building roads, of spanning rivers, and of building for themselves and their posterity schools, churches, and seats of government. It was theirs to make this land to bloom as a garden and to prosper as no other land. There were wars, with their suffering and sorrow. There was sacrifice. More than a million of her sons have fallen in the cause of freedom. This freedom was proclaimed to the world in the Declaration of Independence in 1776, and secured under a written Constitution and Bill of Rights in 1787 and 1791. Under our Constitution and laws:

(1) Sovereignty rests with the citizens. It is symbolized by the flag. Our national government can exercise only such powers as are granted to it by the Constitution, or that are necessarily implied therefrom. All other powers are reserved to the States and to the people.

(2) Ours is a government of laws. No man is above the law. All are subject to the law and all stand equal before the law. All men should obey the law and none should defy it.

(3) Ours is a government of divided and coordinate powers—legislative, executive, and judicial. Neither can legally encroach upon the other. This division of powers prevents the unlawful usurpation of power by those to whom it does not belong, and affords a system of checks and balances that preserves our freedom from within.

(4) We follow majority rule, but the rights of the minority must always be respected and safeguarded. The majority has no right to flaunt the law or to suspend the Constitution.

(5) Our courts are free to our citizens for the vindication and protection of the rights guaranteed to them under the law. You should find occasion to visit our courts—State and Federal—and to observe their important functions in our governmental system.

Among the specific political rights guaranteed to you as citizens of this Republic are these:

1. The right to change your officers by election.
2. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.
3. The right to peaceably assemble, and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.
4. The right to be secure in your persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures. Your home is inviolate in this respect.
5. In all criminal cases, you are entitled to a speedy, public trial by an impartial jury; to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation against you. Concentration camps are unknown to the United States. You cannot be compelled to be a witness against yourself. You are entitled to be confronted with the witnesses against you, and to have the assistance of counsel for your defense. The political purge is wholly foreign to our way of life.
6. You cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Your home is sacred from intrusion, and you may rest secure in your home without apprehension that secret police will seize you or your loved ones. Your property will not be taken from you for public use without just compensation. You are entitled to the equal protection of the laws, due process of law, and the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.

You enjoy many economic rights in this country. Among these are:

1. The right to choose your own work or calling, and to plan your own economic future.
2. The right to an education.
3. The right to use your own earnings as you see fit.
4. The right to work where you want to.
5. The right to live where you please.
6. The right to own property and accumulate property.
7. The right to start your own business.
8. The right to manage your own affairs.
9. The right to succeed or to fail.
10. The right to belong to an organization of your own choice or *not* to belong.

With citizenship, there comes responsibility and duty:

1. You are enjoined to obey the law and to abide by the will of the majority.
2. To serve on juries and to appear as witnesses when called on.
3. To protect and provide for yourself and family.
4. To hold public office.
5. To give of your best to your country, your church, your employer, and to be fair and just with your employees.
6. To serve in the nation's military forces.
7. To register and vote.
8. To support the Government by the payment of taxes.
9. To preserve and strengthen freedom.
10. To help create an intelligent, a just and righteous public opinion.
11. To abstain from interfering with the rights of others.
12. To act with self-restraint.
13. To be a good citizen with all that that implies.

This, your country, will treat you decently. It is to be desired that you will treat her decently in turn.

Each of you is today entering upon an adventure—an adventure in citizenship. I trust that it will be a successful one, and that it will reflect credit upon you and upon the country you have adopted as your own. I congratulate each of you, and wish for you the very best in this great adventure.

## NATIONAL NIGHT DRIVING SAFETY WEEK

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, by tomorrow evening many thousands of drivers will get behind the wheels of their motor vehicles to begin the long Memorial Day weekend holiday.

Traditionally Memorial Day signifies the beginning of the summer vacation season which ends on the long Labor Day weekend in September.

In this coming vacation season we shall have three long 3-day weekends—Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, and Labor Day—each being meant to provide for the enjoyment of our American citizens in various ways. Many will take to the beaches, others to the mountains, still others only to see some interesting or historic area in the immediate vicinity.

And, in many instances the travels of these vacationers will be marred by tragedy—either death on the highway or a long and possibly a totally disabling stay in a hospital.

To minimize such tragedies, our modern highways are being clearly marked to provide a vital component to safe driving. Most of these markings utilize reflective materials in order to provide safe driving conditions for motorists, and are especially beneficial to motorists who do much night driving.

The components which are used in these horizontal highway markings are retroreflective glass spheres which are highly luminous when any light is directed at them. Without these roadway guidelines many more lives could be lost because of a driver's weaving and wandering over his portion of the highway for these line markers provide some measure of safety to driver in keeping on his portion of the highway.

There are not many firms manufacturing this type of glass sphere for use in highway markings; and I am proud to have one in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. This firm is the Potters Brothers, Inc., of Carlstadt, N.J., which is a major supplier of these reflective glass spheres.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to proclaim the week of July 20 through July 26 as National Night Driving Safety Week. Through the passage of this resolution a twofold purpose could be accomplished.

First, to make community and State highway departments aware of the necessity of using and maintaining highway lines and reflective markings as a vital component for safe driving.

Second, it would increase the public's awareness of the value of traffic lines and reflective markings and of their proper use while driving.

Mr. Speaker, not only are these reflective glass spheres used in highway line markings, but also in the reflective directional signs placed on every major

highway traversing this country. These spheres, in a lesser extent, are used by city public works departments in the signs they use in their own specific community.

Mr. Speaker, if through the adoption of the joint resolution we can focus the attention of the driving public on the improvement of driving conditions through the use of these reflective markings; we will be going forward toward saving many of the lives which we expect will be lost during the three long weekend holidays which occur in 1969.

It is my hope that the House will be able to take early action on this joint resolution to permit the President to comply with its objectives.

---

## CONTROVERSY OVER THE RECIPROCAL INTERNATIONAL AIR ROUTE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AFRICA

### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper articles inspired by releases from the American Committee on Africa have given some of my constituents a false impression of my attitudes and my record in the promotion of human rights here at home and throughout the world. I want to set the record straight.

First, let me state that I have no quarrel whatsoever with the American Committee on Africa, which numbers among its members many of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. I fully support the aims of the committee. However, because of its opposition to the granting of an air carrier permit to South African Airways the committee's Washington director was critical of my recent trip to South Africa and I fear that some of his statements, as reported in the press, left some of my constituents with the impression that I was somehow insincere in my support of civil and human rights.

I share the committee's concern over the denial of human rights to any man, anywhere, at any time. Such denial diminishes each of us, but I believe that we must live in this imperfect world, while we are trying to improve it, and I cannot accept the conclusion that I have been unfaithful to the cause of equal justice, just because I visited a particular part of the world where injustice is more apparent than perhaps it is here at home.

The question of granting a foreign air carrier permit to South Africa was debated over a period of many months and the CAB concluded that the diplomatic, economic, and foreign relations aspects requiring reciprocity in air routes were overriding and recommended that the permit be granted. The President accepted this recommendation and granted the permit in November of 1968.

My subcommittee at no time had jurisdiction over this matter. In fact, contrary to the impression which has been given the granting of the right to South African Airways to use New York's air facilities was not a new right, but merely the implementation of an international agreement, which was negotiated with South Africa in 1947.

If the United States had not honored its commitment under the 1947 agreement, it is probable that South Africa would have reacted by canceling the rights previously granted to Pan American, the American-flag carrier.

Yesterday our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. DIGGS, announced that he planned to introduce a bill which would have the effect of suspending South African Airways' air carrier permit.

I have discussed this matter with Mr. DIGGS, and I have assured him that my subcommittee would schedule hearings on his proposal just as soon as our schedule permits.

At the same time I promised Mr. DIGGS a full hearing on his bill, I frankly advised him that I have some reservations about the wisdom of the course he suggests to the Congress.

I told Mr. DIGGS that counsel has advised me that there appear to be serious constitutional questions involved in his proposal, as they relate to the right of the President to make certain foreign policy decisions and also because this would mean that all air traffic between the two countries would shift to the many air carriers of other nations that serve South Africa. This result would not in any way improve the plight of those South Africans, who suffer from racial discrimination.

I honestly believe that my record of support for civil rights and equal justice is as good as any, and better than most, in the U.S. Congress. In fact, Mr. Gary Gappert, who is Washington director of the American Committee on Africa and who has been critical of my visit there, recently wrote to me stating:

> Your own record in support of civil rights has been outstanding.

The apartheid racial policies of the present South African Government are totally abhorrent to me. Such practices are completely opposed to my personal beliefs, strong, deep-rooted beliefs, which I might add have led me to be actively involved in the long struggle to protect and expand fundamental civil and human rights for all people throughout my entire career in public service.

I am just as concerned and affronted by the fact that my distinguished colleague from Michigan, CHARLES DIGGS, as an American citizen and as a Member of Congress, was denied a visa to visit South Africa, because he is a Negro, as I am concerned and affronted by the fact that I, SAM FRIEDEL, as an American citizen and as a Member of Congress was denied free access to Jordan, because I am a Jew.

I went to South Africa for two reasons—because of my long and continuing interest in the fullest possible development of the safety, frequency, and quality of both domestic and international aviation and quite frankly—principally because of my intense curiosity about South Africa.

I wanted to see for myself if conditions there were as they had been pictured to me.

I found to my sorrow that conditions of racial discrimination exist there which closely parallel and often exceed the worst practices which existed in this country prior to the dramatic advances in civil rights, which began with the Roosevelt administration in 1932.

I also found, however, what I am sure the late Senator Bob Kennedy found when he visited South Africa several years ago—that among the young people particularly there is growing dissatisfaction with the Government's rigid policies. For example, I saw young white college students openly defying and demonstrating against the Government. Carrying signs such as "Is Education Only White?" "The Mind Has No Color," and "Education, Not Indoctrination."

I returned from my visit more convinced than ever that we must intensify our peaceful efforts through such forums as the United Nations to cause change in the repressive practices now in use in South Africa and in many other areas of the world. I am also equally convinced that it is important to keep open our lines of communication and to continue to keep in touch with and to encourage those people in South Africa both white and colored who oppose the apartheid policy.

There are many things we Americans do not like about conditions in many parts of the world, but no purpose whatever is served by a head-in-the-sand approach which limits communication and further inhibits understanding.

---

## HOLIDAY HIGHWAY SAFETY

### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this coming weekend is one of those delightful and disastrous times—delightful because most people will have an extra day for leisure and disastrous because many will die on our Nation's highways.

I mention the dark side of what we all hope will be a bright weekend because I hope my colleagues will take the time to remind themselves, their staffs, and their constituents that driving can be one of the world's most dangerous occupations and this weekend is just not time for practice.

We are a mobile society but unfortunately we tend to take so much for granted that we forget the responsibilities required of us when we place ourselves behind the wheel of an automobile. One of our leading magazines has predicted that more people will die on the highways this year than there will be casualties in Vietnam.

There is only one value in repeating that dismal prediction and that is to make people more highway safety conscious this weekend. There is no reason for the highway death toll to climb. Each of us has a responsibility to do something about it. We can remind everyone we know that it would be nice to see them next Monday.

## RESOLUTION ON THE RIGHT OF FARMWORKERS TO ORGANIZE AND SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL GRAPE BOYCOTT

### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the 44-man senate of priests is an elected body drawn from the 1,200 priests of the Catholic archdiocese of Newark, N.J. This archdiocese is made up of four northern New Jersey counties, Hudson, Essex, Bergen, and Union.

On May 5, 1969, the senate of priests of the archdiocese passed three resolutions which I consider worthy of the attention of all Members of the Congress.

Two resolutions were passed unanimously. They include a resolution expressing support for the right of farmworkers to organize and for the national grape boycott. The other resolution was in support of New Jersey State Senate bill No. 206, which authorizes State aid for the purchase and loan of textbooks to public and private school children.

A third resolution was adopted with only one member abstaining. It expressed support for a bill pending in the New Jersey Assembly calling for equal State subsidy for children attending private nonprofit schools.

Mr. Speaker, I include these three resolutions in the RECORD following my remarks.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ON THE RIGHT OF FARMWORKERS TO ORGANIZE AND SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL GRAPE BOYCOTT

Whereas the moral right of workers to organize is being denied the United Farm Workers in California, and

Whereas the living conditions of these and other migrant farmworkers and their families, resulting from the denial of the right to organize, are extreme, intolerable and unjust, and

Whereas the National Boycott of California Table Grapes is seen as the best and perhaps the only weapon to bring about a nonviolent solution to these social and moral evils and an end to the deadlock that is entering its fourth year, and

Whereas the bishops of the United States on two occasions, and the National Federation of Priests' Councils at its recent meeting have spoken out in behalf of the plight of the United Farm Workers.

Be it resolved that:

(a) The Senate of Priests of the Archdiocese of Newark actively support and urge all the priests and people of the Archdiocese to actively support the right of the United Farm Workers to organize and that we do this by supporting the National Boycott of California Table Grapes.

(b) In order to end similar injustices to other migrant farmworkers and to ward off similar disputes in the future in other crops, and mindful of the presence of migrant workers in our own state of New Jersey, we urge the Congress of the United States and our own State Legislature to support the exact legislation that will guarantee the bargaining rights of all farmworkers, insure them of unemployment compensation and the minimum wage.

(c) The Senate of Priests request Archbishop Boland to issue a pastoral letter to be read in all churches of the Archdiocese on this subject as soon as possible.

1. Whereas, both public and non-public schools contribute to the welfare and betterment of their communities and therefore to the State as a whole, and

2. Whereas, all taxpayers share the financial burden of the cost of education, and

3. Whereas, in view of the rapidly increasing cost of education which parents and local school districts are finding increasingly difficult to finance, and

4. Whereas, it is right and fair for all grammar and secondary school children in New Jersey to benefit equally from funds provided by the State for educational aid and that such aid should be increased, and

5. Whereas, there is before the Senate of New Jersey—Senate bill S–206 authorizing State aid for the purchase and loan of text books and offered to pupils attending public and private non-profit schools.

6. Be it resolved, that the Senate of Priests of the Archdiocese of Newark endorse such Bill S–206 and urge upon the New Jersey Senate speedy consideration and approval of said Bill S–206.

Whereas, on February 17, 1969 in the Assembly of the State of New Jersey, Assemblyman Richard J. Vander Plaat, introduced a bill (A–553) the object of which is to distribute to non-public school districts an estimated $30 to $50 million a year subsidy, and

Whereas, the bill would change present State School Law to count every child attending a private non-profit school within or without his own district, and

Whereas, a child attending a private non-profit school would then receive the same amount of State aid as would public school children within the district.

Be it resolved, that the Senate of Priests of the Archdiocese of Newark endorse this bill of Assemblyman Richard J. Vander Plaat (A–553) and urge upon the New Jersey Assembly speedy approval of said bill.

## DENVER CITIZENS VOTE NO BUSING

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education Committee in Congress, I have been keenly concerned with the school board election in Denver. This progressive city has very carefully weighed the choice of busing or neighborhood schools. The vote was on Tuesday and for the RECORD, here is the background story from the New York Times the day preceding the election, and then a summary writeup by the Rocky Mountain News on the day following the election:

EXCERPTS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, MAY 19, 1969

. . . For the most part, everyone was quiet and polite because there seemed to be little left to argue about in Denver's long battle over school integration. All the issues had been laboriously worked over for more than a year.

School board elections, like the one here Tuesday, are usually rated by voters as one of the most-ignored events in American politics. In Denver the turnout is usually about one-third of the registered voters. But Channel 4 in this city was devoting two hours of prime time to the campaign on a Friday night.

The reason for the special treatment was that next fall, schools in Denver will begin one of the nation's most extensive big-city programs in school desegregation if liberals maintain their control of the board. If conservatives win, the plan will almost certainly be canceled.

. . . Though all nine candidates say they support the ideal of integration, only four favor the plan, which was drawn up by School Superintendent Robert D. Gilberts on orders from the board.

One part of the plan would break up heavy concentrations of Negro and Mexican-American students by changing school boundaries and by busing.

As an example Smiley Junior High School in the city's northeast section is now 67 percent Negro. In the fall, it would be 72 percent white.

With Gilberts' program in full effect, 20 percent of the system's 96,500 students would ride buses.

. . . The Denver Post has endorsed both the plan and the candidacies of Mr. Benton and Mr. Pascoe. The Rocky Mountain News stated editorially, "Let's give the Gilberts plan a chance," and endorsed Mr. Perrill and one of the independents who support the plan, Dr. Carl F. Barnhardt, director of teacher education at Loretto Heights College.

In Mr. Benton's living room after the show was done, he and Mr. Pascoe both had a Scotch whisky and went down a long list of groups and people who had pledged their support. However, he was not optimistic.

"We've got everything in the community behind us but a majority of the voters, and you know that can be fatal," he said.

ELECTION STORY FROM THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS, MAY 21, 1969

James C. Perrill and Frank K. Southworth swept to easy victories Tuesday in the nine-candidate race for two vacant seats on the seven-member Denver school board.

Their election, which changes the balance of power on the board, on the surface is considered by many a blunt mandate for the concept of neighborhood schools and a repudiation of recent mandatory bus integration steps taken by the board.

Both candidates, running as a team, championed the neighborhood school concept and pledged to rescind steps taken by the board over the past year to integrate schools in Northeast Denver through busing programs.

Their closest opponents, incumbent A. Edgar Benton and Monte Pascoe, running as a team on a mandatory busing integration platform, trailed the two winners more than 2 to 1.

The unofficial vote, with all 472 precincts reporting: Benton, 31,098; Pascoe, 28,948; Barnhart, 11,726; Perrill, 73,932; and Southworth, 75,596.

Perrill and Southworth had been the firmest of the major candidates in lining up for the neighborhood school and opposed to busing plans adopted by the board.

The dynamic city of Denver answered with the same sincerity as their neighbors in Chicago, New York and everywhere the issue is fairly presented. The newspapers and civic groups spoke out strongly in support of Busing. But the parents who have the children, who are the most concerned, voted No-busing. Americans from coast to coast prefer neighborhood schools.

## MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we approach May 30, Memorial Day, we turn our thoughts to those valiant men and women who gave their lives that freedom might live. In an article prepared for the

Memorial Day observance, Mr. George T. Nickolas, of Davenport, Iowa, pays appropriate tribute to these men and women:

SHALLOW WORDS OR HALLOWED DEEDS?

(By George T. Nickolas)

As many citizens gather in cemeteries throughout the United States on this Memorial Day, they will come to be a part of the national observance of the holiday on which we honor the dead of America's wars. They will, for a few moments, consider the sacrifices made by those men who lie buried in those cemeteries. Even now, Americans should reflect on how the sacrifices of these dead have affected all Americans, and the heirs, of this era of American History.

Those honored dead were not cowards who dodged drafts or burned draft cards, nor were they all volunteers. Many were drafted from their jobs and families to serve in foreign wars. They were not all heroes in the literal sense, nor did they all die in combat. Many, in fact, died after they had served and had returned to their civilian status. But they all had one thing in common: they chose to serve this great country when called to duty.

All American citizens, no matter how they choose to commemorate Memorial Day, owe these honored dead more than just words of praise, a volley of rifle fire, the sounding of "Taps", or even a tear or two. American citizens owe these American dead a renewed devotion and sworn adherence to the principles of freedom, equality, justice and the American way of life for which they were willing to give their lives.

In this affluent society, it is so easy for citizens to nod their heads in agreement to spoken words of patriotism and Americanism. It's so easy to converse lightly in the confines of their homes of how happy they are to live in this great country and enjoy its freedoms, and then to silently resolve to do nothing more than discuss it and agree that "George can do it."

In these modern times, too many of the people of this country have conceived the notion that the passive way is the only way out of this country's problems. But freedom as the average American envisions and enjoys was not achieved nor can it long endure with passiveness.

My hope is that when America commemorates this Memorial Day, citizens will solemnly and sincerely resolve to express in some constructive manner the pride of being an American and keep that resolve every day of their lives.

In addition to the voiced thanks for the rights and privileges that citizens enjoy as free Americans, people in this country must add something more active to continue these freedoms. If we fail to add something—if we continue to seek the easy way out of our debt to these honored dead—they may yet have died in vain and their services and sacrifices may have been wasted.

## GREATER HEALTH AND SAFETY NEEDED IN BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION

### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposed bill that would promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in connection with Federal projects, would save hundreds of lives a year and sharply reduce serious accidents.

I noted with concern and dismay that according to National Safety Council and Bureau of Labor Statistics reports, more than 20 percent of annual fatalities and more than 11 percent of job disabilities, take place in the construction field.

During 1968, 2,800 construction workers were killed on the job and 230,000 were disabled last year. Mr. Speaker, this is an appalling record. It is clearly evident that safety conditions in the construction field must be greatly improved.

Construction accidents are not only costly in human lives, but also in economic cost. The frequency rate for construction accidents is almost double the U.S. average. Work accidents are also expected to cost an estimated $3 billion this year. I know that if this important bill is enacted and national health and safety standards in Government construction work are created, the Federal Government would save in construction costs and contractors would also benefit because of lower injury compensation costs.

There are some who are skeptical about how effective this proposed legislation would be. I just want to point out that under the Maritime Safety Act, injuries were reduced by more than 40 percent in 8 years, saving the industry about $43 million. I am confident that even greater results would be achieved in the building and construction areas if this urgently needed legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I for one deeply appreciate the men who erect the homes and buildings we live and work in. They are, after all, the men who are not only responsible for building a structure that is strong and beautiful, but one that is reliable—an example of their skills and a symbol of their excellence.

In Middlesex County, there are thousands of men in the building trades and construction industry. I want to thank them for the fine work they have done—and will do in the future. Their talents also play an important role in stimulating the economy of our area.

Some say that those who work in the building and construction trades are tough—and they are right—they are tough, because they have to be: the work they do is hard, demanding, and dangerous.

I know these workers well and I am proud to say they are my friends. Their bodies are hard, but their hearts are made of gold. Mr. Speaker, I just want to cite one example of their civic interest and love for people. I know, because I was there:

On Sunday, May 18, 1969, 600 men from the building and construction trades of Middlesex County met and announced that they raised about $16,000 to help fight cerebral palsy. The man who led that inspiring campaign was John J. Wade, president of the Middlesex County Building and Construction Trades Council and business representative of the Iron Workers Local No. 373.

John Wade deserves a commendation for his leadership—not only for leading the campaign to raise $16,000 to be used in the battle against a disease that claims the lives of thousands of persons a year, but also for his able and dynamic leadership in helping to improve working conditions for thousands of union members. And one of the goals is greater safety and health.

A list of union leaders who helped raise the money for this worthy and humane cause is as follows:

THE COMMITTEE

John J. Wade, President Middlesex County Bldg. & Const. Trades Council; Business Representative, Iron Workers Local Union No. 373.

Theodore Walkoczy, Vice-President Middelsex County Bldg. & Const. Trades Council; Business Representative, Roofers Local Union No. 28.

Steven Masley, Sec'y-Treas., Middlesex County Building and Construction Trades Council; Business Representative, Plumbers and Fitters Local Union No. 270.

Sewell A. Peckham, Sec'y., Middlesex County Building and Construction Trades Council; Business Representative, Carpenters Local Union, No. 1006.

*Trade, representative, local number*

Heavy and general labor, Michael Arnone, 472.
Electricians, John C. Boll, 358.
Laborers, Steve Budney, 584.
Laborers, Salvatore Chirico, 72.
Boilermakers, Charles Crowley, 28.
Laborers, Carmen DeAndrea, 156.
Sheetmetal, Robert DeBartolo, 20.
Heavy and general labor, John Deisler, 472.
Carpenters, Edward J. Grobleski, 65.
Lathers, Albert Hudanish, 173.
Plumbers and fitters, Thomas Hussey, 432.
Bricklayers, William Iverson, 27.
Iron workers, Arthur Jensen, 373.
Machinist, William Keele, 367.
Glaziers, Arthur Kjersgaard, 1183.
Painters, Theodore Manhire, 834.
Electricians, Frank Marchitto, 456.
Asbestos workers, James Mulhern, 32.
Sheetmetal, John O'Brien, 20.
Plumbers and fitters, Albert Rauch, 380.
Engineers, John F. Reardon, 825.
Asbestos workers, Paul Reszler, Jr., 89.
Teamsters, Robert Rossi, 469.
Asbestos workers, Edward Sanborn, 32.
Painters, Albert Totka, 144.
Electricians, Clarence Tyrrell, 358.

Mr. Speaker, these men have not only erected thousands of homes and buildings for families and workers. They have also helped thousands of people who need assistance. These are the kind of men who would be helped by health and safety legislation in the building and construction fields. I commend and salute them.

## PATRICK HENRY—NOBLE PATRIOT

### HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 233 years ago tomorrow, there was born in the Old Dominion a boy child—Patrick Henry—who was to grow to manhood and to see many sobriquets attached to him, but none more fitting than that of "noble patriot."

No doubt he was called many other names by those with whom he clashed in that rough and tumultuous period of our country's history, but decency forbade the recording of these epithets for posterity. I am not so sure but that they

would have been duly spelled out to the last letter in today's permissive society which accepts smut and smear in apathetic resignation.

However, history does record for us some other laudatory labels applied to him—"the people's advocate" and "the forest-born Demosthenes." Although these aptly describe him for certain accomplishments, they nevertheless lack the fervor that "noble patriot" implies.

It was Patrick Henry's eloquence in denouncing the odious Stamp Act that is credited with starting the revolutionary ball to rolling. Generations of Americans have been stirred by the reading of his famous speech that concluded with the ringing phrase: "Give me liberty or give me death."

As the author of "The Virginia Resolves," which set the colonies moving toward the break with the Mother Country, Henry's fame spread and be became the first American national hero. Thomas Jefferson said of him:

> He left us all far behind. He gave the first impulse to the ball of Revolution. He was the idol of the country beyond anyone who ever lived.

To many Patrick Henry was, without a doubt, the greatest American orator of his time and often is ranked with the greatest of all times. Jefferson once commented on this:

> Call it oratory or what you will, but I never heard anything like it. He had more command over the passions than any man I ever knew.

As a young, self-taught lawyer, Patrick Henry earned the affectionate title of "the people's advocate" as he scored what we would term today a moral victory in the legally hopeless Parsons case. As defense attorney he technically lost his case, but his eloquence in portraying the dangerous encroachment of the Crown upon the rights of Virginia freemen so stirred the jury that only a token award was made to the plaintiff.

He was a rebel—but with a cause.

As a member of the Virginia Convention called to ratify the Constitution, he discerned certain shortcomings in that great document and spoke long and passionately—sometimes as many as five times a day—for amendments. James Madison is acknowledged as the chief architect of the 10 amendments that have become known as the Bill of Rights, but many ascribe the dogged opposition led by Patrick Henry at the Virginia Convention as responsible for the ultimate adoption of these amendments by the First Congress.

As his health began to fail, Patrick Henry retired to his beloved home, Red Hill, on the Staunton River in a section of Virginia that is now part of the district which I have the honor to represent. After his death on June 6, 1799, he was buried in the garden near his last residence.

Mr. Speaker, many students of the speeches of this great American—this noble patriot—can see an analogy, in his warnings as he fought for the changes that became the Bill of Rights, with many aspects of today's political scene—many of those things of which he was fearful are still with us, proving, if nothing else, that mankind's inherent weaknesses remain unchanged.

I beg your indulgence as I quote from one of the speeches he made during the deliberations at the Virginia Convention called to ratify the Constitution:

> I had doubts of the power of those who went to the Convention; but now we are possessed of their work, let us examine it. When we trusted the great object of reviving the Confederation to the greatest, the best, and most enlightened of our citizens, we thought their deliberations would have been solely confined to that revision. Instead of this, a new system, totally different in nature, and vesting the most extensive powers in Congress, is presented. Will the ten men you send to Congress be more worthy than those seven were? If power grew too rapidly in their hands, what may it not do in the hands of others?
>
> If those who go from this State will find power accompanied with temptation, our situation must be truly critical. When about forming a government, if we mistake the principles, or commit any other error, the very circumstance promises that power will be abused. The greatest caution and circumspection are therefore necessary—nor does this proposed system in its investigation here, deserve the least charity.
>
> The honorable member says that the national government is without energy. I perfectly agree with him; and when he cried out Union, I agreed with him; but I tell him not to mistake the end for the means. The end is union—the most capital means, I suppose, are an army and navy; on a supposition I will acknowledge this; still the bare act of agreeing to that paper, though it may have an amazing influence, will not pay our millions. There must be things to pay debts. What these things are, or how they are to be produced, must be determined by our political wisdom and economy.

Later, he touched upon a subject that was as sore then as it is today—taxes.

> Let us leave no expedient untried to secure happiness; but whatever be our decision, I am consoled, if American liberty will remain entire only for half a century—and I trust that mankind in general and our posterity in particular, will be compensated for every anxiety we now feel.
>
> Another gentleman tells us that no inconvenience will result from the exercise of the power of taxation by the general government; that two shillings out of ten may be saved by the impost; and that four shillings may be paid to the federal collector, and four to the State collector. A change of government will not pay money. If, from the probable amount of the impost, you take the enormous and extravagant expenses, which will certainly attend the support of this great consolidated government, I believe you will find no reduction of the public burdens by this new system.
>
> The splendid maintenance of the President and of the Members of both Houses; and the salaries and fees of the swarm of officers and dependents on the government will cost this continent immense sums. Double sets of collectors will double the expense. To these are to be added oppressive excise-men and custom-house officers. The experience of the mother country leads me to detest them. They have introduced their baneful influence into the administration and destroyed one of the most beautiful systems that ever the world saw. Our forefathers enjoyed liberty there while that system was in its purity—but it is now contaminated by influences of every kind.
>
> The power of direct taxation was called by the honorable gentleman the soul of the government. We all agree, that it is the most important part of the body politic. If the power of raising money be necessary for the general government, it is no less so for the States. If money be the vitals of Congress, is it not precious for those individuals from whom it is to be taken? Must I give my soul, my lungs, to Congress? Congress must have our souls—the State must have our souls. This is dishonorable and disgraceful!

At another time he warned:

> Congress by the power of taxation—by that of raising an army, and by their control over the militia, have the sword in one hand, and the purse in the other. Shall we be safe without either? Congress have an unlimited power over both: they are entirely given up by us. Let him candidly tell me, where and when did freedom exist, when the sword and purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle in human affairs interposed, no nation ever retained its liberty after the loss of the sword and purse. Can you prove by any augmentative deduction, that it is possible to be safe without retaining one of these? If you give them up you are gone.
>
> Give us at least a plausible apology why Congress should keep their proceedings in secret. They have the power of keeping them secret as long as they please; for the provision for a periodical publication is too inexplicit and ambiguous to avail anything. The expression "from time to time," as I have more than once observed, admits of any extension. They may carry on the most wicked and pernicious of schemes under the dark veil of secrecy. The liberties of a people never were nor ever will be secure, when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them. The most iniquitous plots may be carried on against their liberty and happiness. I am not an advocate for divulging indiscriminately all the operations of government, though the practice of our ancestors in some degree justifies it. Such transactions as relate to military operations, or affairs of great consequence, the immediate promulgation of which might defeat the interests of the community, I would not wish to be published, till the end which required their secrecy should have been effected. But to cover with the veil of secrecy the common routine of business, is an abomination in the eyes of every intelligent man, and every friend to his country.

Patrick Henry—noble patriot—was indeed a rebel, with a cause.

---

## PENNSYLVANIA WIDENS ITS LEAD AS THE NO. 1 HUNTING STATE OF THE NATION

---


## HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, once again Pennsylvania is the No. 1 State of the Nation in every category of hunting license sales. The following statement by the Pennsylvania Game Commission tells the story that for the first time in history Pennsylvania has hit the 1 million mark in the number of licensed hunters:

PENNSYLVANIA WIDENS LEAD AS NO. 1 HUNTING STATE

Pennsylvania is increasing its lead as the number one hunting state in the country at an amazing rate, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

For the 1967–68 fiscal year Pennsylvania led the nation in every category of hunting license sales, and rapidly pulled away from all competitors for the number one title.

There were 1,062,121 paid hunting license holders in the Keystone State for the year, an all-time record. It also marked the first

time in history that Pennsylvania has hit the one million mark in number of licensed hunters. Michigan was a distant second in the race with 903,545 paid license holders (a paid license holder is one individual regardless of the number of licenses he may purchase).

The number of paid license holders in the commonwealth represents an increase of 66,931 over the previous year.

When resident hunting licenses, tags, permits and stamps issued by all states were lumped together, Pennsylvania again was well out in front with a total of 1,539,952, ahead of California's figure of 1,459,874.

For the first time in some years Pennsylvania was the undisputed leader in non-resident license sales with 80,481. Colorado was second in non-resident sales with 75,746.

In total license sales, Pennsylvania was way out in front with 1,620,433. California was a distant second with 1,461,836.

The Pennsylvania Game Commission's income from the sale of hunting licenses was $7,455,375.40, an all-time record and nearly one and one-quarter million dollars more than during the previous year. Michigan placed second in this category with a figure of $5,557,463.

Game Commission Executive Director Glenn L. Bowers, in reviewing the federal report, noted that the number of paid hunting license holders in the United States increased by 245,538 last year, so Pennsylvania accounted for more than one-quarter of the national increase.

"I think these figures speak for themselves," Bowers said. It is well known that we offer sportsmen the best diversified hunting recreation in America.

"When one state accounts for over a fourth of the national increase in hunters, the picture as to number one ranking becomes unmistakably clear," he said.

"Especially pleasing to us is the non-resident license sale. For years, we believed we were first, but had no way to prove it, because some states require purchase of separate tags, permits or stamps to hunt different species. When all of these figures were lumped together, totals claimed by other states barely edged our figures," Bowers said.

"Now, there can be no doubt about who leads in sales of non-resident licenses.

"Furthermore, each person who purchases a license in Pennsylvania can hunt any of the many species of game animals and birds we have to offer on that one license; it isn't necessary to have special permits or tags for each species. A Pennsylvania hunting license is a real bargain any way you look at it," Bowers said.

"Hunters agree. They have shown through license purchases where the greatest recreation is to be found," he concluded.

---

## JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT TAKES POSSESSION OF HIS TITULAR CHURCH

---

## HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit the "Discourse of John Cardinal Wright on Taking Possession of His Titular Church" for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

DISCOURSE OF JOHN CARDINAL WRIGHT ON TAKING POSSESSION OF HIS TITULAR CHURCH, JESUS THE DIVINE TEACHER, ROME, MAY 2, 1969

The happy circumstance that finds us gathered under the patronage of Christ the Divine Teacher suggests reflection for a moment on the *works* of the Christian and the *faith* of the Christian in the contemporary world.

The Scripture tells us that at a given moment Christ began to *do* and to *teach*, not the one alone, not the other alone, but both together.

In the Church Christ continues to do and to teach. In what spirit, then, does He now urge us to *do* the works of justice? What demands does He make on our fidelity to *His teaching?*

In the doing of its works, the Church in our day seems "open" or "forward-looking" in facing social problems. Yet, in her teaching she seems "cautious", or "conservative", especially in matters of faith and morals. Such is the import of the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes;* such certainly is the tenor of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Nature of the Church.*

In like manner, our Holy Father, Pope Paul, like his predecessors from Leo XIII to Pope John, brings to social questions a prevailingly "liberal" outlook, a clear openness to the future, the outlook of Pope John's *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* or his own *Progressio Populorum* and address to the United Nations. But also like his predecessors, the Pope speaks on doctrinal points with the fidelity of that witness to tradition which is echoed in the Year of Faith *Credo,* the encyclicals *Aeterna Dei Sapientia, Mysterium Fidei* and *Humanae Vitae,* and in Pope Paul's repeated affirmations of the received faith of our fathers.

The contrast recalls a parallel in St. Paul, a parallel which may be instructive for the times. No one can fail to note the openness of St. Paul to the wide and varied world of the Gentiles of his time, to their cultures and to the need for changes in the old order to meet the needs of the new. And yet, St. Paul was intransigent in his fidelity to the revelations made to the prophets and, above all, to the truth proclaimed in and through Christ Jesus.

The present-day seeming contradiction which occurs to me can be stated thus: In our moment of history both the history of the Church and the history of mankind, a "liberal" social attitude and a "progressive" spirit are the need of the hour. But such openness requires, as an indispensable condition of its health and effectiveness, a jealous regard for doctrinal soundness, an attachment to the faith that is unqualified save for human frailty. I offer the thesis that in a period of social turbulence, indeed revolution, those who are committed to "openness" and needed change on the level of things human are doomed to be blown about by every wind of doctrine unless they have a commitment not less certain to fixed principles of faith and morality.

I am suggesting that it is not only possible but desirable, even necessary, for the prevailing mood of the Church in our day to be one of open, progressive positions on social questions, above all in what pertains to the freedom due the sons of God, but together with a profound fidelity to the established truth at the heart of religious faith, the faith by which we are, in fact, made free.

With a measure of oversimplification, perhaps, but I trust no injustice to the realities, my thesis is this: *Social openness is the need of the hour: theological caution is not less great the need. Doctrinal integrity is essential to the faith, but it is not less essential to freedom. The faith provides the absolutes against which the relatives of social change are necessarily judged by Christians: absolutes concerning God, the person, the honor of God and the dignity of the person, the value of life and the primacy of the spiritual as Christians must see these always and everywhere.*

Herein lies, one strongly feels, the saving formula for the resolution of the tragic ironies set forth by Bonhoeffer in these words of truth. "The demand for absolute liberty brings men to the depths of slavery. The master of the machine becomes its slave. The creature turns against its creator in a strange reenactment of the Fall . . . The liberation of man as an absolute ideal leads only to man's self-destruction."

At our stage in history the temptations of social conservatism could be perilous to the prospects for human freedom, while those of theological liberalism would be fatal to the substance and the future of divine faith and therefore to the very goals of honest liberalism.

Religious faith, properly accepted and lived, provides the moral climate in which human freedoms have their best chance to survive. The Catholics of Poland proclaimed this to Catherine II of Russia: "We love *liberty* and therefore we love *religion* even more; we are *free* because we love *religion.* We shall not deny our *religion* lest we straightway be deprived of our *liberty.*"

Conversely, political and economic freedom should provide the social climate most favorable to responsible and vigorous religious faith.

Hence it turns out, by a curious but persuasive paradox, that social outlooks usually identified as "conservative", certainly those which are "reactionary", by tending to inhibit social growth and personal liberty, impede the common good, even as that good is preserved and fortified by the conservative instinct with respect to the faith an instinct which keeps one on guard against what Cardinal Newman identified as "liberalism in religion".

And so, social progressivism and theological conservatism, far from being inconsistent, can be mutually supportive. They are logical allies in the face of the present crisis in the Church, the crisis of our culture our political order, our very civilization.

That is why those who love both faith and freedom are always *doubly* concerned when the faith appears to be in jeopardy or the Church, the living presence of the teaching Christ in history, is in whatever peril.

Their preoccupation sometimes expresses itself in language that is anxious; it cannot do otherwise, given the gravity of the issues. But they do not, they cannot, lose heart. They know how much of human history, as well as Christian theology, Cardinal Newman summed up when he said:

"In truth the whole course of Christianity from the first, when we come to examine it, is but one series of troubles and disorders. Every century is like every other and to those who live in it seems worse than all times before it. The Church is ever ailing, and lingers on in weakness, 'always bearing about in the body of the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in her body.' Religion seems ever expiring, schisms dominant, the light of Truth dim, its adherents scattered. The cause of Christ is ever in its last agony, as though it were but a question of time whether it fails finally this day or another. . . ." (*Via Media,* Vol. I, pp. 354–355).

The Christian answer to all this is, of course, confident hope and sustaining love, but these because of steadfast faith and yet more faith. *"I believe, Lord, help thou my unbelief"* (Mark 9, 23). If Newman described the recurring condition of turmoil in which the Church always finds itself, he pointed out not less clearly the solution. He said: "Doubt and difficulty seem our lot; the simple question is—What is our duty under it? . . . . Scripture is quite aware of those difficulties . . . . it knows them all; it has provided against them by recognizing them. It says, 'Believe'" (*Essays Critical and Historical,* pp. 244–249).

The problem of *Whom* we shall believe and its solution in Christ, the Divine Teacher, are

both seen in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Again Cardinal Newman is our guide to their understanding:

"After our Lord had declared what all who heard seemed to feel to be a hard doctrine, some in surprise and offence left Him. Our Lord said to the Twelve most tenderly, 'Will ye also go away?' St. Peter promptly answered. No! But observe on what ground he put it: 'Lord, *to whom* shall we go?' . . . . If Christ were not to be trusted, there was nothing in the world to be trusted; and this was a conclusion repugnant both to his reason and to his heart. He had within him ideas of greatness and goodness, holiness and eternity—he had a love of them—he had an instinctive hope and longing after their possession. Nothing could convince him that this unknown good was a dream. Divine life, eternal life, was the object which his soul, as far as it had learned to realize and express its wishes, supremely longed for. In Christ he found what he wanted. . . . He might have misgivings at times; he might have permanent and in themselves insuperable objections still in spite of such objections, in spite of the assaults of unbelief, on the whole, he saw *that* in Christ which was positive, real and satisfying. He saw it nowhere else. 'Thou,' he says, 'hast the words of eternal life; and we *have believed* and *have* known that Thou are the Christ, the Son of the Living God.' As if he said, 'We will stand by what we believed and knew yesterday—what we believed and knew the day before. A sudden gust of new doctrines, a sudden inroad of new perplexities, shall not unsettle us. We *have* believed, we *have* known: we cannot collect together all the evidence, but this is the abiding deep conviction of our minds. We fell that it is better, safer, truer, more pleasant, more blessed to cling to Thy feet, O merciful Saviour, than to leave Thee. Thou, *canst not* deceive us: it is impossible. We will hope in Thee against hope, and believe in Thee against doubt, and obey Thee in spite of gloom.'

"Now what are the feelings I have described but the love of Christ? Thus love is the parent of faith. . . . Love of God let St. Peter to follow Christ, and love of Christ leads men now to love and follow the Church, as His representative and voice" (*Essays Critical and Historical*, pp. 249–252).

In brief, then, Christ offers mankind that truth which makes us free. But we must be tenacious of the faith through which there comes to us that truth which frees if we are to be, as the voice of the times invites us to be, the heirs to liberty and the builders, in responsible freedom, of a more sane and saving order.

In this, too, Newman, may well have been prophetic when, on the occasion of his coming to Rome ninety years ago to receive his cardinal's hat, he warned against what he called "the spirit of liberalism in religion". He praised what is good and true in liberal theory generally, "for example, not to say more, the precepts of justice, truthfulness, sobriety, self-command, and benevolence". But he saw this spirit, when loosed from firm attachment to the faith, as prompting a great "apostasy", "one and the same everywhere, (though) in detail, and in character, it varies in different countries". He saw that spirit, already shaping up in his times, as ultimately inconsistent with the recognition of any religions whatever as true, all being matters of opinion, never of objective fact. Because of its mischief, "over-spreading, as a snare, the whole earth", Newman made his admittance to the Sacred College the occasion to protest that "never did Holy Church need champions (against this kind of 'liberalism in religion') more sorely than now" (*Biglietto* address).

One wonders what Newman would have said had he lived to see his name and his words invoked in defense of a religious spirit which he found so mischievous and which he repudiated in his own times so pointedly, so passionately, and, on occasion, with such personal suffering!!!

Newman's passion for the Church of the Fathers, for the primacy of the papacy, for the witness of hierarchy and laity alike to the faith committed to the Apostles is preeminently needed if liberalism in the building of peace, the flourishing of the intellectual life, the recognition and service of the person, the progress of civil rights is to have firm roots in truth from which to flourish and fixed, unyielding standards to guarantee its freedoms.

Newman lamented the theological trend of his times because he feared that it would be the ruin of many souls. But he added: "I have no fear at all that it really can do . . . serious harm to the Word of God, to Holy Church, to our Almighty King, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, Faithful and True, or to His Vicar on earth. *Christianity has been too often in what seemed deadly peril, that we should fear for it any new trial now.* [To offset and survive these] . . . commonly the Church has nothing more to do than to go in her own proper duties, in confidence and peace . . ."

What we have thus said about the majestic calm and Christian optimism which the ancient faith inspires, together with the magnanimous, venturesome social action which the new hopes invite, is valid everywhere. Everywhere and always we must *do* with the boldness and generosity of Christ, and *teach* without compromise or confusion the Word of God, still echoed across the ages and throughout the world by the voice of the Church, obedient to Him as is He to the Mind and the Will of His Father in God.

We must repeat these joyful, consoling truths in all seasons and all places. But it is especially appropriate to proclaim them on this occasion and here in Rome, where Christ's own Vicar gives the example of *doing* and *teaching*. It is easy to believe them here where the trophies of the apostles, the memories of the martyrs, all the symbols of the city not lightly called "Eternal," declare the abiding strength of truly human aspirations and the immortal power of divine promises.

Let the words of St. Bernard inspire us here in Rome to deepened identity through the Church with the unchanging Christ Who ultimately changes everything: "Surrounded by a company of single-hearted brethren, what have you to fear? What have you to fear at whose side angels stand and whom Christ leads into battle encouraging his friends with the words, 'Fear not, I have overcome the world'? If Christ is with us, who is against us? You can fight with confidence where you are sure of victory. With Christ and for Christ, victory is certain. Not wounds, nor falls, nor bruises, nor (were it possible) can a thousand deaths rob us of victory, if only we do not forsake the fight. Only by desertion can we be defeated. . . ."—desertion from Christ the Divine Teacher of our faith, Christ the Example of our deeds.

Let us, then, recognize with Newman, that, in the order of Providence, our seeming dangers are often our greatest gains. In the words of the Protestant poet,

"The clouds you so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head."

## CONGRESSMAN MESKILL REPORTS TO YOU

## HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the tabulations of my 1969 congressional questionnaire have just been completed. The returns represent the responses of more than 42,000 residents of Connecticut's Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the results in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. I think they show some interesting trends:

CONGRESSMAN MESKILL REPORTS TO YOU

DEAR FRIENDS: The results of my 1969 Congressional Questionnaire have now been tabulated. From over 151,000 questionnaires sent to homes in Connecticut's Sixth Congressional District, I have received 24,194 returns. This means that the views of more than 42,000 residents in our district were sampled since the questionnaire was designed to permit both husband and wife to respond individually. I am most gratified by this response.

As I have stated before, the responsibility for my voting record remains my own. However, the opinions expressed are useful in formulating my positions on legislative issues. Your views are helpful to me as I perform my duties as your Representative here in Washington.

Below are the tabulated results of the questionnaire and my response to each question. I answered my own questionnaire on the day the questionnaire was mailed to you. The percentages represent a combined average of the husband's and wife's responses. The answers have also been broken down by age, sex and political affiliation. This information will be made available to anyone requesting it.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. MESKILL,
*Member of Congress.*

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

[Figures are in percent]

| | Yes | No | Undecided | My response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Should the Federal Government develop laws to help prevent strikes by public employees? | 65 | 26 | 9 | Yes. |
| 2. Do you favor Federal aid to private and parochial schools? | 35 | 60 | 5 | Yes. |
| 3. Should the voting age be lowered to 18 years? | 45 | 51 | 4 | Yes. |
| 4. If a satisfactory peace in Vietnam cannot be secured in the foreseeable future which of the following, if any, would you favor? | | | | |
| (a) Withdrawal of U.S. forces, even if this means a Communist takeover | A | 21 | | C. |
| (b) Adhere to holding operations by joint United States-South Vietnam forces. | B | 12 | | |
| (c) Bring increased military pressure to bear on North Vietnam | C | 55 | | |
| (d) None of these | D | 12 | | |
| 5. Would you favor a constitutional amendment which would allow Congress to override a Supreme Court decision by a ⅔ vote? | 52 | 37 | 11 | No. |
| 6. Should the electoral college be abolished and the election of the President and Vice President be purely and simply by popular vote? | 80 | 12 | 9 | Yes. |
| 7. Would you favor a policy of promoting trade with Communist-bloc nations? | 32 | 54 | 14 | No. |
| 8. Should the United States adopt a 12-mile offshore territorial limit against other nations which impose more than a 3-mile limit? | 86 | 8 | 6 | Yes. |
| 9. Should the Federal Government try to slow the population migration from rural to urban areas through programs of economic incentives and aids to private industry to help create jobs in rural areas? | 61 | 27 | 12 | Yes. |
| 10. At the conclusion of the Vietnam conflict, would you favor granting amnesty to those who fled the country or were imprisoned because of "conscientious objection" to the war? | 20 | 68 | 12 | No. |

## THE UNIQUE STATUS OF THE OIL INDUSTRY


## HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon be considering tax reform legislation which must include meaningful revenue-producing reforms. There can be no sacred cows exempt from this effort. There can be no tax reform bill of any credibility if oil is left out.

The following article from the Monday, May 26, issue of the National Observer outlines the tremendous injustice of the oil tax loopholes which result from a combination of the depletion allowance, foreign tax credit, intangible drilling costs, western hemisphere trade deductions, and an incredible system of oil bookkeeping which allows the 15 major oil refiners to earn almost $5 billion after taxes and pay only 8 percent of their earnings in taxes.

The article is as follows:

THE UNIQUE STATUS OF AN INDUSTRY: HOW TAX BREAKS HAVE NOURISHED THE OIL BUSINESS

In the late Nineteenth Century, the amassing of great wealth from oil was enhanced by the easy ethics of the age. In more recent times, many new oil fortunes have arisen and swelled, and they have swelled in fair measure because the industry enjoys an assortment of tax breaks that no other business can match.

Consider:

Atlantic Richfield Co. reported income before taxes of $377,942,000 in the years 1965 through 1967, but the company paid no Federal income taxes.

Standard Oil of California reported income before taxes in 1967 of $513,067,000 and paid $6,000,000 in Federal corporate income taxes, or 1.2 per cent.

How can this be done? How is it possible to earn so much and pay little or no Federal income taxes? The answer is that the Federal tax structure provides a host of unusual tax sanctuaries for the oil industry.

These tax sanctuaries are related to the controversial Machiasport plan, by which Occidental Petroleum Corp. hopes to erect a huge refinery in the tiny town of Machiasport at the northeastern tip of Maine. The plan represents a sophisticated attempt to hurdle the Federal import quota system for oil. It is the import quota system, which was explained in detail in The National Observer of May 5, as well as restrictions on domestic production, which were examined in The National Observer of May 12, that combine with petroleum's special tax breaks to give the U.S. oil industry a unique status in the economy—and to force the American consumer to pay artificially high prices for many oil products.

It is this unique status that the battle over Machiasport has placed in the spotlight, and the industry is preparing to meet assaults from any direction.

CASH FOR CHANCY PROJECTS

Uncommon tax advantages provide the industry with an uncommonly large cash flow, which the industry argues is required for its gigantic and often chancy operations. What are these tax advantages?

Take a look at the more important ones:

Percentage depletion: Oil and natural gas well operators may deduct 27.5 per cent of the gross revenues of each property before paying taxes, unless this figure totals more than 50 per cent of the net income of the property before deducting the depletion allowance. Thus, if gross revenues on a property total $100,000, the producer may take $27,500, before figuring his taxes, so long as the net income of the property after expenses is $55,000 or more. If, however, the net income was, say, $50,000, the producer would be limited to 50 per cent of that, or $25,000.

Intangible drilling costs: These include such costs of developing a producing well as wages, fuel, repairs, hauling supplies, and other expenses that do not have a salvage value. These "intangibles" may be deducted from gross revenues the first year. Similar expenses incurred by other manufacturers must be capitalized and written off over a number of years.

Foreign tax credits: U.S. companies operating abroad may claim credit for taxes paid to foreign governments on nearly a dollar-for-dollar basis. Thus if a company owed $75,000 to Uncle Sam on its profits earned in, say, Saudi Arabia and had paid $80,000 in taxes to the Saudi Arabia government, the foreign-tax credit would eliminate the taxes on that operation due the U.S. Treasury. Critics, however, say that taxes paid Middle East governments by U.S. oil companies are based on artificial prices, and that some of these taxes should be treated as expenses of doing business and should not be allowed to fully wipe out the companies' U.S. tax debt.

Western Hemisphere trade deduction: This provision allows U.S.-owned companies doing 95 per cent of their business outside the United States but within the Western Hemisphere to a special deduction in figuring their Federal taxes. In effect, it reduces the tax rate by 14 points, currently from 52.8 per cent to 38.8 per cent. This is done before any foreign tax credits or depletion allowances are taken. It is a provision that mostly favors companies in the business of extracting minerals. Like oil.

These sanctuaries are used in combination with still other advantages. An example will indicate what a resourceful accountant might do for his oilman client.

Assume the oilman drills a well that costs $100,000 and produces gross revenues of $100,000 in its first year. Between 75 and 90 percent of his expenses will be intangible drilling costs, which can be written off in the first year. These include rental of a drilling rig and the salaries of crewmen. Assume intangible costs of $80,000 and production costs of $5,000. The gross income of $100,000 minus $85,000 in intangibles and production costs would leave an income of $15,000.

But he would not pay income taxes on $15,000; he would pay them on $7,500.

Here's why: The depletion allowance for oil and gas is 27.5 per cent of the gross income, but this may not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the property. In this example, the depletion allowance equals $27,500. But the oilman, because of the 50 per cent limit, could claim only $7,500 in depletion. If he chose this method, therefore, the oilman would have a taxable income of $7,500.

The next year, however, assuming again a gross revenue of $100,000 and production costs of $5,000, the oilman could take his full percentage depletion allowance of $27,500 and his taxable income would be $67,500.

But a technique known as "carved-out production payments" would save the operator many tax dollars. In his first year of operation, the oilman's intangible costs limited the amount of depletion he could claim to $7,500. But if he sold his second year's production in advance—that is, during his first year of operation—he would have a first-year gross income of $200,000. And a gross income of $200,000 minus intangibles and production costs of $85,000 would result in a first-year net income of $115,000.

The percentage depletion allowance would equal $55,000 (27.5 per cent of $200,000) and the oilman would not have reached the limit of 50 per cent of net income, or $57,500. Thus, although his gross income for the first year was $200,000, he would have a taxable income of only $60,000.

There is yet another aspect of this device. Since the oilman has already received payment for the oil he produces in his second year of operation, he will have no income at all in his second year. But he will have production costs of $5,000, which he can then report as an operating loss. And so, he will be able to claim a tax refund from the Government on this "loss" by carrying it to earlier years without affecting his depletion allowance, or by applying the "loss" to income from other sources.

The net effect of this maneuver is that the oilman would have taxable income—after selling the production payment—of $60,000 in the first year and minus $5,000 in the second year. Without the sale of the production payment, his taxable income would be $7,500 in the first year and $67,500 in the second year. The sale of the production payment thus reduces his taxable income for the two years by $12,500.

There is another form of production payment called the "ABC deal." It does not lend itself to simple explanation, but perhaps a sample offered in a U.S. Treasury Department report makes the effect sufficiently clear.

"In a recent ABC transaction," reports the Treasury Department, "a major oil company purchased all the coal properties of another corporation, subject to a reserved production payment of $460,000,000 payable out of a large percentage of the net profits to be derived from the operation of the coal properties by the buyer. Under present rules, the buyer excludes from income the $460,000,000 of profits derived from its operation of the coal properties and paid over to the holder of the production payment.

"This feature alone represents a Federal income tax saving to the oil company of approximately $175,000,000 over the payout period, or an annual tax saving of between $10,000,000 and $18,000,000 per year depending on the actual length of the payout period. (It was estimated that it would take 7 to 16 years to discharge the production payment out of profits derived from the operation of coal properties.)

"In addition, all of the costs of mining the coal used to discharge the production payment were deducted by the buyer even though it capitalized those costs on its books as a cost of acquiring the coal properties."

The Treasury says that in 1966, ABC transactions totaled $1.85 billion (for all extractive industries) and resulted in a loss of revenue to the Federal Government of $85,000,000. Carved-out production payments totaled $540,000,000 in 1966—up from $214,000,000 in 1965—and cost the Federal Government $70,000,000 in revenue.

FROM THE JOHNSON YEARS

These figures are taken from reports issued by the Treasury Department during the Johnson Administration; the reports included a long list of tax-reform proposals. They make up four volumes titled *Tax Reform Studies and Proposals U.S. Treasury Department*. The first three volumes are treasury Department studies. The fourth is an examination of tax provisions affecting the oil and gas industry, prepared for the Treasury by the Consad Research Corp. of Pittsburgh.

Neither the Johnson nor Nixon administrations has endorsed the far-ranging reforms sought by Treasury specialists. But the reports were sent to Capitol Hill and released jointly by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Included in the Treasury's reports is this comment:

"In effect, the price of crude oil in the United States is being underwritten by import controls, by state controls on production, and by favorable tax provisions. . . ."

The oil industry's tax advantages affect not only its less privileged competitors but the whole national economy as well.

The Consad report states: The oil and gas producing industry accounts for about 1.5 per cent of the Gross National Product. [Reckoned at an annual rate of $93.4 billion in the first quarter of 1969.] By most conventional standards it is not a highly concentrated industry, but with so enormous an output, each of the largest firms is a giant in the economy. The five top domestic producers together account for 20 per cent of the output, the top 20 for 50 per cent.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the value of crude oil at the wellhead in 1967 was $9.4 billion, and the value of natural gas was $2.9 billion. The value of natural gas liquids, liquid fuels extracted from natural gas, was $1.2 billion. The value of products shipped from U.S. refineries in 1967—the latest year for which figures are available—was $20 billion.

The oil industry concedes that it is very big and very important. Indeed, its size and essentiality are often cited by industry spokesmen to defend its preferential treatment by the tax laws, just as they are cited to defend the import quota system and state-enforced controls on domestic production. What the industry prefers not to emphasize are industry profits.

Consider some statistics contained in the "Monthly Economic Letter" for April of this year, published by the First National City Bank of New York City. A survey of 2,250 manufacturing companies, divided into 41 categories, showed a net income in 1968 of $26 billion. Ninety-nine oil producing and refining companies had a total net income last year of $6.1 billion, or almost 25 per cent of the after-tax earnings of the entire list of 2,250 companies.

Significant, too, is the percentage of return on sales, also calculated in the First National City Bank study. Fifty-five aircraft and space companies had a return of 2.8 per cent. Eleven auto and truck manufacturers had 5.8 per cent. Ninety-two printing and publishing firms recorded a return on sales of 6.2 per cent.

The 99 petroleum companies? They enjoyed a return on sales of 9.0 per cent. Only the drug industry scored higher, with 42 drug makers reporting a return on sales of 9.5 per cent.

The oil industry, however, does not place as much importance on these figures as it does on those that reflect its rate of return on investment. And, indeed, the First National City Bank reports that the average rate of return on net worth for the 2,250 companies surveyed was 13.1 per cent in 1968, up from 12.6 per cent in 1967. The 99 oil companies, however, had a return on net worth in 1968 of 12.9 per cent, compared with 12.8 per cent in 1968. So in terms of return on investment, the oil industry is slightly below the national average.

Some oilmen, moreover, say the difference is greater than it seems because the figures do not reflect what it actually costs to replace extracted oil.

"If oil companies figured in what it is costing them to replace their oil, it could cut their return on investment by one-half," declares Minor Jameson, Jr., executive vice president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

It is at this point that the debate over preferential tax treatment for the oil industry approaches the heart of the matter. Most independent economists have a ready answer for Mr. Jameson.

Prof. Walter J. Mead, professor of economics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, told the Senate subcommittee in March of this year:

"The effect of favored tax treatment is to reduce tax costs for oil companies relative to firms in other industries. These measures taken together substantially raise the expected after-tax profit rates on oil industry exploration and development investments in what would otherwise be submarginal uses of scarce capital. Investment in petroleum exploration and development is indeed expanded to the point where the after-tax return is approximately equal to that which may be obtained on alternative uses of capital. . . .

"Oil industry spokesmen have defended their various subsidies with the question, 'If we receive all the subsidies which our critics allege, why is our rate of return on invested capital not substantially higher than other nonsubsidized industries?' The answer to this question is that a subsidy will raise the profit rate at the point in time at which it is conferred.

"Its effects, however, are eroded away with time as producers react to their more profitable situation by expanding into otherwise submarginal areas. This expansion leads to a decline in the rate of return toward a normal yield and to resource misallocation as well."

And here Professor Mead adds an interesting observation in the light of the industry's particularly visible troubles earlier this year.

"The oil spillage case in the Santa Barbara Channel is directly related to the subsidy system. Leases were purchased and drilling occurred in the California offshore area because such operations were made profitable by the subsidy legislation. Under free market conditions, oil prices would be substantially lower, tax costs substantially higher in the oil industry, and the profit inducement to buy leases in the Channel would probably be lacking.

"To develop oil from such sources is to use up more economic value than is produced. In addition to this probable waste of resources, we have the external cost (aptly called 'spillover costs' even before this oil spillage case) of environmental pollution."

Oil industry spokesmen speak frequently about domestic taxes paid as a percentage of gross revenue. The Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, for example, recently published a report showing that the industry paid 5.1 cents on each dollar of gross revenue in 1964 and 1965. This includes Federal, state, and local taxes, but *excludes* state and Federal product taxes. The study showed all business corporations paid an average of 4.5 cents on each dollar of gross revenue.

THE ACCENT ON "GROSS"

So, set forth in these terms, the oil industry pays six-tenths of a cent per gross-revenue dollar more than the average of all industries.

But the comparison is in gross revenue, and does not take into consideration the cost of doing business. Thus if a company doing $10 billion a year volume had business costs of $9 billion, it would probably pay less in taxes than a $10 billion-a-year business with costs of $5 billion. The oil industry's ratio of expenses to gross revenue is lower than that of many other industries.

The oil industry contends that in 1966 it was responsible for $10.5 billion in taxes. Testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, M. A. Wright, chairman of Humble Oil, a subsidiary of Jersey Standard, declared:

"Aggregate tax payments on oil industry operations in 1966 were $10.5 billion, including $8 billion of excise and sales taxes on oil products. These payments provided 5 per cent of all receipts of the Federal, state, and local governments."

But that $8 billion Mr. Wright refers to was not paid by the oil companies. It was paid by, among other customers, the motorists who buy gasoline at the industry's thousands of filling stations.

Now consider data from the Treasury's tax-reform study, which shows "estimates of the effective tax rates actually paid by corporations, as a group and for several industries." Here are the 1965 figures on "actual (Federal) tax on total net income:"

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| All industries | 37.5 |
| Petroleum | 21.1 |
| Other mineral industries | 24.3 |
| Lumber | 29.5 |
| Commercial banks | 24.4 |
| Other manufacturing | 43.3 |

Only mutual savings banks (5.3 per cent) and savings and loan associations (14.5 per cent), among the categories considered, had lower effective tax rates than the oil industry.

Oilmen contend the price of gasoline has been remarkably stable in a period of general inflation. But, according to the Oil and Gas Journal of April 14, 1969, the average price of regular gasoline—excluding taxes—has increased 7.4 per cent since April 1968, and 5.9 per cent since the last week in December 1968.

Its many tax privileges give the oil industry tremendous cash flows and thus very great financial leverage. Some critics argue that this gives oil an unfair advantage over competing industries. But the industry insists the nature of its business requires this heavy cash flow.

"It is essential because so much of our investment is such high risk that it isn't bankable," says John J. Scott, general counsel of Mobil Oil. Mr. Scott cited as an example Mobil's operations in Venezuela. Prior to and during World War II, Mobil invested between $45,000,000 and $50,000,000 in that country before getting any return on its investment. "If we did not have the cash flow, we could not have done it," Mr. Scott says.

What would happen to the industry's oil reserves if the depletion allowance and deductions for intangibles were eliminated?

Frank N. Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, offers this reply:

"I can tell you one thing that is spectacular: The size of the investment in exploration and development the industry is going to have to make to meet the needs of the American people over the next 15 years, as a rough estimate, domestic oil exploration and development outlays will have to be increased about 50 per cent. This means going from a little less than $4.5 billion annually up to somewhere around $6 or $7 billion. An industry that has to make such a big boost in its spending has to make profits to do its job."

Some industry sources say oil needs more tax breaks, not less. Harold M. McClure, Jr., president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, cited figures before the House Ways and Means Committee that showed a 40 per cent reduction in the number of wildcat test wells drilled in 1968 compared with the number drilled in 1956.

"It should be recognized," said Mr. McClure, "that part of these decreases can be attributed to wider well spacing and increased efficiencies in all phases of drilling and producing operations."

It's interesting that Mr. McClure should use the year 1956 as a comparative figure for 1968 drilling operations. Says the Consad report: "The number of wells being drilled reached a peak in 1955-56, but has since declined steadily back to its 1949 level, over 30 per cent below the peak."

Mr. McClure told the senators further: "To re-emphasize the degree of risk, only 2 out of every 100 new field wildcats drilled are likely to find a field large enough to be profitable. . . . To sum up the situation as to incentives for petroleum exploration and development in the United States, there is an obvious need for more—not less—economic stimuli." A wildcat is an experimental or exploratory well.

Mr. McClure uses the term "economic stimuli." In the oil business there are stimuli within stimuli. It is not only the major tax privileges themselves that benefit the industry; it is also the accounting involutions that they make possible. A good example of

such an involution can be found in the uses to which the depletion allowance is put.

Simply stated, oil companies shift expenses, for tax purposes, to the wellhead, where depletion may be claimed, from refinery or transportation costs that do not qualify for this deduction.

In a Senate speech recently, Sen. William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat and critic of oil-industry privileges, described the answers he received from the Interior Department to questions he had posed:

"Apparently," said Senator Proxmire, "Interior had made an analysis which demonstrates that integrated companies shift income from refining and marketing to oil production in order to minimize tax liabilities by maximizing percentage depletion. This analysis is correct as was shown by Texaco's recent action in increasing the price it would pay for crude oil by 20 cents a barrel.

"Since Texaco produces most of the crude oil it refines, the increased cost on the 11,000 net barrels a day it buys from outsiders will be more than offset by the larger depletion allowances it will claim on the oil which it sells to itself. Apparently, Texaco felt the 1.9 per cent of its income paid in Federal income taxes in 1967 was too high."

While Senator Proxmire singled out Texaco as an example, that company is hardly alone in taking advantage of the tax laws as they are on the books.

One of the laws on the books permits oil companies to deduct from their U.S. tax obligation the income taxes they pay to foreign governments. To get as much revenue as possible from the oil companies, oil nations in the Middle East and elsewhere base their tax schedule on "posted prices," which are set arbitrarily and are almost always higher than the actual price the companies get for their oil.

The result is that American companies must pay foreign governments more in taxes than they would if the taxes were figured on the true price for which oil can be sold. Thus, a portion of the foreign tax is considered by many critics as not a tax but a royalty. Therefore, so the argument goes, U.S. companies should be permitted to deduct from their U.S. taxes only that part of foreign taxes that are truly taxes. The other part, which would be considered as royalties, would then be figured as just another business expense.

The oil companies, who are being overcharged by foreign governments, don't like the system of posted prices any more than the U.S. Treasury Department does, but they say there's nothing they can do about it.

The House Ways and Means Committee has about two dozen bills of various sorts that deal with reforming the tax structure as it affects oil. One House bill would eliminate entirely the depletion allowance as it relates to foreign wells; Maine's Sen. Edmund Muskie has introduced a similar bill.

Rep. Henry Reuss, Wisconsin Democrat, has introduced a major tax reform package, one section of which would drop oil and gas depletion allowances, presently 27.5 per cent, and allowances for 41 other minerals, presently at 23 per cent, down to 15 per cent.

In introducing his bill on Jan. 29 of this year, Mr. Reuss told the House: "Ideally, percentage depletion should be replaced with cost depletion. But since we are not living in an ideal world, this title provides only that the oil depletion allowance be reduced by less than one-half, from 27.5 per cent to 15 per cent, the percentage now applicable to over 40 other minerals."

Mr. Reuss and his supporters are not overly optimistic about changing oil's depletion allowance, especially now that President Nixon has reiterated his support of the allowance as it stands.

Nevertheless, says Mr. Reuss, "There is a general sentiment among taxpayers that they are getting a little depleted too."

In the American system of making law, it is far easier to establish prerogatives than to abolish or reduce them. To the beneficiary, preferential treatment becomes first a comfort, then a custom, and finally a necessity. And the progression can be carried still one step further. What of the nation's best interests? The late Sam Rayburn wasn't the only friend of oil to know when to turn solemnly and face the American flag.

THE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

The 27.5 per cent depletion allowance for oil and natural gas is probably the best known of all business tax exemptions. Here's how it came to be:

The Sixteenth Amendment, which became effective on March 1, 1913, made it legal for Congress to assess income taxes. The Revenue Act passed on Oct. 3, 1913, provided that in computing income subject to taxation, producers of ores and all other natural deposits could claim a depletion deduction not to exceed 5 per cent of the gross value of the output at the mine or well.

In 1916 the law was changed, removing the limitation, but specifying that the total depletion allowable over the life of the property could not exceed the capital originally invested, or, if the purchase of the property was made before March 1, 1913, the fair market value as of that date.

A second provision was introduced in 1918 allowing "discovery value depletion." The estimated discovery value was substituted as the value to be amortized for all wells found after March 1, 1913. It wasn't until 1926 that discovery value depletion was replaced by today's system of percentage depletion for oil and natural gas.

Under the 1926 law, any oil or gas producer, or anyone with a financial interest in a well, can deduct 27.5 per cent of his gross income realized from the sale of oil or gas, but this must not exceed 50 per cent of the net income of the property.

Why 27.5 per cent? Because the House of Representatives wanted the figure to be 25 per cent and Senate wanted 30 per cent. The 27.5 per cent figure for oil and gas is the highest depletion allowance; other minerals receive smaller allowances. Metals, for instance, qualify for 15 per cent.

The U.S. Treasury Department reports that, on an average, petroleum producers recover 19 times the cost of their producing wells through percentage depletion.

THE TAXES COMPANIES PAY

Federal corporate income-tax payments for 1967 of the nation's 15 largest oil refiners:

| Name | Net income before tax | Federal tax | Percent | Earnings after all taxes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Standard (N.J.) | $2,098,283,000 | $166,000,000 | 7.9 | $1,232,283,000 |
| Gulf | 955,968,000 | 74,142,000 | 7.8 | 578,287,000 |
| Texaco | 892,986,000 | 17,500,000 | 1.9 | 754,386,000 |
| Mobil | 594,593,000 | 26,900,000 | 4.5 | 385,393,000 |
| Standard (Calif.) | 513,067,000 | 6,000,000 | 1.2 | 421,667,000 |
| Standard (Ind.) | 366,847,000 | 74,021,000 | 20.2 | 282,250,000 |
| Shell | 342,022,000 | 44,940,000 | 13.1 | 284,849,000 |
| Phillips | 227,766,000 | 52,255,000 | 22.9 | 164,015,000 |
| Conoco | 241,362,000 | 30,031,000 | 12.4 | 148,962,000 |
| Cities Service | 165,289,000 | 32,347,000 | 19.6 | 127,837,000 |
| Union | 163,820,000 | 10,400,000 | 6.3 | 144,963,000 |
| Sun | 146,946,000 | 24,700,000 | 16.8 | 108,576,000 |
| Atlantic | 145,259,000 | None | 0 | 130,005,000 |
| Marathon | 138,520,000 | 3,700,000 | 2.7 | 73,858,000 |
| Getty | 132,762,000 | 3,687,000 | 2.8 | 118,166,000 |
| Total | 7,125,490,000 | 566,623,000 | 8.0 | 4,955,497,000 |

Source: Oil Week.

## UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS FORUM

## HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the University of Massachusetts at Boston recently conducted its first public service forum, entitled "the University of Massachusetts/Boston Forum for Argument," which was open to the general public. The first topic for discussion involved the difficult problem of taxation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Four speakers participated in the symposium entitled "Dollars Spent, Services Delivered: Taxation in Massachusetts." They were State Senate President Maurice A. Donahue; Richard M. Millard, chancellor, board of higher education, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Robert T. Capeless, member, Commonwealth's Master Tax Plan Commission, and former Massachusetts tax commissioner; and Bernard P. Rosenblatt, chairman, department of psychology, University of Massachusetts, Boston.

I applaud the involvement of the University of Massachusetts in public discussion of matters that affect the university, its home, the urban center, and the community of which it is an active and important part. I commend Chancellor Francis L. Broderick, the speakers, and the university for recognizing the important role the university plays in our society, and for realizing its responsibility to the community.

I am very happy at this time to include in the RECORD excerpts from the address by Senate President Maurice A. Donahue and the full text of the address by Chancellor Richard Millard. I recommend their remarks to my colleagues, all of whom are concerned with the problems of their States. I am sure the Members of this body will gain from seeing the great work that is being done by the University of Massachusetts at Boston.

The material follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS BY MAURICE A. DONAHUE

BOSTON.—Strong criticism was leveled today by State Senate President Maurice A. Donahue at the present state administration for its "inaction and indecision" in tackling the Bay State's current tax problems.

Senator Donahue was a featured speaker at the U. Mass/Boston Forum for Argu-

ment on "Dollars Spent, Services Delivered: Taxation in Massachusetts," held at the University's auditorium at 100 Arlington Street.

Other panelists included Richard M. Millard of Waban, Chancellor, Board of Higher Education, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Robert T. Capeless of Boston, member, Commonwealth's Master Tax Plan Commission and former Massachusetts Tax Commissioner; and Bernard P. Rosenblatt of Worcester, Chairman, Department of Psychology, U. Mass/Boston.

U. Mass/Boston Chancellor Francis L. Broderick was moderator of the University's first public service project in Boston.

In his remarks, Senator Donahue said, "For some time now I have been speaking out clearly and responsibly about the need for additional revenue to finance the minimal level of state services suggested by Governor Sargent in the budget which he has proposed.

"But Governor Sargent himself by his inaction and indecision has done more than anyone else in Massachusetts to undermine popular support and sabotage legislative approval of any responsible tax program this year.

"He has demonstrated a decided lack of enthusiasm for his own tax plan and has refused to discuss it or defend it publicly, thus inviting attacks upon it even from members of his own party.

"He has created complete confusion about the amounts of new revenue actually needed by endeavoring to claim credit for slashing the costs of Medicaid by fifty million dollars and yet at the same time maintaining that his budget cannot and should not be cut to reflect any such slashes.

"And only last week he raised further doubts about his position on taxes when he specifically refused to repudiate the alternative tax program presented by Republican Senator David Locke and four other House Republicans, and indicated he was reassessing his position and studying this program—a program which includes, among other things, raising the sales tax from three to five percent and raising the tuition at all state institutions of public higher education from $200 to $750!

"It has become increasingly difficult for even the most fair-minded observers to determine exactly what, if anything, the Governor wants by way of new taxes.

"If he and the Republican Party secretly favor a sixty-six and two-thirds percent increase in the sales tax and a two hundred and seventy-five percent increase in the tuition for the more than sixty thousand students in our institutions of higher public education, he ought to have the courage to say so and stop hiding behind somebody else's trial balloons.

"If he and the Republican Party now feel that less revenue is needed than was originally proposed, he ought to tell us so.

"The people have a right to know precisely what his views on additional taxation are.

"I hope that he will soon discover what he truly believes and will at last begin to speak out in clarification of his own position."

Speaking on higher education in Massachusetts, Chancellor Millard said, ". . . The amount expended per capita for public higher education in the Commonwealth is only half that of the national average. This means that the cost of public higher education to the taxpayers in Massachusetts is less than in any other state in the union. . . . This means that our institutions are operating at a dangerously close margin that precludes adequate development of supporting services including libraries and makes the qualitative increase that has taken place truly remarkable. It further means that any holding of the line or cutting back at this point can only result either in reducing the number and level of students accepted or a crippling reduction in quality."

He continued, "We are not now making available as many places for students as are needed by a considerable margin, but if we look ahead to the next decade, to 1975 and 1980, the need becomes compounded, and, if we are even to stay even in terms of the proportion of young people for whom higher educational opportunity will be available, major, even massive efforts are called for."

Dr. Millard also stated, ". . . Projecting operating appropriations at present support levels without necessary provisions for qualitative improvements and at present dollar levels, that is without taking into account inflation, the operating budgets for 1975 would be something on the order of $204 million and for 1980 close to $280 million. But in addition, to achieve such levels of enrollment, will require capital construction over the eleven year period, somewhere in the order of one billion five hundred million. . . ."

Professor Rosenblatt, speaking on the "Cost of Mental Illness" said that "the cost of caring for the mentally ill is far greater than we realize it to be; the cost of not caring for the mentally ill is greater still.

"The major problem in caring for the mentally ill is the shortage of educated and trained manpower. The greatest need in Massachusetts and in other states is for high quality services for children."

The symposium was attended by U. Mass/Boston students and faculty and the general public.

---

ADDRESS BY RICHARD M. MILLARD

While public support of higher education in Massachusetts extends into the distant past, 1636 to be exact, it has only been in the very recent past that the Commonwealth has come to recognize that the development of an adequate and diversified system of public higher education is essential to the well-being and future development of the state. Through the 19th, and a good part of the twentieth century, while our public institutions of higher education existed, it was assumed that with the exceptions of agriculture, home economics, teacher education, and textile technicians education, the major responsibility for higher education could rest with prestigious private institutions in the state, an assumption that had some basis in fact. Since World War II, however, the situation has changed radically. First the veterans and then in the mid and late fifties the rapid and continuing population increase of 18 to 24 year olds, plus a constantly rising college attendance expectation ratio, have made necessary a major reevaluation of the situation. It became evident that the private institutions in spite of increasing size could not meet the increased need. Further, with spiraling tuition costs young people from less economically affluent families were finding it more and more difficult to go to college at a price they or their families could afford. In addition, as pressure for admissions forced existing institutions to become progressively more selective larger numbers of college capable but average students found themselves shut out of higher educational opportunity. But also, with the growth of the 128 complex and the shift in the economy in Massachusetts to major emphasis upon industries highly dependent upon educated manpower, the state became progressively more aware of its dependence upon higher education for its own economic future.

The people of the Commonwealth, through the legislative and executive branches of government, responded by committing themselves to a system of public higher education which in quality and diversity of institutional functions would move in the direction in cooperation with the private institutions of making available higher educational opportunity to a progressively wider range of young people and citizens of the state. In 1958 the Regional Board of Community Colleges was formed and in 1960 the first community college, Berkshire, opened its doors. The progress from 1960 to the present has been phenomenal by any standard. In 1960 there were only 17,029 students in the sixteen public higher educational institutions in the state (6,371 at the University of Massachusetts, 8,373 in the 11 state colleges, 2,285 in the then 3 technological institutes, and 151 students at Berkshire community college). In the fall of 1968, 60,515 students were enrolled in public institutions of higher education, a 3½ fold increase over 1960. The University of Massachusetts, with its Boston branch, opened in 1965, had grown to 19,367. The state colleges had increased to 21,796; the two technological institutes, SMTI having been formed in 1964 out of the combination of Bradford-Durfee and New Bedford, had grown to 5,728; and most striking, the now twelve community colleges, had increased to 13,624 students with over half the students in occupational two year programs.

Such development has been possible through a series of changes involving legislative and institutional foresight and willingness to take necessary steps to meet changing conditions. In the early sixties the institutions and their governing boards attained the essential fiscal responsibility and flexibility to utilize funds efficiently and effectively to meet emergencies and the demands of rapid expansion including being able to adjust professional salaries in an escalating and highly competitive academic market. In 1965 the educational structure was reorganized creating an agency, the Board of Higher Education, at departmental level to work with, help plan for, and coordinate the public higher educational segements in the state. We have increased students by over 350 percent and appropriations by some 417 percent which does place us third in the nation in terms of rate of increase. And far more important, the university has emerged from a small rural institution to one that can hold its head high in any academic community in the nation; the state colleges are evolving from primarily teachers colleges to four year arts and sciences institutions with masters programs but without diminishing their contribution to supplying the elementary and secondary teachers of the Commonwealth. Our technological institutes have increased in stature and influence, and our community colleges have become models for the nation as comprehensive two year institutions which because they are wholly state funded can in general be placed where they are needed rather than where the community can afford them. It would be hard to find any area where tax dollars have been as well and as fruitfully invested both for the present and the future economic and educational health of the Commonwealth as in higher education.

And yet in the present, when the commonwealth is facing a fiscal crisis, it could be far too easy to congratulate ourselves on progress made, to assume that higher education is an area in which we can, if not cut back, at least hold even, or that further growth and development is a luxury we cannot afford. I would like to suggest that quite to the contrary, while we have made progress, we started from such a low base, that not only are we not currently meeting the need in spite of progress, we have only began to recognize the scope of what is facing us in the next decade. To assume that somehow we can even rest at this point is to court economic and educational disaster.

In relation to the present, while the rate

of increase has been high, the percentage of the Commonwealth's budget going into higher education is strikingly low both in terms of our own budget and in comparison with other states. The percentage of the Commonwealth's budget going into higher education has actually decreased over the last four years from around 8 percent to 6.9 percent in the current year, and if the budget recommendations for next year are followed, to 6.3 percent. The amount expended per capita for public higher education in the Commonwealth is only half that of the national average. This means that the cost of public higher education to the taxpayers in Massachusetts is less than in any other state in the union. The average cost per student in the community colleges runs considerably below that of a number of high schools in the state. And the average cost per student including students at all levels in the public system as a whole (not including capital expenditures) is considerably less than tuition at the major private institutions. This means that our institutions are operating at a dangerously close margin that precludes adequate development of supporting services including libraries and makes the qualitative increase that has taken place truly remarkable. It further means that any holding of the line or cutting back at this point can only result either in reducing the number and level of students accepted or a crippling reduction in quality.

We are not now making available as many places for students as are needed by a considerable margin, but if we look ahead to the next decade, to 1975 and 1980, the need becomes compounded, and, if we are even to stay even in terms of the proportion of young people for whom higher educational opportunity will be available, major, even massive efforts are called for. The Board of Higher Education has just completed a demographic population ratio potential enrollment projection, matched against institutional projections through 1980. The most rapidly growing age group in Massachusetts is the 18 to 24 year old group. It should be pointed out that the college age populations for 1975 and 1980 are not hypothetical persons dependent upon what may be or even is now a fluctuating birth rate, but are very live children currently in elementary schools of the state and nation. What these figures show is that if all the private institutions in the state remain viable and accept all the students they now anticipate taking and the public institutions of higher education increase from the current 60,500 to 143,000 (more than double present enrollments) by 1975 (six years from now) we shall still be short some 60,000 places for potential students. This means that almost as many potential students as are currently in all public institutions of higher education will not be provided for. If we project the figures to 1980 and increase the places available in public higher educational institutions to 188,000 or three times current enrollment and private institutions reach an enrollment figure of 223,000, the potential student places deficit will also have increased to something on the order of 113,000.

These are rather unsettling figures and the costs not of meeting the potential need but of reaching the 143,000 enrollment level in 1975 and 188,000 level by 1980 in public institutions of higher education are considerable. Projecting operating appropriations at present support levels without necessary provisions for qualitative improvements and at present dollar levels, that is without taking into account inflation, the operating budgets for 1975 would be something on the order of $204 million and for 1980 close to $280 million. But in addition, to achieve such levels of enrollment, will require capital construction over the eleven year period, somewhere in the order of one billion five hundred million. To complicate the picture, all these projections do involve the assumption which could be contrary to fact, that all of the private institutions will remain viable and able at least to meet their present projected enrollments. There is rather disturbing evidence that without additional help some of these private institutions may be in serious financial trouble. If any of the major institutions do disappear, the burden on the state will be just that much greater. Because of the potential seriousness of this problem, we are currently initiating a study of the financial problems of private higher education in Massachusetts.

The question can well be raised as to whether the Commonwealth can afford, not to meet the full need, but to do what it minimally ought to do in attempting to meet the need by tripling the size of public higher education by 1980. Here, I think, the answer is clear and has to be phrased in terms of the opposite question: can the Commonwealth possibly afford not to? The results of not doing so are, I would suggest, educational disaster in terms of restricting the potential of the Commonwealth's citizens but are very likely to mean economic disaster for the Commonwealth as well. I need hardly remind you of the difference in earning power of high school and college graduates and the fact that the college graduates become taxpayers increasing the Commonwealth's economic base. Equally important, our changing economy constantly calls for more highly educated and more diversely educated men and women in all phases of business and industry. This is why among other things problems will not be solved simply by making more freshmen places available regardless of type or program of institutions. It is why we must have a balanced and differentiated higher educational system, why community colleges, with their occupational as well as transfer programs, are critical, why our state colleges must continue their evolution as complementary multipurpose institutions, why our technological institutes serve so critical a function, and why the university must expand its professional and graduate programs. While the cost of graduate education is high, there are few programs where the direct dollar return in existing industries and through research and innovation in creation of new industries are as high as in graduate education. Further, without adequate graduate programs, the essential faculty for all other programs will not be produced.

We have a major task ahead that will require the cooperative efforts of all higher educational institutions public and private if we are to come anywhere near to meeting the needs. In the public sector it is critically important that the various institutions continue to develop as a complimentary system. We are past the point where we can afford fragmentation and expediency in the place of careful common planning. We must insure that the system be developed as efficiently, as effectively, and as economically as possible commensurate with quality education. To meet the need will require the combined efforts of the institutions, the legislative and executive branches of government, and the general public. The cost will be high but, it would be difficult to point to any area in which the return on investment of the tax dollar is higher or which is more crucial to the future well being of the Commonwealth. Higher education today and for the future is not a luxury but a necessity for the cultural and economic well being of the state. We may have to rearrange priorities in the Commonwealth, but, to diminish or not to expand our efforts in support of higher education is to court disaster. The most expensive dollar the Commonwealth can spend is the dollar withheld from meeting high educational needs.

## FURTHERS WORLD UNDERSTANDING

## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in this day of relatively free and easy world travel, we tend to forget that this travel is limited to a fairly small group of people. There are still large numbers of people who are unable to undertake world travel, and enjoy the rich experience of furthering a better understanding among the peoples of the world. A resident of my district, Mr. George Volger, of Muscatine, Iowa, has made a major contribution in this respect by bringing the world to the people of Iowa, and surrounding States. A couple of recent articles give a pretty good picture of the work being done by Mr. Volger. I salute Mr. Volger for this creative effort to further world understanding.

The articles follow:

[From the American Mail Line Newsletter, July 1965]

SOUND TRAVELS—BY SS "WASHINGTON MAIL"

"I wonder where George is," muses a midwesterner as he turns up the volume on his car radio. At the moment, George Volger may be at his General Manager's desk in the office of KWPC, Muscatine, Iowa. But to tens of thousands of radio listeners tuned to some 50 stations throughout ten Midwestern and Eastern states, the ubiquitous broadcaster may be in mid-Pacific, shouting over the throb of the ship's engines as he questions an engineer on the SS *Washington Mail*—or deep in a Philippine forest, listening to a lumber mill manager plan armed protection for his logging crews from marauding tribesmen—or crouched in a dim corner of a Japanese temple, describing a ritual dance.

George Volger's listeners travel the world with him and his tape recorder—most recently on a ten-week tour of Japan, Korea, Okinawa, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan and Quemoy. Much of the mid-winter trip was spent as a passenger aboard the SS *Washington Mail,* and Volger recorded many of his 65 broadcasts aboard the vessel. Not content to join the card players in the lounge, he prowled the ship, recorder slung over his shoulder. In the skipper's cabin, Captain Arnord Beeken proudly describes his vessel. In the engine room, First Assistant Engineer Arthur Hines discussed water supply desalinization. In the galley, Seward Harry Egolf, Jr., talked about food planning. International communications techniques were the subject in the radio shack with Radio Officer Arnold Dreier. On deck, Chief Mate Norrian Johnson chatted about cargo handling. Finally, back in the passenger lounge, Purser William Eastman talked of passports and visas, cargo manifest and quarantines. Fascinating fellow passengers including an Australian circling the globe by freighter, a missionary from Illinois going "home" to her Hong Kong orphanage, and a bridge-haunting Columbia River Bar pilot on a busman's holiday.

Kitchen radios from Kansas to Kentucky have taken housewives to Mexico, the West Indies, Ireland, Scotland, England, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland and Iceland on previous Volger travels. Since 1956, he has recorded over 400 interviews in foreign countries.

*"I try to give the listener basic information and human interest material on the country and its people,"* Volger says, *"And*

*I try to give him the incentive to travel by telling about sports, art, folklore, education, business, industry, food, travel, customs, and history—but no politics.*" However, prominent political figures are not unknown to Volger's microphone. Nationalist Chinese Premier C. K. Yen was a recent interviewee, and Panmunjom negotiations between U.N. representatives and North Korean Communists were captured on Volger's recorder. Nor is the victim of political oppression overlooked. In Macau, nineteen ragged, half-starved refugees told Volger of conditions in Red China just nine hours after their escape by sampan from the mainland.

But there is fun and enjoyment in Volger's journalist journeys too—sampling sake at a Japanese rice winery, rocketing along at 100 miles an hour on Japan's "bullet train," ogling the girls at Osake Takarazuka Revue, or cheering the 300-pound Sumo wrestlers at a Tokyo match. He has shared them all with his listeners.

---

[From the Farrell Line News, December 1967]

AN AFRICAN TREK ON 12½ MILES OF TAPE

(By George Volger)

Little did I realize when I purchased a pair of "desert" shoes in Chicago in late January, during a Lake Michigan blizzard, that I'd be using them so soon in very literal fashion.

The white material kept coming East, so much so that the *African Dawn's* departure date had to be moved. But on the evening of February 8, with a few feet of snow on deck, we headed out into the Atlantic.

Following a smooth thirteen days, the *African Dawn* came into the busy port of Walvis Bay, South West Africa. It was here I began to comprehend what great advances are being made in some of the remote sections of the "dark continent." Encircled with the Atlantic on one side and the Namib Desert on the other, this port city has sprung from a population of a little over 2,000 in 1950 to an estimated 20,000—spurred chiefly by the thriving pilchard industry. In the midst of new buildings, H. W. Otto Buhr, manager of Cory Mann George (agents for Farrell Lines) and also chairman of the Harbor Board, stated of the expansion, "One of our main problems is we just haven't built big enough—we underestimated our growth."

With only that day in Walvis Bay (I returned a couple of months later, however), and desirous of seeing as much as possible, Mr. Buhr arranged for one of his employees, Von Mallinckrodt, to drive me up to Swakopmund. En route, becoming too entranced with the towering Namib dunes, we got our car stuck in the glistening deceiving sands. Walking to the highway to secure some aid I was, on my first day in Africa, making good use of the desert shoes purchased so recently in the Chicago snow storm.

The Namib Desert episode was a new one for me—none of my previous travels had taken me into comparable country. And at this point, you may well ask, just why and how does a radio station man from Muscatine, Iowa, land in an African desert in the first place?

Over ten years ago, working in conjunction with the British Information Service, my wife, two daughters and I had produced a series of interviews in England and Scotland which were broadcast on over sixty radio stations in the United States. This led to other family projects in Ireland and the West Indies. A few years later, my wife and I complete with tape recorder and cameras, travelled Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Switzerland. More recently I have turned out projects in Mexico and the Far East—Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan.

The trip across the Pacific included my first taste of freighter travel. The trek was aided greatly through the cooperation of Worth Fowler, president of the American Mail Line. A meeting with Peter McChesney, manager, Trade Development for the Farrell Lines, at a CASL meeting in Milwaukee, eventually led to the African plans. At this point I am very much a confirmed freighter traveller.

Interviews cover a wide range. The aim has been to give a detailed and comprehensive picture of a country through the voices of the people themselves. Subjects run the gamut from business and industry to sports—from food and farming to art centers—from wild life to schools, historical centers, weather, communications, transportation and government. Sound backgrounds play an important part, adding much to the listener's mental picture.

The interviews are broadcast on radio stations in a wide area. The taped series have been heard on the Iowa Radio Network of twelve stations, plus over fifty outlets in ten other states. The Far East series was broadcast over the world-wide facilities of the Armed Forces Radio Network and officers in charge have requested additional programs.

In addition to radio, the interviews have taken on a broader scope. Auditioning the recorded conversations, Dr. John Haefner, of the Sociology Department of the University of Iowa, saw possibilities for the classroom. This led to testing at various grade levels in Iowa and Illinois schools and in the audio-visual department of Phoenix, Arizona, schools. Instructors reported that the interviews had motivated students in a wide age range, from fourth and fifth grades through high school. Hearing the voices of people in other lands informally discussing their work and telling about their families, had added a valuable new dimension.

On the African trip, the tape recorder "start button" was pushed long before the S.S. African Dawn docked at Walvis Bay. Already, at the New York office of the Farrell Lines, the project was set in motion with interviews with Peter McChesney and Robert Bielskas, Traffic Manager-Passenger, with discussions on African trade development and passenger traffic.

On ship, programs were recorded also with officers who had graduated from the United States Merchant Marine Academy. These will become part of a series being produced in conjunction with the academy at Kings Point, Long Island. Interviews were also made with Captain Erik Tallbe, other officers and unlicensed men, describing various ship responsibilities. These will form an important segment of a vocational series to be used in high schools around the country, telling young men about the Merchant Marine.

Departing the ship at Cape Town, the tape reels began rolling at a faster pace. Now, after some three months of extensive travel in southern and western sectors of the continent, I look back on a multitude of experiences wrapped up in over 180 interviews, in 12½ miles of tape on 70 reels, plus over 3,000 pictures in color and black and white.

The greater part of the time was devoted to the Republic of South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia and Zambia. On my return, after hopping the S.S. *African Lightning* at Luanda, Angola, additional material was secured there and in the Congo (Brazzaville), Gabon and Liberia.

In Cape Town, attendance at a rehearsal of the Aeoan group of coloured singers, directed by Dr. Joseph Manca, resulted in recordings of their "La Traviata" performance and interviews with the cast. And on a sheep farm near Tarkastad, enthusiastic Xhosa men and women sang tribal hymns, a wedding song and the Xhosa tribal anthem.

The listener feels much closer to the many racial strains in the southern part of the continent through a conversation with a Malay of Muslim faith in Cape Town; Indian families of Durban tell of their customs, foods and business; in Zululand a Kraal head speaks of his family and tribal customs, and in Rhodesia, Chief Chiota speaks of the changes that have taken place in his tribal area.

Through the voices of farmers, businessmen and industrialists, a detailed description of growth is told, not only in gold, diamond and copper mines, but also rock lobster, ostriches and karakul.

The tapes kept turning at Hout Bay, Cape Province, as Abe Wisenburg of South African Sea Products, told of catching and processing rock lobster, a delicacy relished by American gourmets—and an important cargo for Farrell Lines ships.

Hundreds of ostrich farms around Oudtshoorn provide income for thousands of people. We talk about the fast-running and hard-kicking bird with Will Hooper of the High Gate Ostrich Farm, from egg to biltong (a dried meat which, incidentally, also serves as a tasty hors d'oeuvre).

From mountains of ore to the delicate, suspenseful tap which cleaves a raw diamond, we report this great industry—from the world famous Premier Mine at Cullinan to Goldstein's Diamond Cutting Works in Johannesburg.

The story of gold mining is punctuated with sound, from the singing work crews at the 5,500-foot level of the Buffelsfontein Mine, to the technique of blasting in the stopes, to a class in the highly necessary Fanagulo language (in some mines fifty to sixty dialects and languages are represented among the workers).

The famed copper belt of Zambia has its story told through a visit to the Rhokana Mine of the Anglo American Corporation at Kitwe, Zambia, where 4,000 men are underground at any one time. Involvement in employee housing, schools, medicine and recreational facilities plays a big part of the industrial picture in Africa.

A Bantu businessman in Soweto tells of his grocery store operation and discusses general Bantu economy and buying power.

Continuing the audio picture, subjects include a description of Cape Town Harbor with Captain Joubert, Assistant Port Captain; loading ore at Port Elizabeth; the General Motors complex at "P.E." with 6,000 employees; modern whaling techniques, with H. M. Knudsen of Union Whaling Co., Ltd., Durban (a small radio transmitter on the harpooned whale identifies and locates the valuable catch); a visit to the Tsumeb mine of South West Africa; learning more of the expanding pilchard (sardine) business at Walvis Bay, South West Africa, from Carl Albrecht of SWA Fishing Industry, and the world's largest rubber plantation—Firestone at Harbel, Liberia.

Famed engineering projects provide valuable material, from the great Kariba Dam on the Zambezi River, forming the world's largest man-made body of water, to the awesome Hendrik Verwoerd Dam, a vital initial construction in the 30-year Orgage River Project (plans call for dam additions after the year 2,000 to take care of silt accumulation).

Travelling by car allowed a great variety of contacts. A variety of agricultural practices are described:

A sheep farm near Tarkastad, Republic of South Africa, with Hugh Fuller, who has received recognitions for high quality wool; a visit to a country fair in the attractive town of George, on the Indian Ocean, a stop at a South African vineyard near Paarl with the owner, Francois Malan Basson; karakul farms in South West Africa, and in the Karoi sector

of Rhodesia we learn about tobacco farming in an area where it was impossible to cultivate the ground until the 1940's due to problems with lions and the tsetse fly.

Did you realize that elephants are left- or right-tusked? This is just one of the bits of information about wild life coming out of interviews with knowledgeable game wardens of Kruger National Park of Republic of South Africa, the Wankie and Zimbabwe National Parks of Rhodesia, the Etosha Pan of South West Africa and pioneering farmers (one cattle farmer of South West Africa, Major C. H. Hubble, and his wife have shot forty-one leopards on their semi-arid acreage near Grootfontein).

The peoples of this continent love sports. At Stellenbosch University, Dr. Dannie Craven, a rugby great, compares sports in his country and the United States, and in Bulawayo, Rhodesia, at an African sports center, Coach Stutty Dhlamini tells of that country's most popular games.

At the South African Broadcasting Corporation we speak of radio programming in the two official languages, English and Afrikaans, plus seven of the Bantu languages. Television transmission is growing in Rhodesia, and in Zambia education via radio is under the guidance of an Irishman. Patrick Delahanty.

Expanding horizons demand expanding transportation plans. Some of the recent and planned advancements are discussed with officials of South African Airways and South African Railways.

From these notes you gather a fair idea of why it took some 25,000 miles of travel to secure 12½ miles of tape. Certainly much thanks is due Farrell Lines' men in New York and Africa and their agents, who were of such valuable assistance along the way.

My travels filled me with respect for the many solid accomplishments in the countries visited, along with a feeling of awe in estimating the great potentials still untouched.

In a continent of so many facets, it is certainly a part of the world in which general statements are dangerous. It is a country truly emerging in a positive way on the world scene, and one that demands and requires study and understanding. I hope that these African interviews, over the air and in the classroom, will provide more light on the so-called "dark continent."

## SGT. FREDERICK J. MAGSAMEN

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Frederick J. Magsamen, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

WESTMINSTER SOLDIER DIES

Sgt. Frederick J. Magsamen, 21, a soldier from Westminster, has died in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Sergeant Magsamen died Friday after a military aircraft in which he was a passenger crashed and burned. The Defense Department said he was being lifted from the site of the crash by an extraction line to an aircraft hovering above when the line snapped and Sergeant Magsamen fell to the ground.

Born in Baltimore, Sergeant Magsamen lived most of his life in Westminster. He was graduated in 1966 from Westminster High School, where he had played on the varsity football team and was a member of the school music organizations.

IN THE GREEN BERETS

He worked briefly for the Random House Publishing Company in Westminster before enlisting in the Army in July, 1967.

Sergeant Magsamen had basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., jump school training at Fort Benning, Ga., and attended military police school at Fort Gordon, Ga.

He returned to Fort Bragg for special training and became a member of the Green Berets.

Sergeant Magsamen was sent to Vietnam last December. His sister, Mrs. Paul Bowersox, Jr., of Westminster, said that according to letters received at home, Sergeant Magsamen had been awarded two bronze stars and two purple hearts in Vietnam.

Besides his sister, Sergeant Magsamen is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick J. Magsamen, of Westminster, and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilmer T. Butler, of Baltimore.

## A NEED TO REMEMBER

### HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, a new memorial to the Nation's honored war dead will be dedicated this Memorial Day in the city of Victorville, Calif. Located in Victor Valley Memorial Park, the memorial contains the names of those brave men from Victorville and other nearby communities in San Bernardino County who gave their lives for their country in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the war in Vietnam. Interred in the memorial are the remains of Capt. Joseph McConnell, top fighter pilot of the Korean war, who shot down 16 enemy planes and is still the Nation's No. 1 jet ace.

The memorial was built entirely with funds contributed by the citizens of the community. Taking the lead in the project was Joshua Palms Post 2924, Veterans of Foreign Wars, with Dale L. Plumb as the commander.

An editorial in the May 23, 1969, issue of the Victorville Daily Press describes the significance of the memorial. I would like to quote from this editorial for the benefit of my colleagues:

In this day and age of dissent and indecision it is noteworthy to see the response to a project such as construction of a memorial to Victor Valley's war dead.

We have perhaps harped a little on this project for the past year. We have even badgered a few people to get the project underway. And we have urged every citizen to participate by a contribution—no matter the amount—to see the memorial constructed this year.

And now the memorial is a reality. It will be dedicated Friday, May 30 during the morning hours in a ceremony you will find reminiscent of days gone by when communities turned out in force to participate in such Memorial Day ceremonies.

We hope valley citizens will attend the parade and ceremonies Memorial Day. Most of them, by Memorial Day, will have contributed to the fund paying for the construction so we feel they'll want to see what they have created with the dollars given in compassion and honor for those who have died in service of their country during periods of war.

We would like to point out that in these last weeks—even at the time this is written—more and more people are responding with not only dollars, but time and effort to make this a tribute to our war dead.

There will be a band, songs of America, rituals of dedication and military honors. There will be Gold Star Mothers there to observe ceremonies honoring their heroic sons.

There will be a General representing President Nixon and the nation from the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. Dale Evans Rogers will sing "America." There will be many other dignitaries.

There will be veterans organizations placing wreaths and flowers upon the memorial. There will be, we believe, a community area represented that includes all of our 50,000 citizens and families.

But we are sure the community does not want any special accolade. We are sure each valley resident joins with us in doing community services with a minimum of self-approbation.

We will simply dedicate our memorial and conduct, in the most reverent manner, a Memorial Day ceremony which should be repeated in every community throughout the nation to some degree.

We feel it will be a Memorial Day to rededicate ourselves to the principles of this country, to take a close look at our neighbors in the valley and get to know them a little better. It will be a time to read the names of those boys who gave their lives that we can enjoy the freedoms we have.

We feel it is one time in life when there is a need to remember.

## RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE ON MAJOR ISSUES, 25TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW YORK

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this spring I circulated to the approximately 160,000 families in the 25th Congressional District of New York a questionnaire through which I invited them to express their opinions on what I considered to be some of the major national and international issues facing us at this time.

Nearly 20,000 of my constituents took the time to sit down, review the issues, and answer 25 questions dealing with such diverse subjects as defense, foreign policy, crime, the economy, welfare reform, electoral reform, and selective service. In addition, many took the time and trouble to write detailed and thoughtful comments on these issues.

I am presenting for inclusion in the RECORD a tabulation of the results of this questionnaire in the hope that it will be helpful and informative to my colleagues:

A QUESTIONNAIRE FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, 25TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK

[Answers in percent]

| | Yes | No | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|
| **DEFENSE** | | | |
| 1. Do you approve of our present Vietnam policy? | 22 | 69 | 9 |
| 2. If you were to change our present policy, which of the following possible policy changes would you prefer? [1] | | | |
| (a) Increased military effort? | 50 | 42 | 8 |
| (b) Increased negotiation effort? | 69 | 26 | 5 |
| (c) Unilateral withdrawal? | 51 | 45 | 4 |
| (d) Limiting U.S. military efforts to protecting population centers in South Vietnam | 29 | 52 | 18 |
| 3. Do you favor resumption of bombing in North Vietnam? | 44 | 46 | 10 |
| 4. Should the United States spend up to $100 billion on an anti-ballistic-missile system as a possible deterrent to Soviet attack? | 33 | 63 | 4 |
| **FOREIGN POLICY** | | | |
| 1. Should the United States recognize the Nassar government in Egypt? | 57 | 24 | 19 |
| 2. Should the United States fulfill its contract to supply 50 Phantom jets to Israel? | 64 | 31 | 7 |
| 3. Should the United States pressure Israel to withdraw from territories occupied during its 6-day war with the Arab countries? | 26 | 65 | 9 |
| 4. Should the United States join with Russia, France, and England in attempting to impose a Middle East settlement? | 52 | 44 | 4 |
| **CRIME** | | | |
| 1. Should Federal wiretapping restrictions be relaxed? | 50 | 41 | 9 |
| 2. Should possession of marihuana be legalized? | 25 | 68 | 7 |
| 3. Should Congress require registration and licensing of all firearms? | 65 | 33 | 2 |
| 4. Do you favor legalizing detention of persons arrested before trial? | 48 | 38 | 14 |
| **ECONOMY** | | | |
| 1. Do you favor: | | | |
| (a) Extension of the 10 percent surcharge on personal and business income tax? | 21 | 70 | 9 |
| (b) Wage and price controls? | 51 | 42 | 7 |
| (c) An excess profits tax? | 57 | 34 | 9 |
| 2. Should the Federal Government be spending more for highway construction than for mass transit? | 24 | 59 | 17 |
| 3. Should development of the supersonic civilian transport plane be financed by the aviation industry rather than by $2,000,000,000 in Federal funds? | 80 | 13 | 7 |
| **POST OFFICE** | | | |
| Should the Post Office operations be run by a nonprofit private corporation? | 63 | 27 | 10 |
| **WELFARE REFORM** | | | |
| 1. Should Congress approve as a substitute for welfare: | | | |
| (a) Negative income tax? | 35 | 42 | 23 |
| (b) Day care center program to release mothers for work and provide pre-education preparation for children? | 80 | 12 | 8 |
| (c) National standards? | 63 | 25 | 12 |
| (d) Federal assumption of welfare payments? | 49 | 42 | 9 |
| 2. Should the Government become an employer of last resort? | 41 | 52 | 7 |

A QUESTIONNAIRE FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, 25TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK—Continued

[Answers in percent]

| | Yes | No | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ELECTORAL REFORM** | | | |
| 1. Should the electoral college be abolished and the President elected by direct popular vote? | 74 | 19 | 7 |
| 2. Should the electoral college be retained but electors bound and electoral votes apportioned by the statewide popular vote or congressional district results? | 24 | 59 | 17 |
| 3. Should the voting age be lowered to 18? | 50 | 45 | 5 |
| **SELECTIVE SERVICE** | | | |
| 1. Should Congress authorize a national lottery to select Armed Forces inductees? | 55 | 35 | 10 |
| 2. Termination of college exemptions? | 41 | 51 | 8 |
| 3. A National Service Corps which could be chosen as an alternative to military service? | 56 | 27 | 17 |
| 4. Increasing military pay to point at which elimination of the draft and maintenance of a volunteer army are possible? | 41 | 40 | 9 |

[1] Figures total more than 100 percent because many persons checked more than one alternative.

## A REMARKABLE SERVICE BY OLDER CITIZENS IN VERMONT

### HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, since May is Senior Citizens Month, I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues a remarkable service being performed by a group of older citizens in the State of Vermont.

For the last 3 years, there has been in operation a foster grandparents program at the Brandon Training School, Vermont's State institution for retarded. I have personally seen this program in operation and witnessed the almost unbelievable assistance which retarded patients at the training school receive from their foster grandparents.

The following report, however, is a tribute to the senior citizens themselves and deserves the widest possible circulation:

A RECORD TO THE CREDIT AND PRAISE OF OLDER PERSONS 1966–69: THE FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM AT BRANDON TRAINING SCHOOL, BRANDON, VT., CAROLYN WHITLOCK, PROJECT DIRECTOR

1. Sixty percent of our Foster Grandparents are over 70 years old.

2. Of 40 Foster Grandparents, only one had to be replaced during the past year and that was because of her getting married and moving away from Vermont.

3. There has been NO tardiness in 3 years and little absenteeism. Even on blizzard days Foster Grandparents attendance records could match and probably surpass any other school or business.

4. As a group, the Grandparents seem to improve as years go by, physically, emotionally, and socially. Twelve of the original 15 Grandparents will have been in the Program for 3 years in October. The local doctor who gives them annual physical examinations has commented that their sustained good health is remarkable. Emotionally, the Grandparents seem to project more self-confidence in their ability to do their jobs and to relate to other employees. Socially, we continue to see warm friendships and kindnesses exchanged between Grandparents of varied backgrounds and ages. The common denominator of the children and the work seems to have brought about the appreciation they have for each other, despite ethnic differences.

5. One third of our group have never had children of their own before becoming Foster Grandparents. They have shown in many areas that oldsters are not so "set in their ways" that they cannot learn new skills or attitudes when the need for such learning really matters to them. One example of this is the way in which six Grandparents are giving meaningful training and care to blind children. Another example, is a Grandmother who had never been off of a farm until her late 50's when she became a childless widow and had to go to the city to find work. She had never known electricity or used a telephone until this age. With less than $600 a year income before this program, she had not had a home of her own for more than 10 years, living with various families that needed her housework assistance. After a year with this program, she now says that she is happier than she has ever been in her 72 years. She takes great pride in the way she is able to care for a child with disturbed behavior. Likewise, her skill in feeding a difficult baby gives her pleasure. When recently briefly hospitalized, she was in tears as to whether the baby was getting as much to eat without her care. In order to keep well and continue coming to her charges, this woman is taking great care with her diabetic diet for the first time in years and has lost 25 pounds with this health maintaining desire. Another example of "being needed" affecting physical health is our 80-year old Grandmother critically ill with a collapsed lung and tumor. During her three month hospital stay, she was positive and determined that she would get back to her "baby". For the past seven months she has been back without missing a day and at 82 is thrilled to now hear her charge begin to talk. One cannot help but wonder if Nursing Homes would be less crowded if more oldsters had opportunities to really feel and be needed.

6. Not one of our Foster Grandparents found the tragedy of retardation too much to take or to approach with hope.

7. The calmly happy optimistic attitudes of Grandparents have had a healthy effect in Brandon. The unsung heroes in an institution are often the underpaid, hard working dormitory personnel. Their many efforts for the children above and beyond what their jobs demand are seen and appreciated by the Grandparents and therefore better understood by the community outside the institution.

8. Our eldest Grandfather (age 89) did not miss one day's work in 18 months, except for a two week cataract operation absence. Our eldest Grandmother, Daisy, was one of our first 15 Grandparents and is credited with giving the program its motto, "Lets Wear Out, Not Rust Out". We almost did not hire her because she refused to put her birth date on our application form (thinking she would never be hired at nearly 85 years). At 86, she returned to work after a month's illness with a lovely white wig and now she is back with us at 87, after a two month absence and wearing a new eye. Daisy surely shows no signs of "rust" and her "wear" is fortunately kept in good repair.

To many persons living responsible, hectic lives the thought of retiring with nothing to do is anticipated as one step from heaven.

The reality of total forced retirement is far from being even pleasant according to most Senior Citizens who are living it. Here at Brandon, we are convinced that doing nothing and being responsible to no one is not a happy state of being for any age, especially not for older persons with skills in human relationships acquired through 60 to 90 years of experience in dealing with other people of all ages and types.

Perhaps, at this time when our social ills and education goals are being scrutinized we should take our older persons "off the shelf" and let them take a vital role in our society. In fields of technology, an experienced person would not be "shelved" but society has no role and little use for the human relations experience, and skills of our older generation. As one-fourth of our national voting population, persons over 65 generally feel they no longer are useful because society has told them they should not be, except in a few isolated situations such as the Foster Grandparent Program. The numbers of such "roleless" persons are rapidly increasing as retirement age becomes earlier and medical advancement keeps us healthy longer. The performance of the 40 Foster Grandparents at Brandon Training School and of 4,000 similarly involved persons in other parts of the United States has clearly demonstrated that older persons do have much to offer society and should never be "shelved".

The younger generation toward which our national attention and funds are focused often sings out that " . . . what the world needs now is Love . . ." Perhaps if the oldsters had not been made "roleless" for so many generations, the youngsters would not be singing out this need with such a fervor today. Teenage volunteers working at Brandon have appreciated the attitudes and work of Foster Grandparents and made many close friendships with them.

Each of the 40 Brandon Grandparents gives individual attention, care, and training to two retarded children for four hours daily. Thus, over 70 children are having needs of self-identity met, as are the Grandparents' needs for feeling important and useful. Every Grandparent works out a program to meet the needs of his particular charges. Among the things that are patiently taught are skills of self-feeding, going up and down stairs, learning to manipulate buttons and shoestrings, getting along and sharing with others in work and play, and behavior in public. For those children who have the ability, there is help with learning to read and count, with crafts and games. There are special events too such as field trips, visits to stores or grandparents' home. The children are taken out-of-door daily and many participate in the Grandparents Rhythm Band and gardening projects. Speech stimulation and physical therapy are also children's benefits from the program.

As the individual Grandparent-Grandchild relationships continue in most cases they seem to improve in effectiveness for both the oldster and the youngster. As the child matures or his abilities improve, the Grandparent's gratification with his work likewise increases.

The Institution's attitude toward the Program has changed considerably since its beginning in 1966 when it was questionable to all concerned whether elderly persons could handle emotionally disturbed or severely handicapped children. Nowadays, if a child is a difficult problem or has multiple handicaps, the prescription is often to give him a Foster Grandparent. The patience, dedication, and perseverance that older people have is often what children need. To hear a 77-year old woman, with a good understanding of what future potential her young charge has, say that she would die happy if she could get him toilet-trained, exemplifies the thoughts of many Foster Grandparents.

## APOLLO 10: ANOTHER SPACE SUCCESS

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly we can all take great pride in the magnificent achievements of the Apollo 10 astronauts and the Nation's entire space team.

I want to especially commend and congratulate the astronauts—Tom Stafford, John Young, and Gene Cernan—whose cool courage and competence overcame mechanical problems as their craft hovered over the moon's surface.

In this connection I also want to commend the work of the Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tullahoma, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress. The testing of the Apollo components at this center was an important part of the preparation for the mission.

The Apollo 10 astronauts and the other astronauts who participated in the Apollo and prior space programs have laid the foundation for man's first trip to the moon scheduled by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in July.

As we salute the astronauts, I place in the RECORD herewith an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean entited "A Job Well Done, 'Charlie Brown'."

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 24, 1969]

A JOB WELL DONE, "CHARLIE BROWN"

The Apollo 10 mission has again forced those on earth to use up all their best adjectives, as the three astronauts journeyed around the cratered moon and then cut loose in a spidery landing module to dip down to about 50,000 feet of the lunar serface.

There were anxious moments for Col. Thomas P. Stafford and Cmdr. Eugene A. Cernan, flying in the lunar module nicknamed "Snoopy." As its lower stage was jettisioned, "Snoopy" went into wild gyrations. The two men were excited, but never lost their "cool" and Colonel Stafford brought the module back under control and then fired the rocket necessary for "Snoopy" to rejoin the command ship "Charlie Brown" which was orbiting 69 miles above the moon.

Other than the gyrations, which may have resulted because of a switch that wasn't thrown in the correct position, and a couple of other incidents of mild concern, the Apollo 10 mission has gone off in textbook style.

Only the actual moon landing could be a more severe test of the men and machines, and of the long preparatory engineering and training that have figured into the mission.

Apollo 10 has paved the way to the ultimate step, and while there will be additional hazards to the actual touch down and blast off from the pocked lunar surface, the voyage of "Snoopy" proved that it is feasible; that the moon finally is within reach of man's footsteps.

Apollo 10 has accomplished the difficult part, and now can return to earth with the tremendous satisfaction of a job well done and to the applause of fellow Americans who have cause to salute the astronauts for their courage and technical ability.

## POSTAL REFORM: SUPPORT FOR A POSTAL CORPORATION

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial pointing up some of the reasons why we should charter a Postal Corporation based on the recommendations of the Kappel Commission.

I was pleased to join my colleague on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee (Mr. UDALL) in cosponsoring introduction today of the Postal Service Act of 1969.

The editorial, by David E. Rosenbaum, appeared in the Sunday New York Times of May 25, as follows:

POST OFFICE—CASE FOR A PUBLIC CORPORATION

(By David E. Rosenbaum)

WASHINGTON.—"Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

True enough. But politics, red tape and antiquated machinery and facilities sure take their toll.

The United States Post Office—with more than 700,000 employes, a budget of more than $7-billion a year and an annual mail load of more than 80 billion pieces—is one of the most inefficient big businesses imaginable.

How long do you think a company that performed a service—for instance, repairing widgets—would survive with the following handicaps?

The executive officer knew nothing about widgets when he was appointed. He received the appointment as political patronage or because he was a good friend of the chairman of the board (the President).

The company cannot place its revenues in its own bank account for its own use. (Postal rates are set by Congress.)

The company cannot place its revenues in its own bank account for its own use. (Postal revenues go into the Treasury.)

The company receives virtually no money to prepare for the future when there will be many times as many widgets as there are now.

Employes go over the head of the company's management and bargain directly with another party (Congress) for wages and benefits.

The men running the branch offices cannot be transferred, even if they want to go, to another office in a different part of the country. (Local postmasters must live in the area they are appointed to serve.)

These are the handicaps of the United States Post Office. Is it any wonder it operates at an annual deficit of about $1-billion?

During the election campaign, President Nixon said the Post Office needed "to be run like a first class business," and he pledged to "institute the reforms that will give the American people the kind of postal service they're paying for."

Last week, the shape of Mr. Nixon's postal reforms became known. He plans to submit them to Congress this week. Basically, what Mr. Nixon proposes is to convert the Post Office into a government-owned corporation, not unlike the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The United States Postal Corporation would raise the funds it needed for modernization and capital improvements by issuing bonds for public sale. This would prevent

Congress from slashing funds because of current budget necessities.

The corporation would be run by a board of directors appointed by the President, and postal rates would be set by a separate three-member board. The rate board's recommendations would go into effect unless they were specifically vetoed by Congress. This would take the unpleasant chore of raising rates away from politicians.

Postal workers would be removed from civil service. They would have the right to negotiate directly with the corporation's management, and disputes would be settled through compulsory arbitration. This would diminish the political influence of the postal workers' union.

The idea is not a new one. It differs only in minor details from a comprehensive plan put forth by a Presidential commission last year. But many observers here believe that if Mr. Nixon places his prestige behind postal reforms, as no President has done before, the reorganization will be passed by Congress in the next two or three years.

Those who support the plan believe that by handling mail in a business-like manner, free of political pressures, the Post Office deficit could be eliminated within five years and mail delivery could be improved immediately through a modernization of plants, machinery and operations.

There are some, in and out of Congress who argue that converting the Post Office to a corporation would create an "unregulated monopoly." The corporation, they feel, could reduce services considerably, with an eye only to making money and not to the needs of the country.

Some third class (direct mail advertising) mailers fear a corporation would take away their relatively low rates and make them pay their own way. Congress has determined, these mailers contend, that low third-class rates are beneficial to the nation's over-all economy but the corporation would not be compelled to consider national priorities.

But the major obstacles to reform, without question, are the postal workers' unions. They are among the most powerful lobbyists in the capital and are likely to oppose Mr. Nixon's plan vigorously.

"They're afraid of it," one Congressional source noted last night. "These guys carry a lot of clout with Congress now, and they don't know how they'd come out under a new structure."

Rep. Morris K. Udall, a leading Congressional advocate of postal reform, acknowledges that the chance of the proposal's passage this year is just about nil. "It's new and strange and needs an incubation period," the Arizona Democrat says. "But I'm confident that now it's only a matter of time."

## NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK: A BRIEF STATEMENT

### HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, each year in May the Nation pays special tribute to the service of transportation by setting aside a National Transportation Week. Begun in 1956, this practice has continued through the years and rightfully so. It is an expression of the Nation's dependence on the vital function of transportation.

Back in 1959, it was proposed in a joint resolution of Congress to authorize the President to proclaim a week in May each year as National Transportation Week. The Interstate Commerce Commission endorsed the proposal with these words:

Public transportation is the very nerve center of commerce, and commerce is one of the most important methods by which the strength and unity of our Nation have grown. House Joint Resolution 294, would publicly recognize the vitality and resourcefulness of the people who have so capably met and continue to meet the ever-changing and growing needs of our country. It would provide the means by which a tribute could be paid to the entire transportation industry which, over the years, has had no small task in keeping abreast of all of the changing phases that have marked the development of American enterprise.

If adopted, the proposed joint resolution would serve to bring into proper focus the role of this tremendously important industry as a vital part of our national economy. The proclamation contemplated by this measure would be a forward step toward the promotion of complete understanding, not only among the carriers themselves, but between the carriers, shippers, and the public in general.

We are in complete accord with the spirit and purpose of House Joint Resolution 294 and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the idea of paying tribute to the vital function of transportation each year, and add my tribute to the men and women serving the transportation needs of our country.

## LT. ROY McDONALD

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Roy McDonald, an outstanding young officer from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

ARMY LT. ROY MCDONALD, 21, OF CUMBERLAND, DIES IN WAR

A young infantry officer from Cumberland who had hoped to make the Army his career is among the latest casualties of the Vietnam war, authorities have disclosed.

First Lt. Roy L. McDonald, 21, who enlisted as a private in 1966, died May 7 as a result of wounds received in an ammunition explosion at a forward staging-area, the Pentagon announced yesterday.

FORT HILL GRADUATE

The Maryland-born paratrooper had earlier been listed as missing, an Army official said. His body was found later by troops scouring the area.

The body will be returned to his home for funeral services as soon as is possible, a family spokesman said. Burial will be at Hillcrest Cemetery in Cumberland.

A 1965 graduate of Fort Hill High School in Cumberland, Lieutenant McDonald enlisted in the Army in December, 1966, after working briefly at the Fairchild-Hiller Corporation in Baltimore.

After receiving basic training at Fort Gordon, Georgia, he was assigned to Special Forces schools and to Officer Candidate School. He was commissioned as a second lieutenant in February, 1967, and promoted to first lieutenant later.

The young officer had been in Vietnam since December, 1968, as part of the 101st Air Cavalry Division. He planned to stay in the Army—and perhaps go to college—on returning to the United States next year, his family said.

Lieutenant McDonald is survived by his wife, Mrs. Barbara McDonald, and a son, Roy 2d, aged 8 months, as well as his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roy A. McDonald. All are of Cumberland.

Also surviving are three sisters, Miss Delores McDonald of Joppa, Md., Mrs. Barbara Hedrick, of Bel Air, and Miss Janet McDonald, of Cumberland.

## HOW WILL FUNDING LEVELS FOR FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AFFECT THE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN MICHIGAN?

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion of the need for full funding of programs that provide Federal assistance to education. Dr. William Simmons, deputy superintendent of the Detroit public schools, in testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, has given a comprehensive analysis of what reduced funding levels will mean for schoolchildren in Michigan.

His comments are illustrative of the problems that we will be facing all across the country if we fail to make an adequate financial commitment to education in the Congress. Dr. Simmons' comments follow and I commend them to the attention of all who are concerned about the future of education in this country:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM SIMMONS, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BEFORE THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, MAY 20, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am William Simmons, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan. I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before this Committee to testify in support of a new nationwide movement for full funding of all educational programs.

My testimony today will be offered in two parts. The first part will be a discussion of the need for full funding of all educational programs in Detroit. The second part will be a discussion of the need for full funding of the impacted area legislation, Public Laws 815 and 874. All programs are fully operative in Detroit and, combined, represent a major part of our educational expenditures.

Before I begin my basic discussion, I would like the Committee to know that I completely endorse the comprehensive statement made by Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee, before this body on Wednesday, May 14. This statement of the need for full funding of all educational authorizations is a document that clearly details the case. The fulfillment of the goals enunciated rests now in the hands of this Appropriations Committee.

PART I

The financial plight of the urban school districts is well known to this Committee. The Detroit Public Schools, for example, face a grave fiscal situation that, if not reversed, will seriously impair the educative process

for boys and girls served by the School District of the City of Detroit. This fiscal year the school district requires an additional $8.4 million if a deficit is to be avoided. To begin school in September with a continuation of the present program, an additional $23.1 million will be required. Where these amounts, totaling $31.5 million, will come from is a part of the dilemma.

The State has been petitioned for additional funds to help meet this financial crisis. Should funds be forthcoming, it is probable that there will only be some $5 million made available to the City of Detroit. The local taxpayers, in November of 1968, were asked to approve a millage increase with no success. This situation is typical of the situation in most of the large city school districts. The only difference is a matter of degree relating to numbers of pupils and the rate of decline in local taxation. Upon consideration of the monetary demands that are now being made on the school district from the community and from professional organizations, combined with existing deficits, it can be concluded that the fate of the schools is not hopeful.

In the midst of fiscal crisis, federal funding from such pieces of legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided the only monies that the Detroit Public Schools have had for program improvement for several years. Funds allocated to the school district under the various pieces of legislation, especially ESEA, have made possible a concentrated attack on problems related to the education of educationally and economically disadvantaged children of the city. The funds received have provided the only dollars available for some beginnings in the explorations necessary in the area of compensatory education especially as it relates to curricular improvement and teacher training. The major difficulty has been that the funds available from federal sources have not been sufficient. Indeed, the funds have only produced "pilot" or "demonstration" programs and, therefore, do not speak to the total needs of students in the school district, particularly so-called disadvantaged students.

Public education, especially urban public education, must, in the midst of inadequate local and state funding, look to federal grants-in-aid to help remedy the multiplicity of problems which confront it. This is true for all public education, but especially true for public education as it relates to urban centers which have become the depositories of the economically disadvantaged children of the nation.

The extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two years represents a step in the right direction; that direction is the provision of funding assurances for local school districts for more than one year at a time, allowing for more sensible planning and greater continuity in programming. Inasmuch as action in the United States Senate on this matter is still pending, the possibility of a five-year extension is still hoped for.

The school community and staff are agonized and perplexed with the "on again, off again" planning that is experienced by public school systems. Greater understanding of educational planning and the solution of educational problems would be a result of assurances of funding for longer periods and the more effective programming that could take place.

Education as a behavioral science must have the opportunity to operate long-term projects as necessary to accomplish definitive results in modifications of pupil behavior. This longer funding assurance and program life will provide the opportunity for modification of program elements to favor the inclusion of only those elements that show signs of success. This implies that more reliable information about successful program components would be possible through more carefully applied and longer lasting evaluative techniques.

Where forward funding exists, it exists in only a modified way. That is, funding guarantees are uncertain and dependent on annual congressional action or they are limited to a percentage of the present funding level. Not even is there an allowance for normal "cost-of-the-program" increases experienced as a result of wage and product cost increases. Indeed, there is not the kind of assurance that would lead to planning which can guarantee at least continuity of the existing degree of service to clients from one year to the next.

Federal funding legislation, therefore, must begin to establish forward funding statements within their text which will guarantee the continuity of program that leads to more effective solutions to educational problems.

The problem of inadequate appropriations to finance federally funded educational programs is well known. Authorizations passed by Congress are realistically recommended and are based on known needs. Final appropriations, on the other hand, are almost always far less than the amount originally authorized. This immediately indicates that existing needs will be met only to a limited extent. At no time during the operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have adequate appropriations been made to meet the needs of those who expected to be served. Indeed, the appropriations for the present fiscal year were not adequate to continue the federally financed programs of the prior year because the maintenance of the same level of appropriations did not take into consideration the increased cost of doing business that is experienced in every part of the private and public sector.

The restricted allocations of federal funds have put the conduct of most programs under an operational uncertainty that strikes at the effectiveness of the program itself and simply invites unrealistic criticism.

Therefore, one of the decisons that must be made if we are to expect anything other than minor degrees of success with federal funding is the establishment by the Congress of higher levels of appropriations as compared with authorizations.

The appropriations by the Congress for federal educational programs administered by the State have not been sufficient to maintain educational programs in the State of Michigan or in the school districts of the state. The 1966–67 expenditure for all school districts in Michigan for federal educational aids for all programs was approximately $125.48 million. In 1967–68, the appropriation level provided only $121.5 million to Michigan, and in 1968–69 the appropriation had declined to $112.5 million. The decline in the allocation to the State of Michigan, in effect, caused a shrinkage of funds in the local units. ESEA, Title I, has barely maintained its average allocation, and the only program with a constant increase over the three-year period was the impacted area program, Public Law 874.

The Nixon budget for fiscal 1970 reduces even further the allocations for the State of Michigan, which, without question, will mean less funds for the local educational agencies. A review of that budget shows that there will be $3.85 million less to spend on educational programs in Michigan in fiscal 1970 than in the current fiscal year.

The effect of the decreases in Michigan on the Detroit Public Schools is especially significant, since Detroit has 16% of the total school population and 39% of the children who qualify as educationally deprived under Title I programs. Should the Nixon budget be adopted, there would be no funds for ESEA, Titles II and III, or NDEA, Titles III and V–A. The only programs where there might be a possible increase in allocations to Detroit would be ESEA, Title I, Vocational Education, and Adult Education. The increases in these programs, based on the statewide allocation, would be insignificant.

The recommendation for the elimination of all but "A" category pupils under Public Law 874 would remove an allocation of approximately $1 million to Detroit, and almost double that amount should the public housing pupils be added to the act. The point which must be made is when allocations in a budget are shifted from one program to another without additional funds being added to the total, urban school districts suffer the most because these districts participate fully in all of the federally funded programs. What we need in the urban school districts is full funding of all educational programs. A table showing the effect of the Nixon budget on certain of the educational programs in Michigan that have provided substantial amounts to Detroit is shown in Attachment #1. The allocations to Detroit for the ESEA programs are shown in Attachment #2. Needless to say, the decline in the state allocations will mean discontinuation of certain program elements in the Detroit Public Schools.

The impact of the cuts in ESEA, Titles II and III, NDEA, Titles III and V–A, and LSCA, Title I, were described by Dr. Ira Polley, State of Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction, in a letter to all members of the Michigan congressional delegation. The reasons for continuing of funding these programs, to which reasons Detroit concurs, are dramatically described program-by-program in his attachment to that letter as follows:

*Regarding title II, ESEA*

1. 400 libraries have been opened in public school buildings.

2. 2½ million books have been purchased for those libraries.

3. Districts with very limited resources, or with large numbers of poor children have been able to obtain special help to provide learning materials to their children.

4. School systems have expended their own funds to train library aides and to support the education of additional professional school libraries.

5. Librarians are personally convinced of the value of this service, as the following quote from a librarian to the state department indicates: "The Title II materials have given us much more flexibility in the classrooms, many more supplementary materials and excellent resources for the children's studies. We are not conducting classes in the traditional manner where children all sit in rows and recite from memory. Instead, children are taken on field trips out of the institution to become familiar with community living. Title II supplementary books, such as "Who Will Milk My Cow" and "Bin-Bang Pig " or lovely big colored picture charts of animals, give tremendous motivation to the children. Traditional textbooks are also outdated for most retarded children. Instead, the teachers use many creative materials which are most applicable and encompass many of Title II materials."

*Regarding title V–A, NDEA*

1. In 1967–68, 339 school districts, including 680,000 students, participated in NDEA-supported counseling services, and 388,000 students participated in NDEA-supported testing.

2. In 1967–68, over forty schools experimented with elementary guidance programs for troubled young children.

3. Under a new approach by the state department, four community colleges have employed recruitment counselors who recruit and help poor students go on to college.

In the words of this program's director, "Total loss of NDEA V–A will terminate counseling and guidance services to students in several communities where such services have

recently been implemented, and the LEA cannot yet carry programs without help."

*Regarding title III, NDEA*

1. Requests for NDEA funds received from the local school districts have been double the amount of the allocations by the federal government; out of present federal appropriations, the state department, therefore, is able to match only one-half of the requests for equipment.

2. The number of submitted projects has ranged from 480 to 575 each year this decade.

3. Participation in the program has averaged 93.2% of the public school membership. Those schools which have not participated are the smaller school districts which do not feel they would receive sufficient funds to make the effort worthwhile.

4. This year, 462 school districts with 1,825,390 pupils requested funds under the "regular" NDEA, Title III, distribution. In that distribution districts which have a lower SEV behind each child receive a larger share of NDEA funds.

5. This year for the first time, the state department has made a separate distribution of funds to schools which have large percentages of poor children. Under this program 39 school districts in the state are using $975,000 in equipment grants to improve instruction in schools serving many poor children.

6. In the words of the NDEA, Title III, program director:

"With the present economic situation in the State of Michigan and the voter resistance to voting extra allocated operational millage, the elimination of NDEA, Title III, will merely compound the problems in local districts of providing sound educational programs. It is also our feeling that NDEA, Title III, is one of the better federal programs because equipment and programs developed under this Act are financed by the cooperation of federal funds and matching local funds. The matching of federal funds by local school districts, I am sure, means that much more effort and thought is given to the need, type and use of equipment in the educational process."

*Regarding title III, ESEA*

1. A cutback of approximately 30–32% being proposed by the United States Congress in the FY 1970 Title III funding levels will require the state department to reduce the budgets of most Michigan projects by 40% with the following implications:

Approximately 500 school districts are being served by Title III projects. Thirty-five districts, acting as fiscal agents, will receive reduced budgets.

There are over 1.7 million public and nonpublic school children touched in some way by these projects. These children will receive less.

The two areas critical to the success of Title III, dissemination and evaluation, will be reduced or eliminated.

The number of children and professional personnel receiving innovative services will be reduced.

Some excellent projects will decide to terminate and have so indicated such action at this date.

Overall quality, a distinguishing feature of Title III, will be reduced.

2. Other cuts may be:

An out-door learning laboratory in Traverse City, where potential school dropouts find a way to stay in school until they graduate.

A Metropolitan-Flint program to help the parents of deaf children help the child learn at home during his first years of life.

A program which brings learning specialists to Kent County rural schools to work with individual children who seem unable to achieve in their classes.

A seven-county effort in the midpart of the state to strengthen elementary and junior high instruction in seven districts.

A program in an urban center to cut class size sharply in schools serving poor children.

A program in the Upper Peninsula to help retarded children learn new job skills.

*Regarding LSCA I and II*

1. As a result of federal aid, the state has been able to grant from $350,000 to $400,000 to libraries throughout the state for books and for hiring of additional librarians and library aides. These libraries have employed staff, rented space, and started services in anticipation of continued federal support.

2. The state legislature has raised the level of its spending for the libraries of the state, partly in response to the federal presence.

3. The state department of education has employed consultants to work with local library people in improving their services to all citizens.

4. Magazines and other periodicals are purchased by the state libraries and circulated statewide, a service particularly useful to isolated rural libraries.

5. Films and records are made available where none would be otherwise.

6. The construction program has provided over 44 new public libraries, including both branch libraries in the inner city and new facilities in rural communities.

PART II

The extension proposed for the impacted area legislation coincides with the extensions proposed for all other educational programs enacted by the House in H.R. 514. Public Laws 815 and 874 are now scheduled to expire June 30, 1972. The extension proposed will make possible full implementation of forward funding and will remove many of the uncertainties that will undoubtedly affect the level of appropriations for fiscal 1970 and future years, while, at the same time, providing local educational agencies with an opportunity to achieve program continuity that is not possible under shorter extensions. Since the federal revenues provided under Public Law 874 become part of the general fund operating budgets of local school districts, such assurances are necessary at an early date because of their impact on the total school program. The dependence of local educational agencies on this vital revenue source has become increasingly important as school districts across the country are planning educational programs in the face of serious revenue deficits.

The appropriations for the impacted area legislation have been a hotly debated issue before every session of Congress since the laws were enacted in 1950. The regular appropriation process generally has not provided the funds necessary to permit 100% payment for all applicants. It is only through the supplemental appropriation process that adequate funding has been made possible.

This year, the impacted area legislation is faced with a most serious situation. The Johnson budget recommendations for fiscal 1970 proposed that the expenditure level of Public Laws 815 and 874 be limited to $300,000,000. The Nixon Administration further reduced the $300 million to $187 million. The latter budget limitation, if enacted by the Appropriations Committee, would, in effect, eliminate payment to all school districts except those with large concentrations of "A" category pupils. The Johnson Administration recommendation carried with it recommendations for the revisions of the basic legislation to the extent that almost all districts receiving impacted area funds would be eliminated from the program.

The proposed program limitations from the former Administration are detailed hereafter, and it is assumed that the estimated entitlement for full payment would be $622 million. It now appears that the program would not be fully funded at less than $600,594,000. Significantly, nothing was provided in either budget for the funding of the major disaster section of the act. Should payments under this section be required, there would be a proration of payments under the $187 million limitation to both the "A" category pupil and the Section 6 pupil.

*Fiscal year 1970*

[In millions]

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated entitlement under present law | $622 |
| Proposed amendments: | |
| Require school districts to absorb the cost of education equal to 6% of enrollment for section 3(b) children | −140 |
| Reduce the rate of payment to 25% for Section 3(b) children where the related federal property is in another school district | −117 |
| Eliminate one-half state and national average per pupil payment rates for both Sections 3(a) and 3(b) | −75 |
| Eliminate from the definition of Federal property those properties which are outleased by the Federal Government and on which taxes are paid | −21 |
| Eliminate counting children in 13th and 14th grades | −4 |
| Savings provision to prevent more than 25 percent reduction per school district in first year | +35 |
| Total reductions (net) | −322 |
| Entitlement adjusted for proposed reductions | 300 |
| President's Budget for 1970 | 300 |

The budget proposals of both the Johnson and the Nixon Administrations are completely inadequate in terms of the impacted area program. Since it is apparent the latest budget intends to fund only a small portion of the program, the inadequacies of the initial budget should be discussed.

The total impact of these drastic amendments, which provide a budget saving of $322 million, would vary from school district to school district, since there are few instances where all amendments would be applicable to a given local educational agency. It is apparent, however, that the 6% absorption proposed in Amendment No. 1 and the change in the definition of federal property proposed in Amendment No. 4 would eliminate most large school districts now in the program. Proposed Amendment No. 2 would provide a serious cutback in funds to all school districts across the country that could meet the new qualifying requirements. The elimination of the floor provision in proposed Amendment No. 3 would seriously reduce the level of payment to districts qualifying under the new restriction and would have a serious impact on those southern states which are now participating under the national average floor provision. Proposed Amendment No. 5 would eliminate those school districts that are now counting as eligible pupils in grades 13 and 14. This amendment is particularly damaging to school districts in California and other states where the counting of such pupils is permitted under state law.

These two laws appear to be caught in the revenue cap that has been placed on all educational programs in the proposed budget for fiscal 1970. An analysis of the educational appropriations recommended in the budget for fiscal 1970 reveals what appears to be little more than a shifting of funds. The increases in Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds, particularly in Title I, appear to be made at the expense of other educational programs. The tragedy of this type of an approach is that it takes money from one educational pocket of the local educational agency and places it in another pocket. The philosophy that federal educational funds should be concentrated to do a particular job loses its impact because all federal funds that are received in most

school districts are combined in such a way that they have the maximum effect on federally supported educational programs.

The impacted area school districts of this nation are caught in a budget squeeze. The limitations proposed by the Administration are premised on the theory that the large city school districts do not get impacted area school aid. The Committee hearing record on H.R. 514 will show that all of the superintendents from the largest cities in this nation who testified during the second week of testimony supported the impacted area program. They suggested these funds would, in part, permit them to reduce the revenue deficits they are facing in the general fund budgets which must be maintained if they are to adequately satisfy the maintenance of effort provisions in the other programs that produce funds for the disadvantaged.

One can but wonder why additional dollars cannot be made available for educational programs from a nation so wealthy as ours. It appears that funds can be found for a variety of activities that pertain to the general welfare, except in the field of education. Yet, it is seldom that our leaders do not cite adequate education for all as the basis for a more productive and stabilized nation. What we need in the support of all educational programs is more dollars, not dollars shifted from one educational program to another. While one can debate the possibility of combining programs, new programs, and the possibility of greater local and state funds for education, the fact that exists today is that the federal educational dollars, almost without exception, determine whether a school district is making forward progress or whether it has simply deteriorated into the balanced budget approach to education.

The House, in enacting H.R. 514, added a new category to Public Law 874, that of children living in public housing. The thrust of this proposal is to relieve in part the serious situations that have developed in many communities across this nation, particularly in impacted areas, when federal housing brought in pupils and then left school districts to provide school buildings and school services that were not possible without depleting the regular program of the school districts involved. Under the housing provision, this section would require an appropriation of $250 million.

The need for separate funding of this new provision was made clear in the enacting legislation and the discussion that preceded the adoption of this program by the committee. All categories of this legislation should be fully funded at the rate required for each category, and not one category at the expense of another.

The continuation of the impacted area program in school districts across this nation is not inconsistent with the need for more educational funds for the educationally disadvantaged. Funds provided to most impacted area districts are the funds that make the difference between a marginal educational program and a complete educational program. Pupils with expectant mobility must have a complete education if they are to fit into new school situations without becoming a burden to the receiving district.

I would make one further plea in behalf of the school construction provisions of Public Law 815. School districts presently qualifying under this law which has provided so many classrooms for the children of the nation are in a fiscal bind. Even though they have qualified for grants under this law, construction programs are not possible in many cases because of budget limitations during the fiscal year in which the classrooms are most needed. Indeed, there is a question as to whether or not the priority system, made necessary by the lack of funds, will not exclude many school districts who, under the laws as authorized by the Congress, will meet all eligibility requirements. An appropriation of $255 million to pay applicants eligible during fiscal years 1967, 1968 and 1969 is required if the housing needs of these districts are to be met. An additional $80 million will be required to pay out in full the requirement for fiscal 1970.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would urge the Committee to report an appropriation bill that would provide for the full funding of all federally authorized educational programs. Less than full funding during these days of educational crisis, in effect, places education low on the list of national priorities when there is little question that the education of our boys and girls should appear in the highest order of any national rating scale.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EFFECT OF NIXON BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS ON FEDERALLY FUNDED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

| | 1967–68 spending | 1968–69 allocation | 1969–70 Nixon budget | Increase or decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESEA, I: | | | | |
| Grants | $34,300,000 | $32,400,000 | $36,400,000 | +$4,200,000 |
| Administration: | | | | |
| Regular | 343,000 | 324,000 | 364,000 | +40,000 |
| Migrant | 82,000 | 145,000 | | |
| ESEA, II: | | | | |
| Grants | 4,400,000 | 2,000,000 | 0 | −2,200,000 |
| Administration | 226,000 | 116,000 | 0 | −116,000 |
| ESEA, III: | | | | |
| Grants | 7,900,000 | 6,300,000 | 4,400,000 | −1,900,000 |
| Administration | | 474,000 | 327,000 | −147,000 |
| ESEA, IV: Administration | | | 100,000 | +100,000 |
| Adult education: | | | | |
| Grants | 800,000 | 900,000 | [1] 1,000,000 | +100,000 |
| Administration | 96,000 | 104,000 | | |
| Vocational education: | | | | |
| Grants | 10,000,000 | 9,200,000 | [1] 9,900,000 | +700,000 |
| Administration | 298,000 | 375,000 | | |
| NDEA, III: | | | | |
| Grants | | 3,400,000 | 0 | −3,400,000 |
| Administration | | 86,000 | 0 | −86,000 |
| NDEA, V–A: | | | | |
| Grants | 1,000,000 | 700,000 | 0 | −700,000 |
| Administration | 77,000 | 84,000 | 0 | −84,000 |
| LSCA, I: | | | | |
| Grants | 600,000 | 450,000 | 0 | −450,000 |
| Administration | 800,000 | 900,000 | 700,000 | −200,000 |

[1] Our choice.

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT YEARLY FUNDING LEVELS

| | 1965–66 | 1966–67 | 1967–68 | 1968–69 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I: Educational programs for disadvantaged | $11,999,074 | $11,221,532 | $11,281,162 | $10,370,415 |
| Title II: Library materials and supplies | 705,476 | 712,195 | 1,069,275 | [1] |
| | | | 37,000 | |
| Title III: Supplementary educational centers and services | | | 20,722 | [2] |
| | | | | 2,000,000 |
| Adult education: ESEA amendment to title III | | 244,767 | 648,776 | 501,519 |
| Title V: Grants to strengthen State departments of education | | | | 82,154 |
| | | | | [3] |
| Title VI: Education of handicapped children | | | 155,338 | 113,247 |
| | | | | [4] |
| Title VIII: Dropout prevention | | | | 400,000 |
| | | | | [3] |

[1] Pending allocation from the State of Michigan.
[2] Not elsewhere classified.
[3] Proposed.
[4] Pending additional funding for a $202,145 proposal.

---

DR. MAX NOVICH

## HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding avocations open to a man today is to work for and with youngsters. However, this is not an easy field in which to succeed—many frustrations are involved and a great deal of knowledge, patience, and understanding are required. Therefore, I am most proud today to pay tribute to Dr. Max H. Novich, of South Orange, N.J., for his outstanding achievements in training and teaching young men and boys.

Doctor Novich is a renowned orthopedic surgeon, a former professional boxer, and one of our Nation's leading authorities on amateur boxing. For years he has devoted as much of his spare time as possible to sports and to young people. A recent issue of Sports Illustrated magazine highlighted the fact that the basement of Doctor Novich's home in South Orange is converted into a gymnasium every Sunday for the children of friends and neighbors.

Doctor Novich will serve as chief physician for the American team which will participate in the 1969 Maccabees Games in Israel this summer. The Maccabees Games is a convocation of the world's outstanding Jewish athletes in a quadrennial competition. The games serve as a magnificent vehicle for forging international understanding, cooperation, and good will and are unmatched in terms of cultural and spiritual reawakening.

Recently more than 500 persons turned out to honor Doctor Novich at a Newark, N.J., dinner held to raise funds for the American Maccabees competitors. The evening's program included the following portrait of this dedicated individual and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

DR. MAX NOVICH

We honor "Dr. Max" tonight on his reappointment as Chief Physician for the 1969 American Maccabees Team in Israel. Even more we honor Dr. Max as the proponent of the physical fitness of youth and for his time and effort so generously given on behalf of the American Athletic Union, as Chief Physician for the American Boxing Team in the recent Olympic Games in Mexico City and for his services to the American team in the 1965 Maccabees Games in Israel.

Sports Illustrated has given world-wide recognition to our friend and neighbor for his life's devotion to physical fitness, the need for which was early established in his framework of life as a youngster in Newark.

Today, an eminent orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Max, back in the early 1930's, was a 165-pound youth with a right hand good enough to win him a boxing scholarship to the University of North Carolina, two conference championships and two NCAA awards. Later, as a medical student at North Carolina, he met tuition bills by picking up a few professional fights. For the same purpose he took over in 1939 the management of a promising Lithuanian heavyweight named Jack Brazzo.

The arrangement kept both men temporarily solvent but did not have a lasting influence on either of their lives. Brazzo changed his name to Jack Palance and became a knockout as a Hollywood heavy. Novich kept on being Novich. After winning a Purple Heart and Bronze Star in World War II, he came back to New Jersey and established himself as an orthopedic surgeon.

He has also been a New Jersey referee for amateur bouts and is on the State Boxing Commission's medical panel. He has written some 50 articles on sports medicine, has a book on athletic training coming out this spring and is generally regarded as one of the most knowledgeable American physicians when it comes to the development and maintenance of athletes.

Sports Illustrated has referred to Dr. Max as the founder, faculty and resident philosopher of "Novich's Sunday Boxing School for Overprivileged Boys" in pointing to his Sunday morning boxing class which he personally conducts in the basement of his home, converted into a gymnasium for neighborhood youngsters.

The confidence which Dr. Max instills in his charges is termed "remarkable" by this stand-out magazine and the author's words explain it in a way we all understand:

"Put it this way, without exception everyone has an ego to feed. Most of us feed ours in the corners, nibbling away, masking the process with couth little gestures, apologizing for our appetite with phony phrases. But every once in a while you run into somebody like Max Novich, who is a big, honest feeder. He is like a Jewish mother trying to get everybody to stuff themselves all the time. Only he wants to stuff your ego."

Dr. Max will be out to accomplish exactly this as he shepherds our athletes to successful competition in furtherance of world peace through individual excellence in the 1969 Maccabees Games in Israel this summer.

HERBERT E. GREENSTONE,
*General Chairman.*

## FACING THE FACTS

### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once wrote:

The first step toward improvement is to look the facts in the face.

To improve the mail delivery in our Nation, the first step is to establish the facts about our postal operation.

The first fact is mounting cost. Since 1838 we have had—despite repeated increases in postal rates—a history of growing deficits. The deficit has now reached over a billion dollars a year.

Despite mounting appropriations out of the taxpayer's pocket, the other fact is that service is getting poorer. Delays and breakdowns cause economic damage and personal hardship.

If we look these facts in the face we must conclude that we need a postal operation that is run as a self-supporting enterprise on a businesslike basis.

Under present procedures postal officials have not even been able to calculate the cost of delivering a letter. The interests of the Post Office Department have been organized more on the lines of a political organization than as a business enterprise.

President Nixon and the Postmaster General has now offered us a proposal to establish a Government owned but independent postal service. I am happy to join in sponsoring this measure. Under its provisions, as in other public utilities, postal-rate rises will be decided by quasi-judicial expert commissions. As in any other business, salary negotiations will have true collective bargaining. The postal worker will finally take his rightful place beside the worker in private industry. The mail delivery will assume its proper role in the modern communications system of America.

## FUNDS FOR A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF SCENIC HIGHWAYS

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1969, the Michigan Legislature approved Senate Concurrent Resolution 62, memorializing Congress to pass the necessary legislation to provide funds for a national system of scenic highways. I am pleased to include a copy of the resolution in the RECORD for the information and consideration of my colleagues:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 62

(Offered by Senators Schweigert, O'Brien, Rockwell, Fleming and Rozycki)

Whereas, The federal government has conducted studies on the development of a national system of scenic highways in recognition of the fact that roads are more than just conduits of commerce and transportation and in fact are conduits for pleasure, recreation, diversion, experiencing the great out-of-doors and to see and learn of the country around us and legislation to accomplish this purpose has been introduced in the United States Congress, but it has thus far not been enacted; and

Whereas, The beauty, scenery, scenic overlooks and points of interest along the southern shore of Lake Superior in Michigan's beautiful and majestic Upper Peninsula, such as Tahquamenon Falls, Porcupine Mountains and many points of historic significance mandate that such a scenic highway should be located along the southern shore of Lake Superior in the Upper Peninsula; and

Whereas, The United States Congress has not yet seen fit to pass the legislation which would enable these scenic wonders to be opened up to the view of all citizens; now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature urges the United States Congress to pass the enabling legislation and appropriate the necessary funds to develop a national system of scenic highways to include a scenic highway along the southern shore of Lake Superior in Michigan's beautiful Upper Peninsula; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Director of the Department of State Highways, each member of the Commission of State Highways, the governor, and to each United States congressman from Michigan.

Adopted by the Senate, May 1, 1969.
Adopted by the House, May 8, 1969.

BERYL I. KENYON,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

T. THOS. THATCHER,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

## A SHOCKING STATEMENT

### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, May 26, 1969*

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnamese chief negotiator in Paris recently made a statement that must shock the entire civilized world.

He was responding to a plea Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird issued on May 19. Secretary Laird once more asked, as the U.S. Government has repeatedly asked, that the North Vietnamese give to us a list of Americans they are holding prisoner.

We know they are holding hundreds of these prisoners, but we do not know who they are. Of the 1,300 U.S. servicemen listed as either prisoners of war or missing in action, almost 800 were downed over North Vietnam. Most of these are pilots and we believe a substantial number are held prisoner. Of those 1,300, however, there is no way of telling how many are dead and how many are held prisoner. This subjects their families to a prolonged anguish which does not require much imagination to sympathize with.

The chief of the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris, Xuan Thuy, does not share this anguish.

As he said on May 20 in Paris and these are his words:

As long as the United States continues its aggression and does not withdraw its troops from Vietnam—

He will never turn over such a list.

The next day Secretary Laird said, and again I quote:

I am deeply shocked and disappointed by this cruel response of Hanoi's representative to such a basic request for humanitarian action.

I share Secretary Laird's shock. I can only assume that every Member of this body shares my feelings.

The United States holds no prisoners of North Vietnam. Those prisoners taken in combat are in camps maintained by the Government of South Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war. In accordance with that convention these camps are visited by members of the international community of the Red Cross, to assure that the prisoners receive humane treatment and adequate food, shelter, and medical care.

The few prisoners which were held by the United States itself have been returned to North Vietnam.

But hundreds of American wives, children, and parents continue to live in a tragic state of uncertainty, because they do not know anything at all about the fate of their loved ones.

I call on Hanoi to furnish a list of the American prisoners it holds.

I call upon concerned American and civilized people everywhere to voice our appeal to Hanoi to furnish such a list.

Simple human decency requires such an action. To play upon the anxiety of helpless relatives or American servicemen in an attempt to win at the bargaining table what force of arms could not achieve on the battlefield is a type of warfare beneath contempt.

It is no wonder the conscience of the civilized world is shocked by this action, and by the callous words of the chief of the Hanoi delegation in Paris.

## CRIME IN AMERICA

### HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in the May edition of the Police Times, the voice of American law enforcement, is an excellent article written by our esteemed colleague, Representative CLAUDE PEPPER, on our greatest domestic problem: crime.

Subsequent to this article, the House passed House Resolution 17, authored by this distinguished American, creating the Select Committee To Investigate Crime, and he was named by the Speaker as its chairman. I was privileged to have been one of the cosponsors of this legislation, and agree heartily in its goal.

In his article, our colleague states:

It is my personal belief that an even more active role must be played by the Congress in the area of crime control. We must do more than follow recommendations . . . we must make recommendations of our own.

With this, I am in full accord, and I wish my colleague and his committee members well in their vital task. Because I believe his comments should be brought to the attention of all the Congress and the American people, I am pleased to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A VIEW FROM THE CAPITOL: CRIME IN AMERICA

(By Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, 11th Congressional District)

In 1965, President Johnson appointed the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice to make a thorough investigation of the nature, causes, and possible solutions of the problem of crime in America. The Crime Commission reported to the President and the nation in early 1967, telling us that what was required was nothing less than "a revolution in the way America thinks about crime." They summarized some of the nation's most common misconceptions as follows:

Many people take comfort in the view that crime is the vice of a handful of people . . . Many Americans also think of crime as a very narrow range of behavior . . . Many Americans think controlling crime is solely the task of the police, the courts, and correction agencies.

There are few who believe any longer that crime is the vice of only a handful. The 1967 F.B.I. report indicated 3.8 million serious crimes reported to the police, and the preliminary figure for 1968 is about 4.6 million. Juvenile crime is increasing 300 percent faster than the juvenile population. In 1969, approximately one out of every 50 Americans will be the victim of a crime. We have been listening to these statistics throughout the 1960's, and each year they get worse. During the eight-year period 1960–1967, the number of serious crimes per 100,000 population has increased 71%.

This nation has also, and tragically, become aware of the extent to which crime is not a narrow range of behavior, affecting only the few who traffic with risk and temptation. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover in a recent magazine interview:

"Recent events, such as the urban riots, and increase in crimes of violence, the assassination of prominent individuals, have brought home with a terrifying impact the danger of the criminal."

We have become increasingly aware of the danger of crime, and I think also of its complexity. To talk about "crime" is like talking about "disease." Cancer, arthritis, and pneumonia are all diseases, but their causes and cures have little or no relation to each other. So it is with crime. The diversity of the forms of illegal behavior lumped together under the single word is immense. Crime in America ranges from the holiday pickpocket to the mass looting and arson of a riot; from the shooting of an unfaithful wife to the assassination of our greatest leaders; from private desperation to the organized acumen of syndicate crime.

The belief that controlling crime is the job of the police, the courts, and the correction agencies, and no business of the private citizen, is the most dangerous of the public misconceptions identified by the Crime Commission. Public apathy in this regard is as serious as any of the other causes of our spiralling crime rate. Crime control is the occupation, the profession, of the patrolman, the probation officer, the criminal lawyer, but it is the responsibility of every American citizen. In the words of the Crime Commission:

"The responsibility of the individual citizen runs for deeper than cooperating with the police or accepting jury duty or insuring the safety of his family by installing adequate locks—important as they are. He must respect the law, refuse to cut corners, reject the cynical argument that 'anything goes as long as you don't get caught.'

"Most important of all, he must, on his own and through the organizations he belongs to, interest himself in the problems of crime and criminal justice, seek information, express his views, use his vote wisely, get involved.

"In sum, the Commission is sure that the Nation can control crime if it will."

There are indications that the American public is heeding these words, and this is no more apparent than in the Congress of the United States. An unprecedented number of bills relating to a wide range of aspects of crime control was introduced during the 90th Congress. Legislation was enacted providing $63 million dollars for the assistance of State and local governments in fiscal 1969, and authorizing $300 million for fiscal 1970, more money than has been spent by the Federal government in this area in the entire history of this country.

It is my personal belief that an even more active role must be played by the Congress in the area of crime control. We must do more than follow recommendations—and to a large extent major legislation enacted last year was in response to recommendations made by the Crime Commission. We must make recommendations of our own. With this in mind, on January 10 of 1967 I introduced legislation to establish a joint Senate-House Congressional committee to investigate crime, to report to the Congress on its findings and, when appropriate, to recommend legislative measures to be taken. This bill passed the House by an overwhelming majority of 319 to 12 but failed to become law because of Senate inaction. I have introduced identical legislation this year, as well as another measure—in which I am joined by more than 110 co-sponsors—to establish a Select Committee of the House to investigate all aspects of crime. We would like to work with the Senate on this matter, but are willing to take the lead without them if need be.

I have also co-sponsored with Congressman Bob Casey of Texas a measure to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968. This bill would impose a mandatory 10-year sentence on first conviction and 25-year sentence on second conviction, for those found guilty of commiting a felony while in possession of a firearm. I believe a law like this, a mandatory penalty where there could be no question in a man's mind of the risk he is taking, would go a long way toward disarming our criminals.

In the meantime, there is no more serious domestic problem than crime facing this nation today, and I commend the members of the American Federation of Police for their dedication to its prevention and control.

## GI NEVER RETURNED

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is the day we traditionally honor the dead. Graves of countless thousands of courageous servicemen will be visited by their loved ones and the memorial services throughout the land will be conducted in honor and respect of those who have given their all for the cause of freedom. There are some who have no graves to visit.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to a recent article from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette which depicts the heart rending emotion experienced by parents who have the agonizing memories of their dead loved ones in the service but have no graves to honor:

HER SOLDIER SON NEVER RETURNED: THERE IS NO GRAVE FOR SAD MOTHER TO VISIT

There's no grave Mrs. Jessie Corle, 427 Bell Vue Ave., Wall Borough, can visit to memorialize her son, John, a victim of the Vietnam war, this Memorial Day.

Mrs. Corle's son never returned from Vietnam. He was in a helicopter shot down 100 yards off the Vietnamese shore in 1965. His body was never found.

This Memorial Day will be the third since she learned of her son's presumed death and still the agony of uncertainty hangs about her.

"Memorial Day has no real meaning, I feel, for parents like us," she wrote to John Spada, county acting director of veterans affairs. "Our son may be dead in body, but I dare not, I will not say Cpl. John T. Corle is dead, for he lives in our hearts and minds forever."

"Now I see where you talked of servicemen's memorial flags," she wrote to Spada. "Could I have one? I can't say where I could place it but in my front lawn for our son does not have a grave to respect.

"Cpl. John T. Corle might have the sea for a grave. Who really truly knows? That's why I ask: Could I have a flag in memory of our son? But where could I put it?"

Spada said yesterday the letter touched him more than any others he's received requesting memorial markers or flags.

He wrote the distraught mother:

"It is fitting and proper under these circumstances for you to place one or more flags on your front lawn on Memorial Day in memory of your late son and of the others who have made the supreme sacrifice." He said he would provide a flag.

He also invited her to a memorial service May 18 at Aspinwall Veterans Hospital commemorating "men who lost their lives overseas and whose crosses remain on foreign soil."

Mrs. Corle's letter arrived last week and is still sitting on Spada's Courthouse desk because:

"The more times I read it the more it saddens me."

## FORD LOCAL 600 ASKS ENACTMENT OF TAX REFORM BILL

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 27, 1969, I was pleased to welcome to my office two friends of long standing, Mr. Walter Dorosh and Mr. Robert Battle, who were in Washington on behalf of the 50,000 active and retired members of Ford Local 600 of the United Automobile Workers of America.

Mr. Dorosh and Mr. Battle, who are, respectively, president and second vice president of local 600, brought with them petitions signed by more than 25,000 members of local 600 in support of tax reform.

I would like to quote from the petition:

We, the undersigned, respectfully request the 91st Congress to enact a tax reform bill which would provide a long overdue change which would directly aid the great mass of our nation's taxpayers—the low and middle income workers and the younger people who are struggling to raise families in the face of a constantly increasing cost of living.

The reform tax bill should reduce the oil and mineral depletion allowance, repeal the investment tax credit, and block such loopholes as "hobby farms," accelerated real estate depreciation, multiple corporation tax-exempt municipal bonds, unlimited charitable deductions and the special tax treatment for stock options.

Your Honor, we request your Committee to give our views on tax reform serious consideration and urge the 91st Congress to enact a new equitable tax law that must close tax loopholes for the rich and increase dependency allowances to $1,200.

This was unanimously endorsed by the executive board and general council of Ford local 600.

Mr. Speaker, President Dorosh and Vice President Battle speak for a patriotic and hard-working group of American citizens who stand ready to meet in full measure their responsibilities to their country. However, these two fine officials of one of the country's truly outstanding union locals made it clear that the members of local 600 expect the Congress to adopt equitable tax reforms.

In discussing the need for tax reform with Mr. Dorosh and Mr. Battle, I noted that I had introduced legislation early in the 91st Congress to achieve this end. In assuring them of my continuing support for tax reform, I also told them that it was my intention—and they indicated their support of this position—to oppose extension of the present 10-percent tax surcharge unless and until full-scale tax reform is approved by the House. To extend the surcharge without first reforming the tax structure would merely perpetuate and enlarge the already substantial injustices built into the system for persons who draw their incomes largely from wage and salary payments.

I want to thank the members of Ford local 600, both active and retired, and their elected officials for bringing to my attention in this manner their views on this important public issue. I want to assure each and every person who signed these petitions that I shall honor their wishes and fight to the fullest extent of my ability to secure early approval of broad-scale tax reform legislation.

## POSTAL REFORM

### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the President has said:

There is no Democratic or Republican way of delivering the mail. There is only the right way.

I am convinced that it is the President's broad vision, his ability to transcend the immediate concerns of partisan politics in order to see in its entirety the postal system as it is and as it should be—it is these qualities which are the really important feature of this message.

I say that these qualities are important for two reasons:

First. The ability to transcend partisan politics is the mark of a great President no matter what area he is engaged in.

Second. If the people of this country see the President lead the way, if they see that we have here a leader who is unafraid and who wants the best not just the usable, then they will demand the same qualities from all elective officials.

So this postal message is concerned not only with postal matters but with philosophical matters. It is infused with the spirit of nonpartisanship, with the belief that in order to change for the better it is often necessary to change completely, and with the imagination to discover the means by which such complete change can come about.

I am convinced that history will read this message and see in it not those particulars and concrete suggestions we applaud today, but something more: the vision of a man who quietly, earnestly, courageously works for the common good.

## NEW YORK BETH ISRAEL MEDICAL CENTER CELEBRATES 80TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Charles H. Silver, consultant to the mayor of the city of New York and president of the Beth Israel Medical Center, a well-known and well considered institution in my city, recently spoke at the gala 80th anniversary dinner of the medical center on May 4, before a gathering of nearly 2,000 persons.

His remarks, which document the inspiring story of the Beth Israel Medical Center's growth and progress, follow:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER

Five years ago we met in the same ballroom to celebrate the fact that Beth Israel had grown in seventy-five years from a small second-floor clinic into a splendid hospital of some 360 beds.

Today, we gather to mark our 80th anniversary. Beth Israel has become—in just the last five years—the great new Medical Center of New York with nearly 1500 beds . . . recognized for its achievements throughout the world.

Every friend and all of the members of the Beth Israel family who favor us with their presence and fill this room with faith and dedication have helped to make Beth Israel a vital center of science and research . . . a haven of health and of hope.

I am happy that so many of my days have been spent with you, that so many of my years have been devoted to Beth Israel and that this has given a a matchless opportunity to make life better, longer and more rewarding for my fellow man.

But it has not been my reward alone. It is yours, too . . . something we all share . . . every member of our medical staff, our nurses and technicians, our administrative personnel, our volunteers and certainly our loyal, conscientious and generous Board of Trustees.

I think you realize what all of you mean to Beth Israel—and more than that—I think you can appreciate what your presence here means to me tonight.

I have come to know over the years that if there is one area in which the warmth and quality of our City's heart can be measured, it is in our voluntary hospitals.

And don't think for one moment that because Beth Israel is five times . . . nearly ten times . . . the size it was five years ago, that its heart is shrinking as our dimensions grow. It is good to look about and watch new buildings rising on every hand . . . to see the scope of service to our community multiplied many times.

But I am not so much impressed by the things I see as by the things I feel. And I feel that the warm and pulsing heart of Beth Israel beats just as strong today . . . offering the same close and intimate consideration for our patients as our founders dreamed it would.

Their dream came true and it is not going to fade as we grow. The dream will live. The heart of Beth Israel will never diminish. Because of that heart, because we care—and because we believe that a doctor's business is not just sickness—but people—we will continue to give just as much personal attention to the little things that matter so much.

Perhaps, to the casual passerby, ours is a cold, complex pattern of stone and steel, much like many other structures that line our streets.

But come inside and there the picture is very different. Ceaseless activity goes on at any hour of the day or night as we wage the most vital struggle for human survival—twenty-four hours a day, every day of the year.

The wheels never stop turning. The minds never stop thinking. The hands never stop moving. The skills, the arts, the science, the machinery of medicine . . . the gentleness of nursing . . . the miracles of the research laboratory . . . the whole armory of medical innovation and inspiration is marshaled to assist the doctor and to assure the safety of the patient.

It is hard to believe that back at the beginning of our history a little group of immigrant merchants and tradesmen pledged their paltry contributions of twenty-five cents each to open a tiny infirmary.

At their first meeting in 1889 they framed a resolution addressed to the "dear public and Jewish brethren":

"This gathering is to discuss the horrible conditions in the downtown area for those who wait indefinitely for medical attention at hospitals.

"We must heed the complaints of the sick, the old and the poor.

"Something must be done to wash away this sin and to ignore the needy no further.

"We here resolve that a hospital will be built and its name shall be Beth Israel."

That was what they said eighty years ago—and that was what they did.

If you feel proud, as I do, of their vision and foresight . . . you may imagine how proud I am to be standing here with you in the lengthened shadow of their great resolve, knowing that together we have seen it fulfilled beyond the range of their most ambitious plans.

They never could have conceived Beth Israel's ever-widening involvement in community education, public health, teaching, research and treatment.

But the bitter struggle they faced against misery, poverty and disease has not changed.

Human needs do not change. Human want remains. Human distress and neglect still exist.

These things require the healing hands of the men and women in white who breathe life and meaning into the walls we are lifting again and again as we work today to build the new and greater Beth Israel of tomorrow.

We manufacture nothing. We have no product to sell except one precious merchandise beyond price . . . man's concern for the health and welfare and happier existence of his fellow men.

You and I are engaged in a unique business. Profit plays no part—and we will tolerate no loss—not of a single human life, if the things we have learned and the things we can do at Beth Israel will save it.

And I say that in such an ideal and such a purpose is our blueprint for the future . . . and humanity's hope of a better world.

Eighty years is but a winking of the eye of God in the whole history and destiny of civilization. But I feel that His eye has truly been upon us, that we are doing His work and that He lives in every room, corridor and corner of our hospital.

We are the oldest and largest traditionally observant hospital in the world. And it is good at the end of eight decades to take pride in our age and our size . . . but I maintain that these are rather unimportant.

Let us be the most proud of the compassion and the quality of Beth Israel . . . and pledge ourselves that these will never change.

This is what we have worked together to build in the past and what we will forever guard as we build for the future.

Perhaps I can put it best in the gentle, moving words of Emma Lazarus . . . words which seem to herald Beth Israel's own beginnings!

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . .

"I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

As long as the world needs love—as long as mankind needs hope—as long as humanity needs healing—the merciful task of our many hands must continue.

For Beth Israel's eighty years are more than a triumph. They are a challenge. They are a challenge we will work to meet proudly and tirelessly—and we will not fail.

Not for at least another eighty times eighty happy birthdays for Beth Israel!

The golden door that opens on hope and life in our Medical Center will always swing wide for all who are ill and in need of help and healing.

The golden door of Beth Israel will always be open to all people.

It is the door of life.

The hands that hold it open are the hands of love.

With the help of God—that door will never close.

## BERKELEY VIOLENCE

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called for an investigation by the U.S. Attorney General of possible widespread violation of civil rights of the citizens of Berkeley. At that time I noted one man had been killed and more than 100 persons injured, while hundreds of others, including patients in a hospital, had been gassed.

Since yesterday I have examined photographs of the incident in which a young man from my district was shotgunned and fatally injured. The pictures show him with empty hands before the shooting. They also show the roof on which he stood, apparently empty of anything usable as a weapon. Anyone who would care to examine these pictures in my office is welcome to do so.

At the same time I have read the editorial comments on the Berkeley violence in the San Francisco Chronicle, the Berkeley Daily Gazette, and by a distinguished columnist in the San Francisco Examiner. I would like these comments to be entered into the RECORD following my remarks. In addition I am including the comments of members of the University of California Department of Criminology.

I ask your examination of the record of violence in Berkeley.

The above-mentioned material follows:

MAY 20, 1969.

As members of the Faculty of the School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, we feel obligated to express our professional concern and outrage at the recent use of excessive force by local law enforcement agencies under the direction of the Sheriff of Alameda County.

We believe that the use of shotguns against demonstrators and spectators (1) was indiscriminate; (2) was unduly harmful and dangerous; (3) was unnecessary as a crowd control tactic; and, (4) has had the anticipatible and undesirable effect of escalating the level of violence in this and possible future confrontations.

We urge the District Attorney and Grand Jury of Alameda County, and the Department of Justice, to immediately investigate the actions of the Sheriff of Alameda County, and that the Sheriff be relieved of his command pending this investigation.

We request the Sheriff of Alameda County to resign from his position on the Advisory Council to the School of Criminology. We believe that he possesses neither the professional competence required to participate in the preparation of students to become professionally qualified workers in the field of criminal justice administration, nor the qualities of leadership which are normally expected of persons associated with the University community.

ANTHONY PLATT,
*Assistant Professor.*
JAMES CAREY,
*Assistant Professor.*
RICHARD KORN,
*Assistant Professor.*
PAUL TAKAGI,
*Lecturer.*
HERMAN SCHWENDINGER,
*Assistant Professor.*
VONNIE GURGIN,
*Lecturer.*

SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY,
*May 20, 1969.*

I find myself in substantial agreement with the intent of the above statement. It was my belief that the scientific criminological study of crime and criminals is impossible where political factors become totally confused with the issue of social control that was a major factor in my recent resignation, both from my position as Acting Dean of the School of Criminology and from my tenure appointment at Berkeley.

The present situation seems to be such that all local residents (including myself) attempting to continue their activities are held suspect by the various armed forces. Because of the general nature of this attitude of suspicion they can move around certain areas only at considerable risk.

One purpose of law enforcement is to safeguard the legitimate concerns of the citizen. This is not being effected. It cannot be effected while every movement a citizen may make may give rise to suspicion, particularly since "suspicion" is adequate defense for the use of force against him.

The analogy of "warfare" has already been made and it seems that all persons not in uniform are liable to be regarded as members of the guerilla forces. This is not a legitimate law enforcement viewpoint.

If this is the way the situation is perceived to be, this is the way the situation will become. The outlook is extremely serious unless very substantial measures are taken immediately to reverse the trends now developing. In particular, the death of the student must be investigated and guarantees made that appropriate legal action will be followed through.

LESLIE T. WILKINS,
*Acting Dean.*

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, May 22, 1969]

VIETNAM TACTICS IN BERKELEY

Downtown Berkeley is now a proven battleground on which volleys of gunfire have been numerous and occasionally deadly, and

the city has experienced a kind of total war in which an aerial gas attack overspread the target area to invade classrooms, private homes and a hospital.

One man is dead, scores have been wounded (many by random charges) and the citizens have been sickened by displays of force far in excess of provocation, necessity, or justification. The peace-keeping agencies, it appears, grossly overreacted to a situation that was undoubtedly troublesome but—up to the time of those displays, at least—not one requiring fusillades of bullets and a rain of gas from the skies.

In their efforts to explain their massive resort to open warfare, the involved authorities have created a vast credibility gap. Sheriff Madigan's implications that his deputies were using nothing more dangerous than birdshot was gruesomely refuted by the post-mortem discovery of buckshot pellets in the heart of young James Rector. So was the repeated assertion of police that the fatal wounds were incurred in a fall from a rooftop.

Again, the assurance that armed peace officers were opening fire only when in danger of life or injury was completely discredited by the published photograph of a deputy sheriff carefully drawing a bead on the back of a fleeing and unarmed man.

No wonder, then, that the use of a helicopter to drop gas on an assembly of students—a piece of arrant recklessness at that time and place—should have generated widely credited reports that something far more deadly than tear gas had been brought into play.

Even yesterday, National Guard commanders were offering conflicting versions of who ordered the use of gas, and for what reasons. Not entirely convincing was one explanation that gas was employed "because the troops were in danger." In danger from what, one wonders.

The responsible authorities, civil and military, from Sheriff Madigan to the governor's office and back again, have introduced a kind of storm-trooper philosophy into the Berkeley confrontation. Let them de-escalate their zapping tactics promptly. At best, they have been guilty of incredibly bad judgment. They have thereby brought needless death and injury into the arena, have created bitter hostility among thousands of previously "uncommitted" students, and have outraged public opinion.

---

[From the Berkeley (Calif.) Daily Gazette, May 17, 1969]

WERE THINGS THAT DESPERATE?

For the first time in Berkeley history guns have been fired by police into crowds of demonstrators.

We realize it is all too easy to second guess persons in command, but the nagging question in our mind is who gave the order and why?

There can be no doubt about the fact that innocent spectators, including newsmen, suffered injuries from guns Thursday.

We do not question that at times circumstances become so desperate that police must use guns, even at the cost of possible injury to the innocent.

Our question is, "Were things that desperate Thursday?"

The University of California Regents yesterday apologized for the injury caused to persons not responsible for the trouble.

Evidence emerged yesterday to the effect that various policemen and police jurisdictions had serious doubts as to the wisdom of the use of guns.

The Gazette wonders why, after the dangerous situations which have arisen in Berkeley's past, the decision was made to resort to guns in this incident.

We do not preach on the subject, but we do believe the press and the public have the right to the answer.

Police, can not, as is their custom, remain mute as to their motives.

The University of California administration must also fill in some blanks if anyone is ever to piece the current situation into some kind of perspective.

Chancellor Roger W. Heyns told the Berkeley Academic Senate several meetings ago he did not know how persons could continue to write off to youthful idealism what had become a "predictable pattern" of confrontation.

If the chancellor holds to this insight, why did he not immediately identify the "People's Park" as an engineered effort at confrontation and act on that insight?

Also raising questions as to the UC administration's credibility was the statement of the chancellor's second-in-command that the university would not "take any actions in the middle of the night" to reclaim its property. All was to be open and above board with specific prior announcements.

Such was not the case.

One also wonders why, if the university did not have money to develop the park at budget time, they suddenly found the funds.

Finally, the Gazette wonders why the so-called "street people" and large numbers of the college generation allow themselves to become part of power plays larger than their understanding?

Only a fool could believe the idea for a park was accidental.

There can, however, be no doubt that the spirit of most who built the park was spontaneous and without malice.

---

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
*Berkeley, Calif., May 20, 1969.*

Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
*Governor of California.*
HAROLD W. SULLIVAN,
*Commissioner, California Highway Patrol.*
Hon. ROBERT MONAGAN,
*Speaker of the Assembly.*
FRANK I. MADIGAN,
*Sheriff, Alameda County.*
Hon. HOWARD WAY.
Hon. THOMAS C. LYNCH,
*Attorney General.*
EDWIN MEESE III,
*Secretary to the Governor.*
ARLO SMITH,
*Chief, Criminal Department,*
*Office of the Attorney General.*
J. FRANK COAKLEY,
*District Attorney, Alameda County.*
Chief BAKER,
*Berkeley Police.*

GENTLEMEN: The signatories of this letter are members of the faculty of the University of California, School of Law, Berkeley.

The armed conflict on the Berkeley campus and in the neighboring community is too changing and confused to permit any final assessment at this time of what has taken place and who is responsible. But certain facts have been widely reported: police fired guns over the heads of demonstrating students depositing bullets or buckshot in the facade of the library; a photograph in Monday's San Francisco Chronicle shows a police officer in the act of aiming a gun at the back of a single fleeing demonstrator; bird shot discharged from shotguns was used by police last Thursday as a mode of mob dispersal. These so far unchallenged reports give us grave concern that law enforcement has resorted to the use of deadly weapons in circumstances which do not justify their use. We pass no judgment on the responsibility for the tragic death of a 25 year old man who died Monday from buckshot fired by police, because in that case there are unresolved questions of fact.

Since the Report of the President's Crime Commission, a growing consensus has been emerging within law enforcement groups over the imperative of restricting the use of deadly force except where life is at stake. The Model Firearms Use Policy, recently published in the Journal of California Criminal Law Enforcement broadly states that consensus, and the substance of that policy has been adopted by many California police departments. It provides that an officer shall not discharge firearms except when all other means have failed and it is necessary to protect himself or another against serious injury from an attacker or to arrest an adult felony suspect when the crime involves the use of deadly force or there is a substantial risk that the person to be arrested will cause serious injury to another. It provides that firearms shall not be discharged as a warning.

There is little doubt that these policies, developed by and for law enforcement personnel, have been substantially departed from in the course of dealing with the Berkeley disorders and that this departure has resulted in the infliction of serious injury and has imperiled the lives of innocent bystanders as well as demonstrators. It has fulfilled the prophecy of one professional police officer that, "Imprudent or indiscreet use of firearms will arouse public indignation and alienate public support of the police agency." (Samuel Chapman writing in Journal of California Law Enforcement, April 1968, p. 183.)

In the interests of the public welfare, of reason, of human life, of the continued acceptance of authority, including that of our agencies of law enforcement, we call upon those in charge of the law enforcement effort in Berkeley, including the Governor, the Sheriff and the police chiefs, to reassert publicly for the assurance of the public and the guidance of all law enforcement personnel, that firearms are never to be used except as stated in the Model Firearms Statement—that is to say, never except when necessary to protect against an imminent threat of serious personal injury and when all other available means have failed.

Respectfully,

Stephen R. Barnett, Barbette B. Barton, Richard Buxbaum, Jesse Choper, Robert Cole, John E. Coons, Frank O. Goodman, Edward C. Halbach, Jr., Dan Henke, W. James Hill, Sanford H. Kadish, Herma H. Kay, Stanley Lubman, John K. McNulty, Frank C. Newman, Kenneth Phillips, Stefan A. Riesenfeld, Sho Sato, Lawrence Sullivan, Justin Sweet, Jan Vetter, Ira Michael Heyman.

---

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, May 22, 1969]

SHOTGUN STUPIDITY

(By Dick Nolan)

Damn all apologies and extenuations. We can't go around shooting our own kids.

Absolutely nothing else is relevant to the tragedy in which young James Rector was cut down and killed by buckshot.

If the society cannot protect itself intelligently, but must rely on the most brutal use of the most brutal firearm in the arsenal, then the society has already perished, and is a zombie ambulating only in the bodyshell of a dead democracy.

You don't defeat the instigators and the agitators with sawed-off shotguns. When you resort to sawed-off shotguns you have lost to the agitators. And the agitators know it. And everybody knows it.

It is stupidity as well as homicide. It is the idiot charge of the pricked and tormented bull against the cool and calculating matador.

How absolutely bull-stupid it is for Governor Reagan, Sheriff Madigan, and others of our deputies, to imagine that this continuing struggle is a physical one!

They can trot out every tactical weapon in the armory and win every street battle with ease. And while they are meaneuvering with a mastery of squad tactics, preoccupied, the

war of the mind in the larger theatre of ideas is being lost.

That handsome helicopter buzzing the Cal campus and spraying a noxious gas, as though the students were insects and the gas were an insecticide—what a spectacle! What a spectacle of squad level tactics and squad level efficiency!

How many recruits do you suppose that helicopter won for the "other side" in this greater struggle for the heart and the mind?

Those of us who love the Republic and love the humanist traditions of representative democracy can only be enraged by the manner in which our present representatives are misrepresenting us.

We'll never again regain the ground lost when that cruel buckshot was fired into the vitals of James Rector. It did turn out to be buckshot, you know, lethal buckshot, and not the birdshot or rock salt Sheriff Madigan was describing for us so disarmingly.

Whoever fired that deadly charge knows who he is. Presumably, if we have still a society of law, he will be discovered and required to answer to us.

But it is already too late for young Rector, and too late for us in our exertions to hold the love and the loyalties of our seedcrop young for the democracy we hold so dear.

We consistently underestimate both the extent and the depth of the rage that has come to grip our children. The rage and the fear.

There are more of them, angry and scared than so far has been imagined, and they are angrier and more frightened than we would like to believe possible.

They will never forgive us for having put the power of the atom to warlike use. That is at the root of it. We have brought them up to love the sweet green earth and all upon it; and at the same time we have invented and poised for action a doomsday device that could destroy all and everyone.

They are disgusted and terrified at the prospect, and overwhelmed by hopeless anger that there is simply nothing they can do about it. Nothing they can do but rely on our own benevolence—and how shaky does that look when we can turn buckshot and gas-copters on them?

We are in a weak position trying to argue that "we" didn't authorize or now condone Madigan's buckshot or Reagan's bayonets. We are reduced almost to pleading.

If all depends on our true benevolence and it does, we must start proving it. Nothing less than an enormous national change of direction will do. Perhaps a complete new isolationism, and crash concentration on goals and correctives at home.

## A BRAVE YOUNG MAN

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Marine Hospital Corpsman 3c. Patrick R. McNelis, a brave young man from Clairton, was recently killed serving his country in Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

AREA MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM: CLAIRTON PARENTS RECEIVE WORD

A Clairton Marine was killed in action while on duty in Vietnam, it was learned today. He is Hospital Corpsman Third Class Patrick R. McNelis, 22, of 116 Mendelssohn Ave.

He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Cormack (Bud) McNelis.

Corpsman McNelis was a graduate of McKeesport Area Senior High School with the Class of 1966. He was also a resident of Auberle Memorial Home for Boys from 1959 to 1966.

The Marine enlisted in August of 1966 and was assigned to the Marine Corps shortly afterward. He was home on furlough just a month ago before being sent to Vietnam.

The corpsman was born March 17, 1947. He was employed by the G. C. Murphy Co. sign shop prior to enlisting in the service.

He was fatally wounded when struck by enemy missile fire May 15 and died the following day in Da Nang, Vietnam.

## A STUDY IN DISTORTION

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, time was when a rowdy group of students who took over a school building, vandalized the facilities, and threw the school administrator out of his office would land in jail and have the book thrown at them. Today, unfortunately, such rowdies stand a good chance of securing their demands due to wavering school officials.

The same theme of permissiveness is evident in the field of law enforcement where certain schools of thought have all but ruled out the idea of personal guilt and responsibility. One specific example is the number of repeaters who, thanks to lenient judges and parole officers, are free to roam the streets preying on law-abiding citizens.

An Eric Hoffer column in the May 24 edition of the Columbus Citizen-Journal dealt with this problem of laxity in law enforcement and some of the reasons advanced to justify this new thinking. Although this new approach to the issue of crime and punishment has been becoming more popular in some circles, it remained for the Kerner Commission report to turn the tables and place the blame—not on the culprit—but on the average lawful citizen.

I include the above-mentioned column, "Intellectuals Uneasy About Success," in the RECORD at this point:

REFLECTIONS: INTELLECTUALS UNEASY ABOUT SUCCESS

(By Eric Hoffer)

It is probably true that 60 per cent of the adult white population in this country (60 per cent of the white voters) are without a sense of guilt toward the Negro, the poor, and the disadvantaged here and elsewhere. They are ready to help their neighbors and anyone in trouble, but the impulse to help others does not stem from a feeling of guilt festering in some dark corner of their souls.

Most of the 60 per cent started to work for a living in their teens. They had no advantage of wealth or class to give them a jump ahead of their fellow men. Whatever ease, comfort, and security they may enjoy at this moment was achieved by striving and saving through the years. Their white skin did not make life easy for them—did not bring them advantages and privileges. They never felt that the world owed them anything or that they owe anybody—white, black, or yellow—anything.

It is safe to say most of the people who at present speak and write about this country's difficulties, and have a hand in shaping its policies, do not belong to the 60 per cent.

It is the fashion now among educated people to feel uneasy about success—not uneasy enough to give up the fruits of success, but enough to feel guilty about it, and emote soulfully about the grievances of the "disadvantaged," and the defects and sins of the status quo. Right now it is a mark of distinction to have a sense of guilt, and fashionable to confess our sins.

At the 1968 annual convention of the American Bar Association in Philadelphia, speaker after speaker maintained crime is caused by poverty, ignorance, and despair; that law and order cannot be maintained until social ills are first cured.

The dean of the Yale Law School and others spoke against the prosecution of lawbreakers if their cause is worthy. Someone even suggested that persons engaged in civil disobedience should be paid by the government for fighting unjust laws.

The whole tenor of the convention was that we must learn to live with disorder and crime until all ills have been cured and our faulty institutions have been reformed.

The only defender of law enforcement at this convention of American lawyers was an Englishman, John Passmore Widgery, Lord Justice of the Court of Appeals in England.

He pointed out that you cannot establish an orderly society by curing social ills and by reforming institutions. How do lawyers and judges expect to keep the peace unless they have an efficient police force? The shock troops against crime are the police. "Anyone who thinks relief of poverty will bring a decrease in crime is in for some kind of disappointment."

The greatest part of England's slums, he said, were razed by the bombings of the last war, and the reforms of the welfare state have practically eliminated poverty. But there has been a steady increase in crime. The reason is that societies throughout the Western world have lost discipline. "Can we ever rely on the worth of a cause in justifying disorder? My answer is a simple and emphatic negative. There should be no bargain, no concession to those who would have it otherwise."

## BILL ROTH

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 1969*

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, when Senator JOHN WILLIAMS announced that he would not be seeking reelection to the U.S. Senate, my first reaction was to wonder who in Delaware could carry on the tremendous work done by him. In BILL ROTH, whom I have known since we both came to the Congress almost 2½ years ago, I think the State of Delaware will find a very capable replacement for Senator JOHN WILLIAMS. BILL ROTH is nationally known for his work in trying to establish a complete catalog of existing Federal programs. I have found his reports on this subject to be of great value. The taxpayers of Delaware and this country should be most grateful for his work in that area.

The citizens of the State of Delaware, which is known as the first State, can be assured that if they elect BILL ROTH to the U.S. Senate, they will be getting a first-rate Senator.

## PROGRAM TO COMBAT COAL MINERS' PNEUMOCONIOSIS


## HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Johnson of the Public Health Service, made a very cogent statement to the American Mining Congress 2 weeks ago at the American Mining Congress meeting at Pittsburgh, Pa. As my colleagues know, the Public Health Service has been in the forefront of Government agencies in the effort to protect the coal miner from black lung disease. They are to be commended for this and I hope that they can continue to render the individual coal miner the service that they have in the past. This is what Mr. Johnson had to say:

HEW'S EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM TO COMBAT COAL MINERS' PNEUMOCONIOSIS

(By Charles C. Johnson, Jr., Administrator, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

For presentation at a session on Dust Control and Health, American Mining Congress, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 5, 1969.

I appreciate this opportunity to talk with you today about coal workers' pneumoconiosis and to participate in what I hope will represent a significant step forward in our joint efforts to curtail the disease and disability caused by soft coal mining. This particular problem carries with it a sense of urgency which was not apparent when you first formulated this program in which I have the privilege of participating. The explosion at Farmington, West Virginia last November has forcefully and tragically dramatized the need for improved safety and health measures in coal mines. Hearings in Charleston and in Washington and the strike of some 40 thousand coal miners in West Virginia have also contributed importantly to a new and much needed crystallization of national public opinion on this issue.

Since the announcement of HEW's eight-point program last January, the Administration has proposed new legislation. Therefore, I believe a general discussion of the legislation as it relates to our research activities would be more helpful than discussing the program as originally proposed, point by point. But first, let me outline our structure within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for it is new.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service was established last year to achieve a deeper insight into the relationship of man to his environment, to assess the total impact on the human organism caused by many separate environmental stresses, and to implement necessary action programs to help the Nation achieve needed environmental improvement. Our agency is composed of the Food and Drug Administration, the National Air Pollution Control Administration and the Environmental Control Administration.

Occupational safety and health is the responsibility of a Bureau by that name in our Environmental Control Administration, whose Commissioner is Assistant Surgeon General Chris A. Hansen.

In his recent Special Message to the Congress on Coal Mine Safety and Health, President Nixon describes death in the coal mines of this Nation as of two kinds, "sudden as an explosion" or "insidious" as "from pneumoconiosis or 'black lung' disease."

One of the most critical occupational health problems on our list of priority concerns is the disease mentioned by the President, coal miners' pneumoconiosis. There are many types of pneumoconiosis, a term for any pathological condition of the lung induced by inhalation of small particles. These particles may be of any dusty materials, as for example, silica or cotton fibers. Coal miners' pneumoconiosis is a chronic chest disease, caused by the accumulation of fine coal dust particles in the human lung. In its advanced forms, it leads to severe disability and premature death.

Coal miners' pneumoconiosis was recognized in Great Britain, as early as 1943, as a disease entity separate from silicosis. It was not generally recognized as such in the United States until the 1960's. Prevalence studies by the Pennsylvania Department of Health (1959–61) and by the Public Health Service (1963–65) confirmed the existence of the disease entity, doucumented its prevalence among coal miners, and showed that it is a widespread problem.

For over 30 years, the Public Health Service has undertaken cooperative studies with the Bureau of Mines on miners' health problems. Not until 1963, however, did the PHS first receive funds for the direct support of operations in this area.

In 1966, the Department established the Appalachian Laboratory for Occupational Respiratory Diseases (ALFORD) in Morgantown, West Virginia. Our accomplishments to date have been modest. Nevertheless, we *have* identified the scope of the problem. When the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service testified at the Department of Interior's hearings last December 10, he estimated that pneumoconiosis "conservatively affects more than 100,000 soft coal workers." That estimate was based on projections of the prevalence percentages found by the Public Health Service in the 1963–1965 study of active and inactive coal miners in Appalachia; on the Bureau of Mines' census of active coal miners nationally—namely, 144,000; and on recent information as to coal miners in Pennsylvania receiving compensation for pneumoconiosis.

As you know, the President has submitted legislative proposals, embodied now in S. 1300 and H.R. 7976 on which hearings are being held, for "a comprehensive new program to provide a vigorous and multi-faceted attack on the health and safety dangers which prevail in the coal mining industry."

Several of these proposals pertain to health of the miners. For example, the proposed legislation would:

Protect miners from concentrations of respirable dust exceeding 4.5 milligrams of dust per cubic meter of air, within 6 months. As soon as possible, this standard will be lowered to 3.0 milligrams per cubic meter of air.

Authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop and promulgate any additional or revised standards which he deems necessary for the health and safety of the miners. Mandatory health standards proposed by the Secretary of the Interior would be based upon criteria developed and furnished by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of research, demonstrtaions, experiments and other information. This technical and public health information would be developed in consultation with appropriate representatives of the operators and miners, other interested persons, the States, advisory committees, and, where appropriate, foreign countries.

Increase substantially, by direct action, grants, and contracts, the necessary research, training, and education for the prevention and control of coal miners' pneumoconiosis, the improvement of State workmen's compensation systems, and the reduction of mine accidents.

Provide for cooperative action with the States in relation to coal mine safety and health conditions, and for grant assistance to such States for the advancement of health and safety in coal mines.

I am sure you will agree the Administration has not acted too precipitously in proposing this much-needed legislation. The United States is the only major coal-producing Nation in the world which does not have an official government standard for coal mine dust. Since Great Britain began requiring dust control efforts in the coal mines, there has been a substantial reduction there in the prevalence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. Thus, the incidence of new cases in miners has decreased from 8.1 new cases per 1,000 miners in 1955 to 1.9 new cases per 1,000 miners in 1967; the age specific prevalence of simple coal miners pneumoconiosis has also decreased as has the overall prevalence (12.5 percent in 1959–62 as compared to 10.9 in 1964–67).

An official respirable dust standard for coal mines could, in our opinion, if properly enforced, make a significant reduction in new cases of pneumoconiosis and decrease the rate of progression of old cases. Last year, we concluded that sufficient data were available to recommend the adoption of an interim coal dust exposure standard for miners, pending further refinement of technical knowledge. After careful analysis of the British and Pennsylvania experiences, and after consultation with many authorities, we concluded that:

An interim standard should represent no more than a reasonable degree of risk to our miners, given our present technology, and be one that would significantly reduce the rate at which new cases of pneumoconiosis would develop in the future and old cases would progress.

On the basis of those conclusions, last December, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended to the Department of the Interior a Federal standard which could be used to lower respirable dust levels in coal mines. This standard called for a respirable dust level not to exceed 3.0 milligrams per cubic meter as measured by the Mining Research Establishment (MRE) horizontal elutriator instrument. We recommended this standard in the conviction that it could, if adopted and properly enforced throughout the coal mining industry, make a significant reduction in coal miners' pneumoconiosis. This standard, if adopted and enforced, would place the United States on a par with other major coal producing nations which have set health standards for dust exposures in the coal mining industry.

The suggested interim standard of 3.0 milligrams of respirable coal dust per cubic meter (MRE instrument) is consistent with the data from the British Pneumoconiosis Field Research Project in which dust concentrations in 24 mines ranged from 1.0 to 8.9 milligrams per cubic meter (average of 3.8) and with the standard used since about 1966 by the Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries to evaluate dust exposures in bituminous coal mines in that State. The standard thus used in Pennsylvania is that recommended by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists as the threshold limit value for quartz containing dusts:

$$TLV = \frac{250}{\%\ \text{Quartz} + 5}$$ (expressed as million particles per cubic foot)

Particle count and weight equivalents of the ACGIH standard used by Pennsylvania are as follows for various percentages of quartz in the dust:

| Quartz (percent) | Particle count (millions per cubic foot) | Dust weight mg/m³ (MRE) |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 50.0 | 5.5 |
| 3 | 31.2 | 3.45 |
| 5 | 25.0 | 2.8 |

When we recommended the interim dust standard last December, we recognized that dust concentrations in most American coal mines exceeded the recommended standard. We also knew, partly from our discussions with the Bureau of Mines, that it would not be feasible in all situations to achieve immediate compliance with such an interim standard and that a time-phased schedule for compliance would be necessary. Consequently, we are in full accord with the provisions of H.R. 7976 and S. 1300 which would require compliance with an initial interim standard of 4.5 milligrams per cubic meter within 6 months after enactment. We feel, however, that the industry should move toward a standard of 3.0 milligrams per cubic meter as rapidly as possible.

The best technical information available to us indicates a direct correlation between the amount of dust breathed by miners and the progression of coal miners' pneumoconiosis. Thus, we can expect that under any interim standard some new disease will develop and some old disease will become more severe. This makes it very clear, then, that a great deal remains to be learned about this disease.

The Appalachian Laboratory for Occupational Respiratory Diseases (ALFORD), which is a field station of the Bureau of Occupational Safety and Health in our Environmental Control Administration is our base for epidemiological and diagnostic studies on coal workers' pneumoconiosis. Miners admitted to the West Virginia University Hospital at Morgantown are examined by ALFORD's physicians. In their evaluations, the investigators use the latest techniques of pulmonary function testing, vector-cardiography, cardiac catheterization, and biochemical analyses. Research is currently underway there to determine more precisely the role of environmental factors in pneumoconiosis and to develop early diagnostic techniques.

Clinical characterization of the disease and definition of physiologic impairment will be achieved by the "in-house" study of 200 miners at ALFORD. So far, 106 miners have been examined in our cardiac catheterization laboratory, and the study should be completed by 1970. Several other studies relating to causation and early diagnosis of coal workers' pneumoconiosis have been prepared by ALFORD, but have not been started because of budgetary limitations.

Scheduled to begin soon at ALFORD is an epidemiological study, called the National Study of Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis, to be made in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines, on a group of over 5,500 miners working in about 30 mines, predominantly in Appalachia. The purposes of this study are to determine the prevalence and progression of the disease and to correlate those medical aspects with dust levels in the mines.

In the course of the National Study of Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis, about 3.5 percent of the active mining population would be examined every five years for 15 years. We hope eventually to be able to examine every miner every three to five years to detect pneumoconiosis early enough to prevent progression. At this time, the only effective method of prevention of progression is to remove the miner from dusty exposures.

The United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund, as you know, provides medical care for the vast majority of coal miners. We have invited the Social Rehabilitation Service of the Department of HEW to cooperate in a study of rehabilitation services available to coal miners with pneumoconiosis. The Environmental Control Administration, meanwhile, is developing guidelines for estimating pulmonary impairment in connection with disability evaluation.

We have informed the United Mine Workers of America, the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund, the Bituminous Coal Operators of America, the Anthracite Institute, and the National Coal Association of our research plans and progress. Through one or more of these organizations, you will most probably be asked to help during the course of our studies. I feel confident you will assist us, for the knowledge we are seeking will benefit the entire coal mining industry.

Coal is our most abundant fuel resource. Right now, it supplies nearly a fourth of our total energy demand. Every forecast, whether by government or the private sector, indicates that coal must continue to play a significant role if this country's future energy requirements are to be satisfied. At the same time, it is clear that our society can no longer tolerate the cost in human life and human misery that is exacted in the mining of this essential fuel. We must find ways to eliminate that intolerable cost so that it does not limit our ability to make maximum use of this valuable resource.

The technology of coal mining, already complex and sophisticated, will become even more so in the years ahead. Government, industry, and labor must perform research to assure that safety and health features are designed into the coal mining equipment of the future—not merely built on as afterthoughts. As the industry goes into deeper and doubtless gassier seams for our fuel supplies, the safety and health of our miners will pose constantly greater challenges for technology. Environmental problems—such as subsidence and water pollution—also will become more serious, unless the ways in which we mine coal are carefully calculated to minimize them.

But we cannot wait until tomorrow to meet the urgent needs of today. With the technology now available, I am told that safety in our coal mines can be markedly improved. We know that there are specific segments of our coal mining industry that have injury and fatality rates much lower than the industry average. There is no defensible reason why the overall disease, injury and fatality rates should not be reduced dramatically.

In his recent message to the Congress on the Administration's proposed legislation President Nixon declared:

"These legislative proposals, together with other steps already taken or to be taken are essential to meet our obligation to the Nation's coal miners, and to accomplish our mission of eliminating the tragedies which have occurred in the mines.

"These proposals are not intended to replace the voluntary and enlightened efforts of management and labor to reduce coal mine hazards, which efforts are the touchstone to any successful health and safety program. Rather, these measures would expand and render uniform by enforceable authority the most advanced of the health and safety precautions undertaken and potentially available in the coal mining industry."

I urge you to continue and to expand your voluntary efforts. For I am sure you will agree with me that we can afford no more of the tragedies among coal miners in this country that have occurred in the past.

I speak not only of dramatic tragedies, such as that which occurred in Farmington, West Virginia, last November, but also of the quiet, unnoticed tragedy which occurs everytime a miner or ex-miner struggles in vain for one more breath through lungs exposed for too long to levels of coal dust which nature obviously never intended a man to breathe.

## ISRAEL'S 21ST ANNIVERSARY

### HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, this month we are celebrating the 21st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. The first 21 years in life are usually characterized as experimental, growing years—the years when, sure of being protected and sheltered, we can afford a little self-indulgence, and trial-and-error. Israel never had the luxury of such youthful years: she was born out of turbulence and had to struggle for her very existence. She could not afford any hit-or-miss efforts nor any irresponsible acts, for the odds were clearly against her. Although burdened by centuries of oppression, handicapped by waves of immigration, lack of funds, and barren wastelands, and threatened by surrounding hostile nations, Israel has triumphed over every obstacle.

The faith, courage, perseverance, and dedication of the Israeli people have transformed their centuries-old dreams and hopes into living realities. Any nation must stand in awe of the countless Israeli achievements. Through technological innovations in land irrigation and desalination, she has been able to turn arid deserts into fertile oases and farmlands. The hard work and toil of the Israeli people have generated one of the greatest economic growth rates of modern times. Cultural achievements have brought Israeli music, art, and literature to the entire world. The traditional Jewish thirst for learning and knowledge has enabled the Israeli people to provide first-class educations to the diverse people who have emigrated to Israel. And yet, while making herself strong and independent, Israel has not forgotten other new and struggling nations. To help bridge the gap between prosperous and poor nations, Israel has sent hundreds of technicians, instructors, and builders to dozens of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to share the instruments of progress.

But our respect and admiration for Israel goes far beyond her success story and her contributions in the scientific, technical, and cultural fields. Our identification with and empathy for Israel stems even more from her belief in democratic ideals which so closely parallel our own ideals. The words of Israel's Declaration of Independence are reminiscent of the words uttered by our own Founding Fathers:

". . . it will foster the development of the country for the benefit of all inhabitants; it will be based on freedom, justice, and peace; . . . it will insure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants . . . it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education, and culture; it will safeguard the holy places of all religions;

Thus, we in the United States have a deep commitment to the ideals of freedom and democracy as does Israel. As

freedom-loving peoples, we share a common destiny. We identify with the strong pioneering spirit of a people which has transformed Israel in 21 short years from a relatively poor and struggling nation into the progressive and economically strong country she is today. We especially understand her insistence that the words "can't" and "impossible" are not in the dictionary.

Israel's achievements and ideals must not be taken for granted—her victories can only be considered temporary until a meaningful and secure peace is established in the Middle East. We, in the United States, must not be indifferent to this struggle for existence and we must do everything possible to establish an equitable and lasting peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Surely we must never tolerate the loss of Israel, or any other genuine democracy, to armed aggression.

The congratulatory "Mazel Tov" is not enough—our commemoration of Israel's 21st birthday must carry with it a renewed commitment to do everything we can to bring peace to this part of the world so that the Hebrew "Shalom"—peace—can become a living and enduring reality.

## FEDERAL POLLUTION GRANTS FALL SHORT OF AUTHORIZATIONS

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years water pollution has become a subject of increasing political attention. Unfortunately, the performance of the Federal Government in the protection of our environment from the effects of water pollution has been much less impressive than its promises.

The following article from the May 23 edition of the Wausau Record Herald expresses very well the startling gap between promise and performance. I commend it to my colleagues:

FEDERAL POLLUTION GRANTS FALL SHORT OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Conservation is a popular topic of the hour and no politician is against it any more than he is against motherhood and the flag.

But what is said and what is done by our political friends are two different horses entirely.

A case in point is the federal grant program to municipalities for water pollution control.

What Congress authorized in appropriations is one horse; but what is actually appropriated isn't even a horse. For the municipalities depending upon this federal assistance program to help solve their pollution problem, it becomes a jackass and the tail is pinned on them.

Here's the frustrating story:

Fiscal 1968—$450 million authorized, $203 million appropriated.

Fiscal 1969—$700 million authorized, $214 million appropriated.

Fiscal 1970—$1 billion authorized, $214 million requested in executive budget. (Fiscal 1970 begins July 1, 1969, and ends June 30, 1970.)

Already authorized for fiscal 1971 is the grandiose sum of $1.5 billion, but what will the actual appropriation be?

The gap between what is promised and what is delivered comes to nearly $1.4 billion in the three fiscal years.

There are two glaring deficiencies which stand out like silos on a prairie.

One, of course, is that the water resources of this nation are in sad shape. The federal water pollution grant program promised to help get this deficiency remedied.

The job, to do it right, has been estimated in the $30–40 billion range, with local and federal funding sharing the cost.

Indeed, the federal program, which got under way in 1956 on a modest scale, had, as of March 31, this year, already stimulated the construction of 9,251 waste treatment plants at a total cost of $5.7 billion, the federal investment being $1.3 billion.

The other glaring deficiency has to do with municipal financing. Most cities must borrow via bonding and some have gone ahead in good faith in Uncle Sam's word that the federal grants are authorized. But then Uncle does not deliver.

Other cities, seeing the credibility gap between promises and delivery, are permitting deplorable water pollution conditions to worsen because they are reluctant to embark on waste treatment plans unless the promised federal grant is in hand.

Obviously, what is needed is less lip service to conservation and more action.

Either Congress should quit talking about cleaning up America's rivers, or else appropriate the money to get the job done.

As someone else's ironical quote puts it: "Here we are, standing knee-deep in sewage, trying to land men on the moon."

## THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1969

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we should be taking a good hard look at recent Consumer Price Index statistics. For April there was a six-tenths of 1 percent increase in the cost of living. The increase in March was even greater. Taking the last 3 months as a whole there was an increase of 7 percent on an annual rate basis. This rate of increase in the Consumer Price Index is greater than it has been at any time since 1951 when we were involved in the Korean war.

This rapid rate of inflation creates problems for every sector of our society; but I am especially concerned about the impact that it has on our senior citizens receiving social security payments. These are the people least able to protect themselves from inflation because they must live on fixed incomes. They have put in many years of hard work and upon reaching a stage in life when they should be able to enjoy retirement they find that rising costs of living put strains on the budget that make anything but the basic necessities become luxuries for them. Those recipients who have savings can rarely afford the risk of the type of investments that would return them earnings of 7 percent after taxes.

We have an obligation to raise social security benefits to a level where social security payments allow people to live decent lives free from need.

The reduction from a 10- to 7-percent increase for social security benefits that appears in the Nixon administration's budget requests does not face up to this obligation. Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee, though supporting a 10-percent increase, unfortunately does not foresee hearings on such an increase until next year. This is too long for those on social security to wait. Inflation will not wait; and social security recipients are feeling its pinch right now.

Therefore, I have joined with many of my colleagues in cosponsoring a bill to amend 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 monthly primary benefit of $80. It is estimated that these measures would move 1.4 million persons out of poverty.

I hope, in light of these new cost-of-living statistics, that there can be a reevaluation of the need for legislation updating social security payments. Inflation calls for fiscal restraints, but not restraints on those least able to sustain them.

## TRIBUTE TO SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

### HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud of the great educational institution in my congressional district, Southern Illinois University. Two great campuses, one at Carbondale and one at Edwardsville, Ill., have experienced a phenomenal growth during the past 15 years that I have served in Congress. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the University is 100 years old but 75 percent of all graduates have received their degrees during my 15-year tenure in Congress. Enrollment has climbed from a small 2,000, 15 years ago to more than 31,000 this year.

I recently had the privilege of flying to Carbondale to attend a salute to Dr. Delyte Morris, the outstanding president of this great university. Dr. Morris is ably assisted by Chancellor Robert MacVicar on the Carbondale campus, and Chancellor John Rendleman on the Edwardsville campus. They, of course, are backed up by a fine university board of trustees headed by banker Lindell W. Sturgis, Mr. F. Guy Hitt, Melvin Lockard, Dr. Martin V. Brown, Harold Fischer, and Eugene T. Simonds.

Mr. Speaker, we are all perplexed, confused, and sad by some of the student behavior and the resultant unrest on many of our college campuses. I am pleased to include under authority previously granted me to list some of the positive attempts and accomplishments Southern Illinois University and its officers have made to bridge the communications gap by involving students in

university affairs. We are all conscious that it is possible for a new wave of unrest to erupt at any time on any campus, but we are proud to report some positive achievements at Carbondale, Ill.

I want to commend and thank Dr. MacVicar for supplying me with information concerning his efforts on the Carbondale campus to bridge the communications gap by involving students in university affairs.

I hope this will be of some value to my colleagues and universities who are trying desperately to provide high quality education without disruption.

The information follows:

POSITIVE ATTEMPTS BY SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY—CARBONDALE CAMPUS—TO BRIDGE THE COMMUNICATIONS GAP BY INVOLVING STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

*Open Forum:* Sessions are conducted by Chancellor Robert W. MacVicar, the Dean of Students, and the Student Body President. These meetings are the question and answer type with no-holds-barred. Various kinds of grievances are heard.

*Student Advisory Group:* Each school or college has an advisory group of students that meets with the respective dean to consider the academic program, curriculum, student relations, and faculty matters. Furthermore, there is a student representative from each of the dean's school or college that attends the joint meeting of the deans.

*Black American Studies:* This program was initiated in the Fall of 1969 and has the support of the Chancellor's Office. It is run by black graduate students (mostly under the program and advisory committee, including black students and faculty members). The program has its own campus office with seminar and reading rooms. The courses so far include English, Anthropology, Government, History, Music, and Sociology. A minor is anticipated by the Fall quarter and there are hopes for a bachelor's degree program at a later date.

*Booklet on Student Legal Rights:* The University's Legal Counsel has been assigned to assist the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee of Student Government in the preparation of a booklet on student legal rights. The document should be ready for distribution before the end of the current academic year.

*Committee on Freedom of Expression and Dissent Within the University:* A Committee of the University Council substantially recommends to the President and the Board of Trustees the adoption of the "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students" approved in 1967 by the U.S. National Student Association of University Professors. Included are:

"The involvement of students to the fullest possible extent in rule making for student behavior and in policy formulation in academic areas."

"The encouragement of dissent within the framework of the principle that 'dissent and dissenters have no monopoly on freedom; they must tolerate opposition; they must accept dissent from dissent.'" (Quote from *Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience,* Justice Abe Fortas.

*Other Attempts to Bridge the Gap:* A proposal for a campus Ombudsman to act as a pipeline for student complaints is now before the Chancellor.

Upper class women students may now determine their own hours and sophomore women with certain grade point average may self-deliberate hours.

A new Southern Illinois University student disciplinary code and judicial review procedure is being formulated by students in conjunction with the Dean of Students.



## NONPROFIT SEACAMP IN FLORIDA KEYS UNIQUE SUMMER EXPERIENCE

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a unique nonprofit summer camp for children, located in the Florida Keys—a beautiful part of the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent.

Children from Seacamp, a marine science center, do not bring home the traditional case of poison ivy at the end of their camping stint, as do more mundane summer campers.

Instead, they may lug home a cannonball found imbedded in the timbers of an offshore sunken ship, a shell-encrusted musket, or even a piece of eight. It is all part of the curriculum at Seacamp, where the professors wear face masks, snorkels, and fins, and teach in a living underwater lab.

Seacamp is a nonprofit camp for children aged 13 to 18 located at Newfound Habor on Big Pine Key. Sessions begin on June 26 and run through the summer months.

Children need to have a keen interest in oceanography and a letter of recommendation from either their principal or science teacher in order to attend the 18-day sessions. There is tuition for room and board which includes all classes and fees with the exception of scuba lessons for which an additional fee is charged. The scuba gear is provided by the school.

Seacamp was begun in 1963 by the local Girl Scout troops but faltered when a hurricane blew away the buildings in 1966. Instructors, interested parents, and scientists from the University of Miami, got together shortly afterward and decided to make Seacamp a nonprofit marine science center for all kids interested in oceanography. The facility got off to a limited start in 1967 and has expanded each year since.

Now with permanent dorms, mess hall, lab, boats, and so forth, Seacamp takes 100 youngsters at each of the three sessions that run through the summer. The first session runs from June 26 to July 13; second, from July 15 to August 1; and the third, from August 3 to August 20. Interested youngsters from 28 States and four foreign countries have attended the Seacamp since it was reformed.

All instructors are licensed registered teachers. There are 40 staff members in all. The majority of youngsters are in the 14 to 16 age group and the boys outnumber the girls. In many cases, parents bring their youngsters to the camp and then vacation in the Keys, a plan which I wholeheartedly recommend to my colleagues.

A typical day might include a trip to a nearby reef in the morning for skindiving and collecting specimens, back for lunch, then a lab session with a scientist, or sailing, scuba instruction, or swimming until supper.

In the evening guest scientists drop in to speak to the group as did Jacques Piccard last year. They generally talk about their specialty and then allow a question and answer session afterward and when guest speakers are not lined up, campers plan their own evening social activities which include folk singing, square dances, costume parties, and so forth.

Campers taking scuba instruction can get their official certification from the Florida Skindivers Association and the Underwater Society of America, while at Seacamp.

I commend this outstanding program for the stimulation and opportunity it provides youngsters who have an interest in oceanography. This field of science is growing both in importance and development and it is extremely heartening to see the interest and abilities of these young people being harnessed in this direction.

## MEMORIAL DAY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is the ceremonial observance that links us with those brave Americans who have died in the service of their country—with those who were once our neighbors and friends.

More than any other day in the year, it links the past and the present, opening wide for a while the floodgates of memory.

There is something wrong with the man who can stand beside his fellows at Memorial Day services honoring departed comrades, and not feel a deep and abiding sense of nearness to the Unknown.

Something is terribly wrong in the soul of a man if his thoughts do not go winging back at such times to the days when those, who are our honored dead, also breathed deep of life itself.

The observance of Memorial Day has grown year by year to have a deeper, more penetrating significance in Americans' thoughts and consciousness.

John A. Logan was the originator of Memorial Day. He conceived the idea of setting aside 1 day in the year "for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country."

Logan was Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic at the time. From its headquarters in Washington, he issued the general order under date of May 5, 1868, designating the 30th day of May of that year as a time for paying reverent tribute to the departed comrades of the Grand Army.

Quite a lot of history has been written into America's pages since then, a history of service and sacrifice at home and on the foreign soil of all quarters of the globe.

Since that first observance, 101 years ago this May, Memorial Day has grown in scope and significance far beyond anything that John A. Logan or his Grand Army comrades might have anticipated.

Set aside in tribute to the fallen soldiers of the Union Army, May 30 now honors the men who fell on native soil and on foreign fields across the wide sweep of the world.

Some rest near at home; others sleep on foreign shores beyond the seas. For the memory of all of them, whatever their status in life, Memorial Day is a benediction—a humble prayer that some day the age-old prophecy will come true that all of mankind's swords will be beaten into plowshares.

That is why Memorial Day is so deeply meaningful to most of us. In its observance is the ever-strengthening hope that war may never engulf the world again. That, today, is our humble prayer.

## POSTAL REFORM: SUPPORT FOR A POSTAL CORPORATION

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard J. Willey, which I found to have been the most concisely stated and persuasive yet on the question of establishing a Postal Corporation based on the recommendations of the Kappel Commission.

Mr. Willey correctly concludes, I believe, that the Commission recommendations will serve as a focus of public education and debate, the starting point in the process of getting sensible ideas converted into public action. I joined my colleague on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee (Mr. UDALL), today in cosponsoring the Postal Service Act of 1969, because only with bipartisan support can the bipartisan issue of postal reform through the Postal Corporation concept become law.

The article, by Richard J. Willey, department of political science, Vassar College, which appeared in the spring issue of the Public Interest, follows:

TAKING THE POST OFFICE OUT OF POLITICS

(By Richard J. Willey)

A number of signs indicate that the Nixon administration will introduce legislation to the Ninety-first Congress to implement the major recommendations of the President's Commission on Postal Organization. The Commission, chaired by Frederick Kappel of AT&T, has proposed that the Post Office Department be removed from the President's Cabinet and reorganized as a nonprofit, government-owned corporation (such as TVA). A businessman's recommendation (among the ten-man Commission were six top executives of major corporations and the Dean of the Harvard Business School), it has natural appeal to a Republican administration and special appeal to Winton M. Blount, the new Postmaster General. Blount was formerly President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—an organization which surveyed its several thousand members and found that over 95 per cent endorsed the Commission proposals. The administration has already taken a first step in the direction of a nonpolitical post office by announcing the intention to sever postmaster appointments from congressional patronage.

Despite the receptivity of the Nixon administration, there is also a strong sign that the Commission proposals will run into stiff, if not fatal, opposition in Congress. Not that this is a partisan issue. The government corporation was first suggested by a Democratic Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien, in April 1967. President Johnson subsequently appointed the Kappel Commission to study the question and, in his final message to Congress in January 1969, urged "enactment of legislation along the lines recommended by the Commission." Moreover, editorial opinion across the nation has heavily supported the reorganization, and from sources as diverse as *Barron's Weekly* and the *New Republic*.

The major stumbling block is organized postal labor. The postal unions have tremendous leverage in Congress, and Congress is in the habit of constructing part-way houses when serious political opposition to any measure is aroused. Ordinarily, this kind of compromise is the very essence of democracy. It is not an answer, however, to the serious deficiencies that plague the postal operation today. For these deficiencies are unavoidable without a fundamental reorganization. They inhere in the regular-agency form under which the Post Office is now organized.

POSTAL DEFICIENCIES

The single incident most responsible for the original O'Brien proposal was the Chicago breakdown of October 1966. For several weeks, the largest postal facility in the world was in a state of near paralysis. At the height of the crisis, 10 million pieces of mail remained unprocessed and undelivered in a sixty-acre building literally choking on its own product. Not difficult to explain—inadequate equipment and management authority to handle an unexpected increase in mail volume—the breakdown is significant because the conditions that caused it prevail throughout the entire postal system. Although mail volume is ballooning—over 80 billion pieces in 1968, double that of two decades ago—equipment and management practices remain largely of pre-World War II vintage. Thus, "Chicagos" can happen again, at any time and place.

Threat of service failure is the most dramatic kind of deficiency, but by no means the only one. The Post Office continues to offer the same types of service it always has, with no effective mechanism for discerning the new needs of an ever-changing society. Perhaps postal patrons would pay extra to get guaranteed next-day delivery for urgent mail? The Post Office lacks information on this and other market demands because it has never made a comprehensive market survey—a basic tool of consumer-oriented private companies. Neglect of new services not only leaves the public with unmet mailing needs, but deprives the Post Office of badly needed revenues.

The failure to modernize affects personnel as well as service. With over 700,000 employees, the Post Office has one of the largest work forces in the nation. Yet it does little to fulfill what should be a basic employer responsibility today—providing opportunity for the energetic and talented to get ahead. Because a primitive organization of "production" requires little gradation of skill, four-fifths of postal employees retire at the same grade at which they were hired. In many industries in the private sector (which have no edge on the Post Office in suitability for mechanization and new techniques), the ratio is just the reverse: only about 20 per cent retire at entrance grade. Moreover, the top job in every office—that of postmaster—has traditionally been a political appointment, usually filled from outside the career service. Consequently, politics influences career decisions in the supposedly merit ranks as well. It is not atypical, for example, for a nod from the local party committee to be the decisive factor in promotion to supervisor, nor for disciplinary action against an employee with the right connections to be quietly dropped.

The physical environment in which employees work is often appalling. Most big-city post offices were built before World War II for much less mail and fewer workers. During peak hours, their mail-processing floors look like Hollywood caricatures of the nineteenth-century factory system. Crowding, dirt, poor light, inadequate heat and ventilation, too few lockers and rest rooms—these are not exceptional conditions, but the rule.

The inefficiency of the postal operation can be substantiated with a single statistic. Whereas the productivity of the average American worker has been increasing at an annual rate of about 3.2 per cent, that of the postal employee has averaged less than a tenth as much in the last decade—0.23 per cent per year. Stagnant productivity has resulted in ever-increasing charges to mail users: the cost of a first-class stamp has doubled since 1958. But still the post office does not break even. In 1967, as a result of the largest deficit ever (about one fifth of total costs), it consumed $1.2 billion of the taxpayer's money.

Other deficiencies can be mentioned: widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of everyday mail service, a highly authoritarian mode of supervising postal employees, a rate structure that allows many mail users to avoid paying what the Post Office ascertains to be full costs. Altogether, they portray a U.S. Post Office that is threatened by large-scale breakdowns, satisfies neither its customers nor employees, and drains the public treasury of funds urgently needed for other purposes. One can only conclude that it is an organization badly in need of strong corrective action.

THE GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

The Commission found the root cause of postal deficiencies to be the fact that, as a regular governmental agency, the Post Office was too deeply involved in the political process to be managed in a fashion appropriate to its essentially business nature. What was needed was an organizational form that would give postal management the same kinds of decision-making freedom enjoyed in a more efficiently run private sector.

At first, many commissioners even spoke of private ownership as the most desirable solution. Although the long tradition of a government post office was a deterrent to this recommendation, the primary obstacle became the simple question: in its present state, who on earth would buy the Post Office? The government corporation of the O'Brien proposal provided a neat combination of public ownership with many of the management freedoms of the private sector. On the latter point, Harry Truman said in his 1948 budget message:

"Experience indicates that the corporate form of organization is peculiarly adapted to the administration of governmental programs which are predominantly of a commercial character . . . [its usefulness] lies in its ability to deal with the public in the manner employed by private business for similar work."

And the Commission had the example of TVA to draw from, with its world-renowned record of successful management under the government-corporation form.

Of course, TVA began as a government corporation. Changing the organizational form of such a vast and long-established institution as the Post Office, as Commissioner George Meany observed in a footnote to the report, is not a step to be taken lightly. The critical question is whether reforms can be made to allow business-type management without a complete reorganization. The Commission concluded that piecemeal changes would not suffice. Their judgment can be buttressed by

showing that *any* regular agency cannot be run in the fashion of a business (and quite properly so). The kind of deficiencies which the Commission observed in the Post Office are inherent in the regular agency form. Thus, postal deficiencies can only be overcome with reorganization—or with so many piecemeal reforms that the Post Office would become in fact, if not in name, akin to a government corporation. Showing postal deficiencies as intrinsically a part of organizational form has the additional merit of removing any suspicion that individuals—whether postal officials or congressmen—are somehow to blame rather than the system.

REGULAR AGENCIES AND BUSINESS OPERATION

The criteria for business as opposed to regular-agency decision-making are clearly incompatible. The businessman is concerned first and foremost with economy: for both saleability and profit, any given quality of product must be turned out at least cost. When personnel appointments are made, it is on the basis of expertise in this endeavor. In the ideal, this is an enormously beneficial process for society. It ensures the efficient expenditure of economic resources, always relatively scarce, whereas governmental regulation exists to prevent the exaction of too great a social price.

In contrast, the most important regular-agency decisions are made in Congress and the Executive Branch by individuals who must look to political as well as economic criteria. First consideration must be given to the welfare of the nation as a whole, even though the economic cost be great. In a democratic system, the differing interests of groups and individuals must also be represented, frequently with very inefficient results from an economic point of view. One need only look at the loopholes of tax legislation for vivid testimony to this point. Finally, because partisan loyalty is often at least as important as expertise in the administration of public policy, many regular-agency personnel appointments remain in the political realm.

In short, regular agencies cannot be run in the fashion of businesses because the national, group, and partisan interests often take precedence over questions of economy and expertise. Applying this general conclusion to the Post Office, we find that it explains—as a good theory should—the most important relationships that the Commission found between postal deficiencies and present organizational realities. Three of these realities of greatest consequence are the investment process, Congressional management, and political appointments.

POSTAL INVESTMENT

Because the Post Office is a regular agency, research, facilities, and equipment are financed through the normal governmental budgetary and appropriations process. Investment in these areas makes the finest kind of economic sense for the Post Office. Just to give one example: a letter-sorting machine can pay for itself in little over one year. A million dollar investment in such machinery means that, every year after the first, a million dollars is saved in the cost of postal operations. Yet letter-sorting machines are found in only thirty-nine post offices!

The paucity of these machines is but one indication that the entire postal system is undercapitalized. O'Brien estimated in 1967 that a billion dollars a year for five years would be needed to make up the insufficiency. The result of underinvestment, naturally, is the stagnant productivity and inefficiency that now characterize the postal operation.

Why the lack of investment? Under the normal governmental process, final decisions on finance are made by the Bureau of the Budget and Congress, not by postal officials. In a time of inflation, of pressure abroad on the dollar, of the political need to balance a tax bill with reduced government spending, where do these officials look to cut? There is no easier place than in the area of capital investment. It fills no immediate need; it is demanded by no powerful groups. Budget officials and congressmen, on the other hand, are under desperate pressures to reduce spending. They cannot help but grasp any opportunities that the system grants.

A perfect illustration is the budget for 1969. The Post Office began with a request for $507 million for plant and equipment. This was pared down to $313 million by the Bureau of the Budget and to $250 million by Congress—less than one half the original request. Ironically, Congress approved at the same time a $228 million increase over the last year's appropriation for postal operations (almost wholly personnel costs). A similarly large increase must be approved every year for the simple reason that if increased mail volume is not handled through capital investment, the number of employees must be increased instead—a cost, unlike investment, with no potential for savings and one that has to be borne every year thereafter.

In this manner, uneconomic and wholly irrational financial decisions are forced on the Post Office by a system that (rightly, from its point of view) places the national interest in immediately reduced spending ahead of postal investment. The answer is not to subordinate the national interest to postal modernization, but to take the Post Office out of the system. If it were a government corporation, it could follow the pattern of TVA and borrow the funds needed for modernization from the private capital market. As long as investment made economic sense, interest charges would provide no obstacle.

CONGRESSIONAL MANAGEMENT AND GROUP INTERESTS

Congressmen are in truth the top managers of the Post Office. As well as appropriating its funds, they make the final decisions on rates (and therefore determine revenues), wages (which account for four fifths of postal costs), and a large number of operating procedures. Like the managers of any enterprise, they have the responsibility to treat with parties affected by their decisions, most importantly, organized labor and the large mail users. But there is a fundamental incongruity here.

A more basic responsibility of congressmen is to represent in the political sphere these very same groups, parts of their constituencies. In fact, these groups have often had considerable influence in getting congressmen into office in the first place. The postal unions, for example, among the strongest in the country, have been generous contributors of time and money to campaigns. (Where the Hatch Act forbids campaign activities to postal employees, their wives, organized into trade-union auxiliary associations, have taken over.) The nation's press, a major user of the mails, has an intimate link with politics through its ability to influence public opinion. How can congressmen, then, deal with these groups as would the managers of an economic enterprise? The effects of this impossible situation are everywhere in evidence:

Although the Postal Policy Act of 1958 enjoins Congress periodically to adjust the rates of nonpublic-service categories of mail to cover costs, the Post Office calculated—prior to the 1967 rate bill—that regular second-class mail, mainly mass-circulation magazines, newspapers, and business publications, covered only 29 per cent of costs (estimated loss in 1967, $236 million) and regular third-class mail, mainly advertising, covered only 67 per cent of costs (estimated loss, $309 million).[1]

Congress passed a pay increase for postal workers in 1967, despite the great pressure to reduce spending that led to the slash in capital investment. This increase was both larger than that for other civil servants and larger than the President recommended (estimated cost, about $60 million for 1968 and $160 million for 1969).

The number of restrictive operating procedures forced on the Post Office as a result of group pressures on Congress is legion. For instance, in order to lessen competition from the Post Office, private express companies worked for the passage of legislation in 1951 that prohibited parcels of certain sizes from being sent through the mails. A union-inspired statute requires that mail be transported by postal employees where an airport is thirty-five miles or less from a city, even though private carriers under contract to the Post Office are covering similar ground. These same private carriers have fought legislation, wanted by the Post Office since 1958, that would enable the shipment of mail via highway common carriers to supplement the contract service based on competitive bidding it now must use.

Although congressional decisions such as these have contributed markedly to postal deficiencies, the blame cannot be placed on individual congressmen nor congresses. To interpret such decisions as a knuckling under to powerful groups entirely misconstrues the nature of the political process. Representing the interests of constituents is a vital job of congressmen, and political pressure and its consequent give and take is what democracy is all about. If uneconomic decisions on postal matters are to be avoided, the answer is to remove the Post Office from a system that requires business decisions from men who have to be responsive politically.

With the Post Office reorganized as a government corporation, congressmen would become general overseers without detailed decision-making involvement in rates, wages, and operating procedures. Annual review of corporation budgets by Congress is provided for in the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945. In practice, this device has given congressmen ample opportunity to influence important issues of policy that have arisen. Business-type decisions for a postal corporation, however, would be made by professional management and a Board of Directors appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

In the sensitive area of rates, the Commission has recommended that a small panel of expert rate commissioners, independent of the professional operating management of the corporation, hear the views of interested parties, assess postal needs, and advise the board as to the merits of changes proposed by management. It would be the responsibility of the board to protect the public interest, but Congress would also have a reserve power in this respect: it could veto a rate action within sixty days. This procedure was preferred to the creation of an independent agency, like the FCC, to regulate postal rates, because it avoided the anomaly of one governmental body regulating another as well as the proliferation of bureaucracy. Congress would be much less susceptible to group pressures on a veto than when directly setting rates itself. For a veto to succeed, a determined majority would be needed for action.

The Commission has recommended that wages be determined through collective bargaining between unions and the postal corporation, with continuation of the present prohibition against strikes by federal employees. Impasses would be settled by voluntary and binding arbitration, perhaps using the standard of comparability with private industry, or—if that course did not produce settlement—by a suitable mechanism determined on an *ad hoc* basis by the President, as railroad disputes have been settled in the past.

[1] If the Post Office used a business-type cost ascertainment system, these figures might very well be different. But this does not deny that on the basis of the only information available, Congress has set below-cost rates.

Postal union leaders, strangers to collective bargaining, naturally resent the rupture of their accustomed relationship with Congress, and the remembrance of Presidential involvement in the rail disputes is not a particularly pleasant one. Yet this recommendation still seems the least unattractive of the alternatives. The present relationship between the unions and Congress is an unnatural one for a business enterprise, and there would be some motivation to settle disputes without drawing in the President because neither side could be certain as to the mechanism he would choose. In any case, arbitration, whether through a panel chosen by the two sides or by the President, seems the most sensible way to settle labor conflicts today in an industry essential to the national welfare.

POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS

Business firms usually appoint top managers on the basis of expertise and wide experience, either within their own or related organizations. Only once in modern history, however, has the President appointed a man to head the Post Office who has been an experienced postal manager (Jesse Donaldson under Truman in 1947). Typically, the Postmaster General has been a top party man, more important to the President as a manager of political affairs than of the Post Office. Naturally, he picks up some experience of postal matters over time, but this tends to be of short-lived usefulness. These top managers of the Post Office generally leave after only two or three years in office.

The field managers of the postal system—the several thousand postmasters across the land—are also appointed by the President, although in the past the decision has actually been made informally by the congressman in whose district the post office is located. (If the congressman is not of the President's party, the "adviser" becomes some other state or local political figure.) As a result, only about one third of postmasters appointed in this decade have been career employees, and even these did not always include the best qualified from a management point of view: there have been cases of clerks or carriers appointed over the heads of supervisors. Thus, more often than not, that man on the supervisory staff of a post office with the most advantageous experience and greatest ability does not get the number one slot. Nor can a man who performs admirably as the postmaster of a small town ever be transferred to the more demanding position of postmaster in a large city, because of the residency requirement of political appointment.

Political appointments in the Post Office result in the strangest sort of chain-of-command for a business enterprise. Because postmasters are appointed for life and in most cases owe their positions not to postal management but to a place in the political scheme, local post offices can exist as islands unto themselves. This makes it most difficult for the Post Office to "manage" its operations in the true sense of the word. Within headquarters in Washington, political appointments also contribute to a fragmented structure. Each bureau is headed by a Presidential appointee who often has a power base independent of the Postmaster General.

The Commission has recommended that, with corporation form, postmaster appointments be taken out of politics. A nine-man board of directors would be made up of six part-time members appointed by the President and three full-time officers (including the counterpart to the present Postmaster General—a Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board) named in turn by the Presidential appointees and responsible to them for the management of the Post Office.

Having these most important full-time officers appointed outside the political sphere represents a departure from normal government-corporation practice. It embodies the strong Commission feeling that what a successful Post Office needs is professional management, and management that could be released without a political row if it failed to perform. To attract the most talented managers, the Commission has also recommended that full-time officers be paid salaries competitive with private industry—and this would mean higher than the salaries now received by congressmen, Supreme Court justices, and members of the President's Cabinet. The justification is that without the prestige and power that accrue to these latter positions, financial incentive would be needed to induce the best people to leave private industry (although the challenge of making the Post Office work might intrigue the more daring.)

THE POST OFFICE: A BUSINESS?

The burden of the argument to this point has been to show that the Post Office is seriously deficient in many respects and that these deficiencies cannot be overcome without reorganizing for a business type of operation. The key question remaining to be explored, however, is one of value rather than fact: *should* the Post Office be run as a business? The Commission thinks so, but its background—predominantly in private enterprise—hardly makes this judgment surprising. If the Commission is mistaken and the Post Office does not perform essentially a business function, then regular-agency form is the right one, despite inherent deficiencies. In fact, many supposed deficiencies take on a different light when seen from a nonbusinessman's point of view. Billion-dollar "deficits," for example, are accepted features of most regular agencies, and political appointments make sense when there are politically sensitive policies to administer.

Does a crucial distinction exist, then, between the Post Office and normal agencies of government? If it is proper that the most important decisions for regular agencies be made in Congress and the Executive Branch, according to other than strictly economic criteria, why should the Post Office under a different form be allowed more business-type freedoms?

The answer has to be that the Post Office receives a payment from the recipients of its service and is potentially self-supporting. Although almost all regular agencies have to be financed wholly through tax revenues, only a small part of postal costs—averaging 15 per cent over the years—has to be covered in this way. At times in the past, the Post Office has even operated in the black. The need for tax revenues explains political controls and the consequent measure of economic inefficiency built into all regular agencies. Because tax revenues come from the people and belong to the nation as a whole, they must be expended in the best national interest and, in a democracy, as the people dictate through their representatives. But the converse is then true for the Post Office, which does not necessarily require tax revenues.

If the Post Office had always been completely self-supporting, and had never been used for the kind of public policy program financed through tax revenues, it would be difficult to object to this line of reasoning. As it is, however, arguments based on these grounds do have to be answered.

THE DEFICIT AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

Because a portion of tax revenues has been needed in most years to cover a deficit, one could argue that the Post Office should be controlled in the same political fashion as any other agency spending the people's money. The flaw in this argument is that the postal deficit is brought on by the very organizational form it is used to justify. Change that form to eliminate inherent deficiencies and no more deficit! The Commission estimates that, in time, a minimum of 20 per cent of present costs could be saved with the more business-oriented operation it recommends. If those savings had been effected in 1967, the deficit would have been erased, and with no rate increase.

Another argument sees mail communication as so indispensable to the general welfare of the country that the Post Office should receive at least some financial support from tax revenues (whose expenditure, of course, would require regular-agency political controls). Congress shared in this philosophy when, in the Postal Policy Act of 1958, it determined that a percentage of the costs of rural operations should be paid out of tax revenues, on the assumption that rural services were unprofitable but had to be maintained for the public good.

Functioning for the public good, however, cannot be the sole criterion for tax support and regular-agency status. Otherwise, most of society would be so organized. A whole host of organizations are indispensable to the national welfare and are not regular agencies—in the private sector, for example, telephone companies, electric utilities, the entire system for the provision of foodstuffs. Further, to think that a tax subsidy should be paid for rural service is to misunderstand the nature of the postal enterprise. Providing nationwide coverage is just as much a service to urban as to rural America. Who benefits when an urban business sends a catalogue to the country, or when young people who have moved to the city receive a letter from home? The costs of nationwide coverage cannot be separated into urban and rural components, but must be borne by the system as a whole.

A corollary to the general welfare argument is that tax support permits low rates, thereby stimulating commerce and the dissemination of information. Many publications and direct mail advertisers even claim that to pay what the Post Office ascertains to be full costs would drive them out of business. This might not upset too many people with regard to advertising in the mail, but some of the highest quality magazines and journals are financially very marginal operations, and the widest possible dissemination of the press is vital to the democratic process. Does tax support really permit low rates, however? Pointing to the steadily climbing rates of past years, one could argue that the inefficiencies resulting from the regular-agency form more than cancel out any beneficial effects of tax support. A better way to maintain low rates for all types of mail would be through a more business-like operation. Moreover, the Post Office now allocates its very extensive (almost half) fixed or institutional costs proportionately among all classes of mail in determining rates. A business-like operation would realize that having marginal users pay only a small share of fixed costs would be more profitable for the Post Office than driving them out of business. Thus publications and other "below-cost" commercial mailers are likely to fare better in the long run under corporate form than with the present system, and will escape at the same time any charge of "subsidy."

SUBSIDIES

Congress might wish, however, to continue subsidies through preferential rates to certain types of mail user, such as educational institutions, religious orders, and other nonprofit organizations. No different from any other public policy program, one could maintain that such subsidies should properly be funded from tax revenues.

Yes, they should—properly. But if the objective of an efficient Post Office is to be achieved, at this point a compromise with logic may be desirable. At present, the cost of this kind of subsidy calculated by the Commission according to economic standards, is less than 4 per cent of total postal costs. It is reasonable that such a small percentage should justify an organizational

form that costs the Post Office so much more through inherent inefficiencies?

To avoid this anomaly, the Commission has recommended that the postal corporation itself cover the 4 per cent subsidy, with the proviso that the subsidy be kept within the general range of that figure. The corporation would thus be paying a kind of income tax, such as those assumed by private and even other government corporations. TVA, for example, makes a contribution in lieu of taxes to states and localities, in its area of operation, of 5 per cent of gross power proceeds (excluding sales to the U.S. government). Of course, mail users would eventually end up paying the costs through postal rates. Because the mails are so generally used by the public, however, and in rough proportion to income, this method would not differ greatly from the present method of the general public paying the costs through taxes. The significant difference is that the Post Office would not have to go to Congress for any funds at all.

EMPLOYER OF LAST RESORT?

The postal corporation would not be able, however, to cover by itself the costs of one major kind of public policy program advocated for the Post Office: that it be used to provide jobs for surplus labor, a vast employer of last resort. It might deliberately be kept inefficient in order to employ greater numbers (as it does unintentionally today), or it might be used to provide additional labor-consuming services which really are not needed. Daniel P. Moynihan has suggested, for example, the creation of 50,000 jobs by reinstituting two mail deliveries per day in residential areas—a service, it seems, most of the nation has gotten along well enough without.

If there were no other jobs in the nation that needed to be done, one might agree with this line of reasoning. Every able-bodied citizen should be able to work. But there are slums to be cleared, children to be taught streets to be policed, sick people to be cared for. With so many tasks waiting to be done, the Post Office does not need to be used in what would be a highly demoralizing, make-work fashion. What is needed, instead, to fund some of these urgent tasks is the $1.2 billion in tax revenues now squandered on an inefficient postal operation.

PROSPECTS

Because the Post Office has the potential to be self-supporting and because its public policy functions are relatively unimportant compared to the advantages of a more efficient operation, the Post Office can be considered essentially a business enterprise. There is nothing in the nature of what it does to prevent conversion to a government corporation. On the contrary, this is impelled by the serious deficiencies in the postal operation that are unavoidable with regular-agency form. Despite the reasonableness of the case for reorganization, however, prospects for implementing legislation in the near future do not look particularly bright.

Traditionally, Congress has been a defensive, conservative body, requiring a great deal of pressure to secure action and very much less to stop it, and the influential postal unions are generally hostile to the Commission recommendations. Endorsed by only one of the twelve postal employee organizations (General Services and Maintenance Employees), the recommendations have been savagely attacked by the letter carriers, the largest and most powerful union of them all. Their president sees the corporation proposal as "the most serious situation that has arisen in the Postal Establishment in the past century" and has called upon all postal unions to mount a "militant offensive" against it.

The grounds for union hostility are not difficult to discern. The promise of improved career opportunities and better working conditions for employees has not been enough to motivate union leaders to exchange their special relationship with Congress ("the best and most consistent friend we have ever had") for collective bargaining in which the leaders are inexperienced. Nor can the rank and file be won over against a relationship that produces tangible rewards in the important bread-and-butter issues (in the nation as a whole, postal wages and benefits are above those of such industries as general manufacturing and telephone communication). Moreover, no matter how evident it may be that present postal employees will not lose their jobs, organized postal labor will tend not to look favorably on a reorganization that can only increase productivity by retarding growth in employment.

Union hostility might be enough by itself to head off reorganization. As it is, significant bases for opposition also exist within Congress. The campaigns of many congressmen benefit from contributions, in time and money, from organized postal labor. If congressmen no longer made decisions about wages and operating procedures, there would be no grounds for such assistance. Those congressmen, too, who have seniority in the committees and appropriations subcommittees concerned with postal affairs will not want to see their bases of power swept away. And many congressmen have been able to use postal patronage to their political advantage back home. Despite the introduction of a number of bills to take postmaster appointments out of politics, one has yet to pass the House.

In addition to these grounds for individual opposition, Congress as a whole has not been moved by some of the more compelling arguments for reorganization. One argument, outside the postal sphere altogether, is that relief from the minutiae of routine business management will allow congressmen more time to master the truly important complexities of governmental concern today. The failure to keep up with the technical expertise of the Executive Branch has meant a drift of power away from Congress in today's complicated world. But most congressmen do not feel that postal matters take up an inordinate amount of time. In fact, some are probably glad to have a subject to grapple with that appears familiar and easily comprehensible. There has also been no indication of alarm about the postal deficit, only a drop among other tens of billions being spent. And Congress generally still retains the feeling that its guardianship is demanded over an industry so important to the national welfare and that its ministrations result in lower rates and better service rather than the reverse.

Congress does sense the need for some change in the Post Office. The Commission Report and editorial response have at least created this awareness. But the reaction has been the traditional seeking of a happy medium. For example, the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Thaddeus J. Dulski, introduced in January a comprehensive Postal Reform Act (H.R. 4) which, among other things, would take postal investment out of the normal budgetary and appropriations process. Yet, the bill would still allow congressional control over wages, and thus 80 percent of postal costs; it would still necessitate congressional appropriations to make up deficits (for the Post Office in the bill is not envisaged as self-supporting); Congress would still be very substantially involved in rate-setting; postmasters would still be appointed by the President, and because of a residence requirement, talented postmasters could not be transferred to more demanding offices; in fact, the bill would retain almost the entire panoply of fragmentation and political responsiveness in management that has made the Post Office in the past such a failure as an economic enterprise.

Piecemeal reform will not suffice to remove deficiencies that inhere in regular-agency form, nor will the habit—fashioned over a century and a half—of thinking and acting in terms of a political post office ever be modified except by a dramatic break with the past. The principal beneficiary of reorganization, however, the mail-using, tax-paying general public, has not yet been stirred to make the kind of general outcry that alone will move Congress in the face of opposition. The outlook, therefore, is for the Post Office (in the words of the Commission describing the price of inaction) "to jog along in its rickety fashion for years before it collapses." The collapse might well come in the form of another Chicago-type breakdown, or a series of them, which would finally stimulate public outrage and congressional action. In the meantime, the Commission recommendations will serve as a focus of public education and debate, the starting point in the long and painstaking process of getting sensible ideas converted into public action.

---

## BALTIMORE MAGAZINE SALES COMPANY NAMED IN NEW JERSEY LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DECEPTIVE SALES PRACTICES

---

### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that the State of New Jersey yesterday initiated court proceedings to seek an injunction against deceptive sales practices of the International Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., a Baltimore-based magazine subscription sales company.

Acting on the complaints of 19 New Jersey consumers, Deputy Attorney General Douglas J. Harper of New Jersey, filed the formal complaint in superior court in Warren County.

The deceptive and fraudulent practices which I have repeatedly stated in this Chamber are being used to dupe American consumers into costly and unwanted magazine subscription purchases are the same practices described in the complaint filed against International Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc.

Offers of free magazines, misrepresented or unstated contract terms, representations that reader interest surveys are being conducted, representations that the consumer is a winner or eligible to win substantial prizes in a contest—practices named in the New Jersey complaint—are typical of the sales practices being utilized by International Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic and numerous other magazine subscription sales companies all across the country.

Consumer fraud of this or any other kind must be stamped out where it thrives, where it profits, and where it seeks to conceal itself—in interstate commerce. Decisive Federal Government action, either by the Federal Trade Commission or by Congress, can stamp out this kind of consumer fraud.

The sales abuses identified in New Jersey are not merely isolated instances of misrepresentation which can be traced to one or two unscrupulous sales personnel. They are but one small bit of a vast pattern of fraud which typifies the sales tactics of a number of multimillion-dollar magazine subscription sales operations owned by or affiliated with some of the best known publishing houses in the Nation.

I want to point out that this action by the New Jersey attorney general and other legal proceedings begun by the attorney general of Pennsylvania against magazine subscription sales abuses are the direct result of attention focused on deceptive and fraudulent practices by the Easton, Pa., Express newspaper's public service column, "Action! Express."

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, many of whom are contacting my office for information regarding magazine sales abuses, I insert in the RECORD a copy of the complaint filed in the Superior Court of New Jersey yesterday.

ARTHUR J. SILLS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY, PLAINTIFF, *v.* INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE SERVICE, A CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, DEFENDANT

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY, CHANCERY DIVISION, WARREN COUNTY, DOCKET NO. — CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Arthur J. Sills, Attorney General of New Jersey who resides at 1100 Raymond Boulevard, Room 504 Newark, New Jersey states as follows:

*Count I*

1. The Attorney General is charged with the responsibility of administering the N.J. Consumer Protection Act N.J.S.A. 56:8–1 *et seq.*

2. Defendant, International Magazine Service is a Delaware Corporation engaging in the business of soliciting magazine subscriptions within the State of New Jersey. Said defendant is not registered with the Secretary of State as a non-resident corporation doing business in New Jersey.

3. Defendant, through its agents and employees, Stanley Bernstein, Frank Gigliotti and Harry Stubbs and through sub-employees of the stated individuals, actively solicits the purchase of subscriptions to magazines and periodicals from the residents of the State of New Jersey.

4. Between the dates of August 28, 1967 and the present defendant, through its agents and employees, solicited magazine subscriptions from those New Jersey consumers set forth in Schedule A. Said schedule is attached to and made a part of this complaint. Said solicitations resulted in the execution of written contracts obligating New Jersey consumers to purchase subscriptions in diverse magazines and other periodical publications.

5. Said solicitations were initiated through telephone inquiries made by defendant's agents and employees wherein the stated consumers were led to believe by representations made by defendant's agents and employees that free magazine subscriptions were available to them.

6. As a result of said representations the stated consumers allowed defendant to visit their private homes.

7. While in the homes of the stated New Jersey consumers defendant through its agents and employees actively employed certain unlawful sales solicitation practices. Said unlawful practices included, but are not limited to the following:

(A) Representations that subscriptions to certain periodicals were free when in fact the total contract prices paid were substantially equivalent to or greater than direct subscription prices with the publishers of the individual magazines subscribed to.

(B) Representations that monthly payments were to be certain stated amounts and for certain stated durations where in fact upon receipt of payment booklets both the amount and duration were materially different from the terms verbally represented by defendant through its agents and employees.

Said representations made in the course of soliciting the purchase of merchandise constitutes the use and employment of false promises, false pretenses, deception and misrepresentation all in violation of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2.

*Count II*

1. Plaintiff repeats and reiterates each and every allegation of the first count of the complaint as if the same were recited herein at length or incorporated herein by reference.

2. During both the above stated dates and at present defendant through its agents and employees employ a sales technique known as the "International Hotline."

3. Said sales technique is initiated by a telephone call to a prospective customer wherein it is represented that the customer "may" win a color television set, an all expense vacation to Hawaii or Puerto Rico, a new Mustang convertible, "plus hundreds of other prizes". Final selection of winners is indicated as being by "random drawing."

4. As a condition for the customer's winning any of the above stated prizes the consumer is requested to give his name and address.

5. In addition to the solicitation of the consumers name and address, a request is made that the consumers "without obligation" assist defendant International Magazine Service in its "readership inquiry" by naming two magazines which are presently not subscribed to by the consumer.

6. At no point in the sales technique is it revealed to the consumer that International Magazine Service is soliciting or is about to solicit magazine subscriptions from the consumer.

7. In those cases where names and addresses are given, defendant dispatches sales personnel to the homes of consumer for the express purpose of soliciting subscription contracts. Said solicitations are made within several hours after the inquiry from "International Hotline" and are directly related to the representations contained therein.

8. Defendant's use of the above stated sales technique constitutes the use and employment of false pretense, misrepresentation and deception in violation of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2 in that said technique is in fact a reuse employed for the single purpose of gaining entry into the private residences of the consuming public for the purpose of inducing subscription contracts.

*Count III*

1. Plaintiff repeats and reiterates each and every allegation of the first and second counts of the complaint as if the same were recited herein at length or incorporated herein by reference.

2. In the course of soliciting the contracts with those consumers set forth in the schedule annexed hereto and made a part hereof, defendant through its agents and employees, represented the total dollar obligations under the stated contracts in terms of monthly payments.

3. Defendant at no time in the course of soliciting the stated contracts revealed the total obligations owing from the stated consumers in terms of the total dollars due and owing for the subscriptions contracted for.

4. Defendant's failure to clearly state the total dollar obligations embodied in the stated contracts prior to the executing thereof constitutes the knowing concealment; suppression and omission of a material fact relating to the stated sales transactions with the intent that the stated consumers rely upon such concealment, suppression and omission, all in violation of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2.

Wherefore, Plaintiff demands the following:

1. An order enjoining defendant from engaging in the use and/or employment of those specific acts and practices herein alleged and found to be violative of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2.

2. An order enjoining defendant, International Magazine Service, from engaging in business in the State of New Jersey until such time that said defendant secures the certificate of authority required of non-resident corporations by N.J.S.A. 14:15–3.

3. An order in accordance with N.J.S.A. 56:8–8 rescinding the contracts executed by those consumers set forth in the attached schedule and directing defendant to return any and all monies and property to those consumers set forth in the annexed schedule where such monies have been acquired by practices herein alleged and found to be prescribed by N.J.S.A. 56:8–2.

4. An order pursuant to N.J.S.A. 56:8–13 assessing monetary penalties in the amount of $100 for each transaction found to be violative of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2.

ARTHUR J. SILLS,
*Attorney General of New Jersey.*
(By) DOUGLAS J. HARPER,
*Deputy Attorney General.*

SCHEDULE "A"

CONSUMER'S NAME AND ADDRESS

Mrs. Sandra L. Berger, Greenwich Street, Stewartsville, N.J.

Alice C. Claxton, Washington Street, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Mrs. Claire Conway, 267 W. Warren Street, Washington, N.J.

Mrs. Francis Faltinosky, Box 36, Route 2, Milford, N.J.

Mrs. Nancy Gouger, Route 1, Box 298, Stewartsville, N.J.

Mrs. Melva J. Lewis, 60 New Jersey Avenue, Blackwood, N.J.

Mrs. Olga Mohr, 106 North Riverview Road, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Mrs. Harold Parry, 159 Belt Road, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Miss Kathleen Penna, 749 Linden Avenue, Elizabeth, N.J.

Mrs. Virginia Pursell, 774½ South Main Street, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Mrs. Elmer Ramsey, 103 Fairview Avenue, High Bridge, N.J.

Mrs. Grace Rossi, 562 Roseberry Street, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Mrs. Rodger L. Smith, 228–6th Street, Morris Park, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Mrs. Martin Stoken, 5 Henshaw Court, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Mrs. Arlene Taylor, 137 Cedar Alley, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Raymond Usignol, 1536 Good Intent Road, Deptford, N.J.

Sarah Wene, 314 Somerset St., Alpha, N.J.

Stella Young, R.D. #2, Box 382, Phillipsburg, N.J.

Josephine Yukna, 776½ So. Main Street, Phillipsburg, N.J.

ARTHUR J. SILLS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY, PLAINTIFF, *v.* INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE SERVICE, A CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, DEFENDANT.

AFFIDAVIT OF VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
*County of Essex, ss:*

Douglas J. Harper being duly sworn according to law deposes and says:

1. I am a Deputy Attorney General of the State of New Jersey and discharge my duties as co-counsel to the N.J. Office of Consumer Protection.

2. The Attorney General of New Jersey is charged with the responsibility of administering the New Jersey Consumer Protection Act, N.J.S.A. 56:6–1 *et seq.*

3. In accordance with the above-stated directive, the Office of Consumer Protection exists within the Department of Law and Public Safety.

4. I have read the complaint filed herewith and the facts stated therein are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Said facts are taken from the investigative files of the New Jersey Office of Consumer Protection.

5. Given the truth of said facts it appears to me that the defendant named in the complaint herein has engaged in and is presently engaging in acts violative of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2.

ARTHUR J. SILLS,
*Attorney General of New Jersey.*

By DOUGLAS J. HARPER,
*Deputy Attorney General.*

---

ARTHUR J. SILLS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY, PLAINTIFF, *v.* INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE SERVICE, A CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, DEFENDANT

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY, CHANCERY DIVISION, WARREN COUNTY, DOCKET NO. — CIVIL ACTION: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter being opened to the Court by Arthur J. Sills, Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, Plaintiff, by Douglas J. Harper, Deputy Attorney General attorney for Plaintiff and it appearing to the Court upon a reading of the duly verified Complaint that the defendant is in violation of N.J.S.A. 56:8–2 in that he did perform certain acts contrary to the above stated statutory Section, to wit:

a. Representations that subscriptions to certain periodicals were free when in fact the total contract prices paid were substantially equivalent to or greater than direct subscription prices with the publishers of the individual magazines subscribed to.

b. Representations that monthly payments were to be certain stated amounts and for certain stated durations where in fact upon receipt of payment booklets both the amount and duration were materially different from the terms verbally represented by defendant though its agents and employees.

c. The use and employment of a sales practice wherein the total dollar obligation arising out of the contract obligating said consumers is not revealed in clear and express terms prior to the execution of said contracts.

It is on this — day of ——, 1969 ordered that the defendant show cause before the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Warren County, in the Morris County Courthouse, (Judge Alexander P. Waugh) Morristown, New Jersey on the — day of ——, 1969 at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard why an interlocutory injunction prohibiting defendant from engaging in the above stated acts should not be granted pending final disposition of plaintiff's claim for the relief set forth in the Complaint to be served herewith.

It is further ordered that a copy of this Order to Show Cause and of the Complaint and affidavits annexed thereto, all certified to be true copies by Deputy Attorney General Douglas J. Harper, be served on the defendant within ( ) days from the date hereof by personally serving the said certified copy of the Complaint, affidavits and Order as provided by the rules of Court.

ALEXANDER P. WAUGH, J.S.C.

## MONEY FOR MASS TRANSIT—LET US GET MOVING

---

## HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the transportation situation in our cities demands prompt Federal action to help cities and States build modern mass transportation systems to meet tomorrow's needs.

The fact of the matter is that there is just not enough Federal money available for mass transit programs. When you consider that $37 of Federal money is spent for highways for each $1 spent on mass transportation, this amounts to what I consider "highway robbery."

Those of us who have introduced legislation to provide a capital investment to build a better and more balanced transportation system through the establishment of a mass transportation trust fund were heartened by a general endorsement of this idea by Secretary Volpe at the Fourth International Conference on Urban Transportation, held in my city of Pittsburgh last March. However, since that time there have been conflicting reports concerning what he considered the Department's priorities to be, and no official word from the Secretary or the administration.

I believe the United States needs to establish a national goal for urban mass transportation as we have done for defense and space.

The Wall Street Journal of May 22 carried an excellent article in which it is reported that the Secretary does consider public transportation his top priority, and plans to request money for a program to upgrade our existing systems, develop new transit systems and establish an innovative long-range planning program.

If this is true, he will be verbalizing what many of us in the House Banking and Currency Committee have been advocating for some time, and we would be delighted to lend our support.

Your move, Mr. Secretary.

I include the Wall Street Journal article for the attention of my colleagues.

UNCLOGGING THE JAM—ADMINISTRATION STRESSES MASS TRANSIT AS CURE FOR URBAN TRAFFIC ILLS—EMPHASIS IS SHIFTING FROM HIGHWAYS; AID FOR PRESENT SYSTEMS, RESEARCH PLANNED—BARRIERS TO A SPENDING BOOST

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

WASHINGTON.—To the surprise of some early critics, President Nixon's transportation chiefs plan to promote mass public transportation, not more highways, as the best way to untangle urban traffic jams.

Though the Budget Bureau has opposed a Transportation Department proposal for a special trust fund to mass transit aid to cities, officials say an expanded public transportation program remains a top goal this year. They're planning sharply increased Federal aid aimed at improving the speed, convenience and comfort of travel by bus, subway or surface rail line. The planners hope their efforts will lure more travelers out of the autos that often choke city streets.

It's possible that some problems with safety implications, such as air congestion, may get more immediate attention. But fundamentally, "if I have to set a priority, the number one priority is public transportation," says John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation.

That surprises some observers because Mr. Volpe came to his new post with the label of highway backer. Supporters of the former Massachusetts governor insist that label wasn't completely accurate. The Transportation Department naturally isn't going to stop highway-building, but officials say it will push to give localities as a realistic alternative to Federal highway aid for alleviating urban transportation problems.

RISING TO $600 MILLION A YEAR

To provide that alternative, officials are aiming for annual mass transit aid starting at about $200 million and rising to $600 million by 1974. These outlays now run about $170 million a year. But Mr. Volpe would actually prefer to spend as much as $1 billion annually for mass transit within two or three years. He's now seeking Presidential approval for such an ambitious plan. His success or failure will become known when the Administration unveils its mass transit program, probably next week.

Whatever sum is chosen, the money would go toward three objectives. One would be an immediate upgrading of existing transit systems, particularly by helping to finance new buses or rail cars. A second goal would be a start on development of new transit systems for use in five or 10 years, possibly including high-speed vehicles propelled on cushions of air. A third phase would involve long-range planning for even more advanced transit innovations; these might include "gravitrains," which would be propelled by their own weight through inclined underground tunnels and then would roll upward to surface stations on their own momentum and pneumatic pressure.

"Our feeling is that we've got to act now on the immediate problems but still recognize what the needs will be in the next decades," says Charles Baker, Deputy Under Secretary of Transportation.

A further idea of what the planners have in mind can be gleaned from a sampling of the Volpe team's recent aid grants for mass transit projects. They include $200,000 for study of a system of moving sidewalks in Boston, a $245,000 initial allocation for a planned demonstration of pollution-free steam-powered buses in San Francisco and a $25.2 million grant to a Chicago public agency for the purchase of 130 new commuter cars for the Illinois Central Railroad.

TOO LITTLE TOO LATE?

It remains to be seen how much the department actually can do to unsnarl urban congestion. Some critics contend its mass transit program represents too little too late. And it's still uncertain how big a program it will be able to push through the Budget Bureau and Congress; ardent highway advocates may oppose any steep rise in spending for mass public transportation if it seems to raise a threat to road-building.

Mass-transit supporters, for their part, are worried that the Transportation Department will scale down its plans. "If the department backs out now, it could frustrate growing support to move ahead on public transportation," says Donald Alexander, a legislative assistant for the National League of Cities.

Urban and transit officials say increased—and long-term—Federal support is needed for mass transit if the financially strapped cities are to cope with congestion. Without such a commitment, "we'll just continue to

hobble along until somebody does something about it," says Thomas B. O'Connor, general manager of the Institute for Rail Transit.

Transportation Department officials insist they will press hard for their expanded mass transit program. "Anybody who thinks Gov. Volpe won't fight for his programs doesn't know him," says one long-time aide. They note that President Nixon has specified mass transit as one of his top priorities.

THE COMMUTING ORDEAL

Almost everyone agrees something has to be done about the traffic congestion that threatens to choke many city centers. Automobiles are proliferating while public transit systems deteriorate. Among the cities suffering most are New York, Boston and Washington. The Transportation Department estimates that the average auto-commuter in some large cities spends 13% of his waking hours in traffic each workday. In some cities—notably New York—commuters who use outdated public transportation fare no better as far as time goes. Officials also say that inner-city residents, many of whom don't own cars, can't reach jobs on many present transit systems without numerous transfers and long delays.

To date, the Federal Government's solution for urban congestion has been more highways—a solution that has recently run into opposition in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington and other cities. While $170 million annually now goes for mass transit, Federal highway aid runs between $4 billion and $5 billion a year (though much of that money goes for roads outside urban areas). Moreover, Uncle Sam pays 90% of the highway costs and only two-thirds of the bill for Federally aided mass transit projects. States and cities thus have had little real choice, transportation planners say.

What's needed, officials contend, is a more realistic view of both private autos and public transit. Indeed, "the key to the entire passenger transport network is the automobile," says James Beggs, Under Secretary of Transportation. "No solution to our other problems can be complete unless we learn to control it."

While hoping to lure auto riders to public transportation, officials say tougher restrictions on autos may be needed eventually if cities aren't to be inundated by cars. Among the possibilities: A tax on auto-commuters entering cities during rush hours or even the complete banning of cars in city centers.

As for mass transit, "we ought to get rid of the idea once and for all that public transportation must make a profit," Secretary Volpe has said. "Public transportation is so important that we must look at its financing much like any other public service. We don't expect the Army to make a profit."

While private operation of mass transit is preferred, Transportation Department officials add, such intracity transit is increasingly difficult to run at a profit. Here in Washington, one of the largest cities still served by privately owned transportation lines, the D.C. Transit System has continued to run in the red despite a series of fare increases; there are proposals for the local government to take over.

AID FOR ROCHESTER, N.Y.

The Volpe team has already approved a $3 million grant to help the city of Rochester, N.Y., purchase the local bus lines, as well as buy 27 new buses. If necessary, officials say, local governments should take on the responsibility of operating public transit even at a loss, just as they support schools or police services.

The Federal Government can chip in with some aid but probably wouldn't provide direct operating subsidies. "That's a bottomless pit," says Paul Cherington, Assistant Transportation Secretary for Policy and International Affairs.

Under the department's current plan, the Federal Government would provide loans to localities primarily for mass transit improvements or to pay the interest on long-term financing for transportation. For major projects, the localities—generally metropolitan areas including suburbs, as opposed to cities alone—first would have to come up with a comprehensive, long-range plan for all types of transportation.

Department officials maintain they aren't wedded to the trust fund plan to finance their plans but are hopeful of obtaining some sort of long-term Federal financing commitment. "What we've got to have is a program that allows a locality to make plans with the assurance the money will be there 10 years from now," says James D. Braman, Assistant Transportation Secretary for Urban Systems and Environment.

NEW BUS ROUTES

Whatever the financing, the initial emphasis will be on fast first-aid for today's transit systems—plain old buses, subways and trains—rather than exotic schemes for monorails or electronic highways.

This means providing Federal money to help buy air-conditioned rail cars or new buses. It also means aid to cities that want to redraw bus routes to make them more convenient for commuters to get to jobs in the city and for ghetto residents who want to travel to job openings in the suburbs. Cleveland Mayor Carl Stokes is among those interested in laying out new routes.

Meanwhile, the department would begin the study of bolder transportation innovations. "If we just patch up the kind of subways and buses you find today, patronage will continue to drop," warns Secretary Volpe.

These innovations could range from automated rapid transit systems such as the one currently being built in the San Francisco bay area to air-cushion vehicles that could carry 100 people at speeds up to 300 miles an hour on routes extending from cities to the suburbs or beyond. The Transportation Department hopes to have an air-cushion test under way by 1972 possibly running between Miami and a new air-port proposed near the Everglades.

## THE ROBERTS CASE—JUSTICE ON TRIAL

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court in another of its remarkable decisions has held that in a case on appeal a Justice who is in business with the judges who heard the case below cannot be recused for cause by one of the litigants.

The unique situation involves Dr. William H. Roberts in a case involving Catholic University. The circuit court of appeals had ruled against Dr. Roberts, and one of the questions to be resolved by the Supreme Court involves the credibility of Chief Judge David L. Bazelon, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Chief Judge Bazelon and Associate Justice William J. Brennan are business partners in the recently exposed tax shelters, Concord Associates and Wilson Associates. See my remarks, RECORD of May 15, 1969, page 12687.

In a question of the credibility of a witness, can there be any question as to whom Brennan will believe? He must choose between David Bazelon, his financial partner, and Roberts, who is unknown to him and who has shown the courage to bare Brennan's financial entanglement with Bazelon, Wright, and Fortas, and to ask in the name of justice that Brennan step aside and not take part in reviewing of his partner's decision.

Despite the court's arbitrary ruling, Dr. Roberts' case remains undecided. All will watch to see if Justice Brennan will demonstrate the honor and the absolute impartiality hitherto expected of a Justice of our Supreme Court by voluntarily recusing himself and declining to participate in the case. I include a news clipping as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 26, 1969]

COURT WON'T BAR BRENNAN IN CU CASE

The Supreme Court today refused to order one of its members, William J. Brennan, to disqualify himself from handling a case involving Catholic University.

Brennan's recent tie with the university's law school and his business connections with lower court judges, who had heard the case, had been challenged by the law professor who filed the lawsuit.

Prof. William H. Roberts has been seeking a court ruling to restore a school of international law he formerly headed on the campus. It was merged with another department two years ago.

Failing in lower courts, Roberts is seeking to appeal to the highest court. But he filed a motion to disqualify Brennan from any part in handling the appeal.

Without giving its reasons, the court today refused to disqualify Brennan. It did not act on Roberts' appeal. When it does, Brennan could, if he wishes, disqualify himself.

## DRUG ABUSE POSES DEADLY THREAT

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse is a prime cause of crime and domestic chaos and a greater Federal effort to educate citizens about dangerous drugs is obviously called for.

As ranking Republican on the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am convinced there is no greater threat to the people of this country than in the abusive use of harmful drugs. If we ignore this threat, the future cost to society will be immense in terms of crime, illegitimacy, and human degradation.

It has been estimated that more than 100,000 Americans are already narcotics addicts, whose annual cost to society amounts to $541 million. And all the evidence points to a massive increase in nonnarcotic drug abusers. About 40 tons of amphetamine tablets are being produced each year, enough to provide everyone in the country with 35 doses. About half these tablets are reported to have gone into illicit channels of dis-

tribution. At least 5 million Americans have been estimated to have used marihuana at least once.

Most alarming is the "drug tug" craze among young people. From slum schools to college campuses, it has become tragically fashionable to experiment with LSD, marihuana, and other kinds of dope. A recent study showed that the use of marihuana on five California campuses tripled in 18 months. More than 50 percent of the students admitted to smoking pot. In one Washington, D.C., high school, it has been reported that nearly a full one-third of the student body has become heroin addicts.

It is obvious more must be done to acquaint the public, particularly young people, with the step-by-step descent into hopeless addiction which seems to accompany the indiscriminate use of drugs.

I am, therefore, today joining in the cosponsorship of legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new section dealing with drug abuse education and information. It would provide the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with authority to assist public or private nonprofit projects devoted to educating the public about drug abuse problems.

## POSTAL REFORM: DANGER AND OPPORTUNITY

### HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the word "crisis" in Chinese is represented by the juxtaposition of two word pictures—the word picture for "danger" and the word picture for "opportunity." Today America faces a crisis in mail communication. But although we are confronted by the danger of a breakdown in our mail service, we also have the opportunity to do something about it.

It is about time, for it certainly is a paradox that just when we are close to landing a man on the moon, we still cannot seem to deliver a letter on time. Such a spectacle would be laughable if it were not so serious.

Delays and breakdowns constantly threaten the mails. In fact, one of our largest cities in 1966 did have such a breakdown and such a recurrence could happen any day in one of our metropolitan post office operations. But if there is the ever-present danger of late mail, lost letters, and even postal operation collapse, we now have an opportunity to bring about a major modernization program.

President Nixon has proposed a plan that would take the Post Office out of politics and make it an independent Government-owned operation run like a modern business enterprise. This new U.S. Postal Service will be self-supporting with the regulation of postal increases decided by expert rate commissioners just as in any public utility.

If we seize this opportunity to introduce these reforms, gone will be the days of bigger deficits and mounting postage costs along with slower delivery and poorer service.

## RICHARD KING MELLON FOUNDATION

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following in the Extensions of Remarks:

[Telegram]

Hon. RICHARD K. MELLON,
*Pittsburgh, Pa:*

Thank you so much for sending me the report for the years 1966–68 of the Richard King Mellon Foundation. We in Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania are proud and pleased with the fine progress and civic and cultural development that you have been able to assist so well. In the United States Navy the phrase is "well done!"

As I believe that in this day of general attacks on foundations the excellent report of your trustees shows what can be accomplished through well run foundations. I am placing this report in the Congressional Record for today. We must not permit hue and cry to destroy constructive good works, but must support good civic assets as your fine organization.

My compliments to you for your generosity and foresight in advancing Pittsburgh's progress and civic and cultural improvements, and my compliments to the Board of Trustees, officers, and consultants of the Richard King Mellon Foundation for their broad vision.

With my personal regards,

Sincerely,

Congressman JIM FULTON,
*Pennsylvania.*

RICHARD KING MELLON FOUNDATION REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES, 1966–68, PITTSBURGH, PA.

During the period covered by this Report, the Richard King Mellon Foundation observed its twentieth year of activity. The anniversary occurred on November 14, 1967, two decades from the date on which the Foundation was created by deed of trust. Since that founding date, the trustees have approved 1,092 grants to 535 recipients, for a total authorized disbursement of $43,373,533.

The year 1967 was more than a twentieth anniversary. It was also a year in which the Foundation significantly increased the scope and number of programs extending the social function of the Pittsburgh Renaissance into the poor and run-down neighborhoods of the City. The trustees made grants totaling $11,720,818 in the three Report years 1966–1968. Of that amount, $2,562,500 was awarded to programs whose goal is to help people and communities at the lowest level of income and opportunity.

Some of these grants continued the Foundation's traditional support of programs for helping the young, the old, the sick and the troubled. Others were for new programs whose purpose is to educate, train and employ disadvantaged members of the community. These new programs have been added within the framework of the Foundation's long established principles. They represent an extension of our aims rather than a change of our direction.

Increased effort by the Foundation to help remove the causes and to alleviate the effects of poverty, bad housing, under-education, chronic unemployment and racial alienation grew out of our continuing, supporting participation in the program of renewal and rebuilding that Pittsburgh began in the year the Foundation was created.

THE REBIRTH OF A CITY

For nearly a century and a half, Pittsburgh had been growing into an industrial slum. In 1947, it was a blighted city, especially in the 330 acres of the downtown business area. There was danger of more costly and disastrous floods. Several hundred communities were dumping raw sewage into the rivers. No major expressway had been built or designed. Major corporations were talking of leaving, and some had leased space in other cities. George Sessions Perry, in his series on American cities, said of Pittsburgh: "The multiple scuttles of soot one must devour per annum as part of the price of living in Pittsburgh is no laughing matter. Instead, they are a hellish, tormenting, disease-abetting and spirit-wilting thing."

The soot lay over the spirit of the city, and its citizens suffered under a long accumulation of civic ills. But a new spirit emerged to give hope and direction to the renaissance of Pittsburgh.

A legend has grown up about the "Pittsburgh Renaissance." It tells how Lieutenant General Richard K. Mellon returned to Pittsburgh in 1945, at the end of World War II, to find a shabby, blighted community beset by problems, and made a sudden decision to help his city rebuild itself.

The story is a dramatic one, and perhaps for that reason it has persisted; but the facts are somewhat different. General Mellon had worked for some years before the war with civic leaders and with other Pittsburgh industrialists to plan such civic improvements as economic conditions and the state of public opinion would support. He served on the board of the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association (which his father had help to found) and became its president in 1941. In 1943, while in the Army, he created and helped to finance the Allegheny Conference on Postwar Planning, which had the mission of drawing up a redevelopment program for Pittsburgh for the years after World War II.

It is apparent, therefore, that General Mellon had, long before his return to Pittsburgh at the end of the war, a knowledge of the city's needs, a grounding in the mechanics of civic action, and a strong desire to do what he could, as soon as he could, to make the city a better place in which to live and work. It was always his intention during the war to return to Pittsburgh and help to put into action the planned programs for the city.

He had, moreover, a clear realization of the added community responsibilities of business management in a mid-Twentieth Century economy. He expressed his views in 1953 in an address at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, when he said:

"The corporation is proceeding from the stage of living within legal rights and powers to a new stage of recognition of corporate responsibilities and duties from which those rights are received.

"Top industrial leadership today is raising its sights to include a feeling of responsibility toward the social and political problems of our modern industrialized society. . . . The businessman has an unavoidable duty toward the entire environment in which he lives, moves and has his being. . . . It is impossible to separate business from the social and personal tides of our economy."

General Mellon was joined by industrial, civic, labor and political leaders of Pittsburgh who wanted to rescue their city. A dedicated team was formed. The Conference

on Post-War Planning became the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. Incorporated in 1943, it found unprecedented cooperation from elected city and county officials. So began the renaissance of Pittsburgh—a rebirth that became the model for scores of communities across the country.

Pittsburgh used the Allegheny Conference as the over-all civic organization to marshal the community's full energies and resources on a non-partisan basis. The Conference researched the needs of the city, planned for action, and then began to coordinate the complex parts of the programs that were created to give new life to the Pittsburgh area.

Effective legislation cleaned the smoke from the skies. New buildings rose as slums came down. The Golden Triangle was renewed in beauty. Various bodies, public, quasi-public and private, built flood control dams, a sewage disposal system, express highways, a jet-age airport, downtown parking facilities, city parks, and a downtown museum.

The Foundation joined with other groups in giving financial support to the Allegheny Conference and to three other private civic agencies that played key roles in rebuilding Pittsburgh. They are:

The Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association: a body that encourages long-range physical planning in the Southwestern Pennsylvania area and prepares and implements master plans as a service for municipalities regions and urban renewal programs.

The Pennsylvania Economy League: a fact-finding body conducting research in methods of government administration of the state and its various political sub-divisions.

Action-housing, Inc.: a private non-profit civic organization established by the Allegheny Conference to improve the condition of housing for the people of Allegheny County.

The Foundation has been privileged to participate in many other ways in the resurgence of new life in the Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania area, in programs that are described in these pages. Of the Foundation's $40,378,216 in grants paid between the founding date in 1947 and December 31, 1968, approximately 64 per cent has been given to organizations in Pittsburgh 85 per cent to organizations in Western Pennsylvania (including Pittsburgh), and 15 per cent outside of Western Pennsylvania.

A CHANGING PATTERN OF GROWTH

Over the years, Pittsburgh has experienced a changing pattern of industrial and business growth. New scientific and technological developments, together with increases in the capabilities of human resources that have been attracted here, keep adding new perspectives to the economy. Research and development, for example, has now become Pittsburgh's third largest industry, with more than 170 laboratories in the area.

Thus Pittsburgh has built the physical base for an improved environment. From that base, it is now possible to direct further attention toward those parts of the community where the force of the Renaissance has not yet fully penetrated. Certainly it would be impossible to take this next step without first having rebuilt the city and strengthened its institutions. It would be difficult to aid the disadvantaged segments of the community if Pittsburgh were now a decaying community, if industries were leaving instead of coming in, if jobs were scarce and confidence was impaired. In this sense, the disadvantaged have shared in the benefits of the Pittsburgh Renaissance. But more is needed.

A city is a living thing, and the projection of the Renaissance has not been merely to create wealth from which nothing proceeds, nor beauty toward which nothing moves, nor social and cultural opportunities that cannot be appropriated. The fruits of the Renaissance are for all the people of the area to use and enjoy. Therefore, while the Foundation continues to support those institutions and organizations that will sustain the improvements already begun, it is at the same time making a number of additional grants for the specific purpose of aiding disadvantaged members of the community. The programs range from remedial tutoring to training of hard-core unemployed; from recreational and cultural programs in the inner city to a mobile library that tours the slum areas with books, records and films.

These programs complement the continuing thrust of the Pittsburgh Renaissance, which today has more projects in progress than ever before. The programs are helping to prove that our latter-day problems are manageable and that our city can and must extend its increasing economic, educational and cultural advantages to all its citizens.

The trustees recognize the privilege they have enjoyed in sharing in the many undertakings that have led to the renewal and betterment of Greater Pittsburgh and its institutions. They are deeply aware of their responsibility to use the resources of the Richard King Mellon Foundation in ways that will give the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people.

This Report details the Foundation's activities in the years 1966 through 1968. In scope and purpose, the grants reflect the purposes of the founder as set forth in 1947, and they reaffirm the principles that have guided the trustees through the first twenty-one years of service.

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
RICHARD KING MELLON FOUNDATION

---

## GEN. H. MILLER AINSWORTH

### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, Texas and our country lost a great American and one of our most dedicated and outstanding sons.

Lt. Gen. H. Miller Ainsworth was cut from a cloth no longer seen, and he truly represented one of the finest examples of the free and aggressive spirit so important to our country.

General Ainsworth excelled in many fields and in many ways. The scope of his endeavors ranged from military command to oil field speculation, and he was one of the most colorful figures ever to come from our central Texas area.

Probably more than any other individual I have known, he always was able to maintain a balanced perspective in the most trying circumstances, and perhaps it was for this reason that interests were so varied and successful.

As a young man born in Austin, he soon moved with his family to Gonzales, where he spent his boyhood years. He entered Texas A. & M., but left in 1917, to enroll in the first class of officer's school at Leon Springs. It was this training school which supplied our first offerings of new officers in the first war, and it is significant, I believe, that he led the times even then.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant in August of that year, and assigned to the 159th Infantry of the 40th Division.

At the outbreak of World War II, he returned to Federal service, was promoted to lieutenant colonel, and transferred to the 142d Infantry, 36th Division. It was in September of 1943 that the 36th—the famous T-patch Texas division—began the tough softening-up operations in the invasion of Italy, and General Ainsworth was the executive officer for the 142d Infantry at the Salerno Beach landing. For his conduct and gallantry there, he was awarded the Silver Star.

At the end of the war, Miller Ainsworth returned to central Texas and pursued his activities as a successful banker and oilman. Some of the highlights of his many years in Luling, Tex., include serving as chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Luling, chairman of the board of the Luling Foundation; and active memberships in the American Legion and the Church of the Annunciation.

At the same time, he pursued his activities in the Texas National Guard. During these years, he played a large role in the reorganization of the 36th National Guard Division, and he soon became commanding general of the 36th. He was promoted to lieutenant general on retirement.

It is significant, I believe, that General Ainsworth took all of his responsibilities so seriously. He was an ideal citizen-soldier, strong and capable in both aspects of that term, and he has given us an example which serves us well.

When his country called, he never hesitated to answer.

His sweet wife, Annie Francis, was always a strength to the general, and I also personally know and respect his son, H. Miller Ainsworth, Jr., of Luling.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that our country sees a man of the caliber of Gen. Miller Ainsworth.

He was a general and a leader for us in Texas; he was a leader and an example for the entire Nation. He truly was an outstanding American.

---

## FILTH FLOWS FREELY THROUGH THE U.S. MAILS

### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district—and judging from what I have been reading and hearing, most congressional districts are similarly confronted—is being flooded with the filthiest, most prurient samples of pure smut I have ever encountered.

Each day's mail contains more letters from constituents who have been shocked and angered by the filth being disseminated under the guise of sex education literature.

This material, in the form of advertisements for smutty books and magazines, is being sent through the U.S. postal system to youngsters and adults alike.

I am personally appalled that Supreme Court decisions have opened the dike to

permit the mailing of smut into American homes. Nevertheless, I cannot accept some of the Post Office Department's weak-kneed excuses for failing to halt the mailing of such scum.

The filing of a personal demand to be removed from a mailing list is not enough. The flow of filth through the mail should be stopped and stopped promptly, even if a special postage rate must be established—perhaps a dollar an ounce or higher—to nip sex racketeering in the bud.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not reproduce photographs because perhaps if some of these photos were published, we could convince Justice Department and Post Office Department officials to find a few legal loopholes which in this instance would protect the American citizen rather than abuse or misuse him.

President Nixon several weeks ago proposed three specific legislative actions to slow down the flow of filth through the mails. I state here and now that I will support all three. And the stiffer the fines and jail sentences, the better I'll like the legislation.

In the meantime, however, I am asking Postmaster General Winton Blount to take another look at existing postal regulations and investigative procedures to determine whether it is not possible for postal authorities to reject these mailings immediately.

## THE POSTAL SERVICE ACT

### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly creative features of the Postal Service Act is its proposal for the settlement of disputes arising during collective bargaining negotiations between the Postal Service and the employees' bargaining agents.

The bill would first leave it up to the parties to adopt by mutual agreement any procedure for resolution of disputes or impasses arising in the negotiation of an agreement. If the Postal Service and the bargaining agent do not adopt procedures for the resolution of disputes or impasses, or if the procedures adopted do not result in the resolution of a dispute, the entire matter upon demand of either party would be referred to a panel of experts to be known as the Postal Disputes Panel.

The Postal Disputes Panel would be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government composed of nine members, of whom three would be named by the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, three by the American Arbitration Association, and three by the six members so selected. This Panel would be empowered to fact-find, to mediate and make recommendations, or to turn back to the parties any or all issues and disputes, and thus to have great flexibility in inducing the parties to reach agreement. If the parties still fail to reach agreement, the Panel may relinquish control over these issues and refer any such issue to final and binding arbitration by an impartial board of arbitration.

Such a procedure insures bona fide negotiations and, most important, provides a creative mechanism to fairly handle disputes which inevitably arise during the course of contract negotiations. The procedure is both imaginative and practical. It heralds great improvements in the working conditions of 720,000 postal employees.

## A NEW ERA FOR THE COURT

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Warren E. Burger as our country's 15th Chief Justice, has signaled the beginning of a new era for the Supreme Court. The choice of a man with substantial experience on the bench, a legal philosophy of judicial restraint, a demonstrated concern over the problems of law enforcement in the wake of recent court decisions, and a reputation of "unquestioned integrity throughout his private and public life," the President has moved to restore both balance and confidence to our highest court. This was a good appointment and it has been well received. Clear evidence of this is provided by the concurring opinions of the daily newspapers servicing the Sixth Congressional District, of Michigan, and I am pleased to make available the editorial comments of the Jackson Citizen Patriot of May 23, 1969, the State Journal of Lansing, May 24, 1969, and the Owosso Argus-Press of May 23, 1969, so that they may be included in the RECORD of this important time in the history of the Supreme Court and the Nation:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, May 23, 1969]

BURGER NOMINATION A COMFORTING ONE

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger!

In his first appointment to the United States Supreme Court, President Nixon has produced a name which is not particularly familiar to the American people, although the nominee is a veteran of public service, both in the Justice Department and on the federal bench. He is one of the many capable men who were brought into the government by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Initial reaction in the circles where he is known indicate that President Nixon has chosen well in naming a successor to the controversial Chief Justice Earl Warren, who is retiring at the end of the court's present term.

The selection is pleasing to conservatives, but has aroused no resistance from Senate liberals who apparently see him as a competent, experienced and fair jurist. His fellow judges speak well of his integrity and his ability.

If he is a shade more conservative than the present members of the court, that is to be expected. American Presidents traditionally use their power of appointment to the court to put their own philosophical stamp on it.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt did that to the extreme. He even tried to change the make-up of the court to shape it to suit his philosophies. The court-packing attempt failed, but time gave President Roosevelt the opportunity to create a court to his liking.

Despite the opportunity it gives him to influence the only truly independent branch of the federal government, no more awesome duty faces a President than that of selecting members of the court.

The temptation to pay off political debts or to exercise the maximum influence on the bench not always is resisted by Chief Executives. If the court presently is sagging in the public eye, it is due to this factor. Warren was a political appointment (Eisenhower); Abe Fortas a political crony (Johnson), and Justice William O. Douglas, who now is coming under increasing fire, was named by Roosevelt for his extremely liberal views.

The circumstances thus make President Nixon's responsibility for court appointments all the heavier. He already is faced with a second choice for the bench (to replace Fortas). The age and state of health of senior Justices indicate that he will have the opportunity to appoint additional members of the court before his first term ends.

His clear duty is to select experienced jurists instead of political figures or philosophers; to pick men of unquestioned integrity and judgment and with dignity in keeping with the popular image of the Supreme Court. The President has no margin for error. Each choice must be no less than magnificent.

Apparently he has made a good start with the election of Warren E. Burger. The precedent is comforting.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, May 24, 1969]

U.S. SUPREME COURT GETS A NEW BALANCE

President Nixon's appointment of federal appeals Judge Warren E. Burger as new chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court is a move which will be welcomed by most Americans.

The decision came at a crucial time in the history of the nation's highest legal body, a time when the court is under heavy criticism from many directions.

Bringing in a man of superb legal qualifications from the outside is a wise step which should do much to help heal some deep wounds caused by the unfortunate problems of former associate Justice Abe Fortas.

The arrival of Judge Burger may upset a few on the far left who seem to regard the court as a legislative branch of the federal government since the new chief justice has the reputation of being a strict constitutionalist.

He is known as a tough law and order man but also a liberal on civil rights issues. This is balance that is needed in our troubled times.

In connection with the appointment, President Nixon hinted he may follow a policy of naming future justices from among the best qualified persons now serving in the lower federal courts.

It is clearly a move to avoid any taint of pure politics in court selections and should go a long way toward shoring up the Supreme Court.

[From the Owosso (Mich.) Argus-Press, May 23, 1969]

COURT NOMINEE A FINE START

With the resignation of Supreme Court Associate Justice Abe Fortas and the impending retirement of Chief Justice Earl Warren, President Nixon in his first half-year in office will be privileged to exercise what has become over the decades one of the most important functions of the presidency—the nomination of men to sit on the nation's highest tribunal.

In all, 32 presidents out of 35 (counting Grover Cleveland, who served two nonconsecutive terms, as one president) have made, and the Senate has approved, 100 appointments to the Supreme Court. Not that many individuals have served, however. Four were either promoted from associate justice to chief justice or left the bench and were subsequently reappointed.

Only 24 other presidents have had the opportunity to appoint as many as two justices. Only 12 have appointed chief justices. Before his first term of office is over, it is possible that Nixon may join an even more select group—the six presidents who have appointed as many as five justices. They were Washington (10), Jackson (5), Lincoln (5), Taft (6), Franklin Roosevelt (9) and Eisenhower (5).

Justice Hugo M. Black is 83 years old. John Marshall Harlan is 70 and suffers from seriously deteriorating vision. William O. Douglas is 70 and wears an electric heart pacer and, in the backfire of the Fortas affair, is coming under increasing criticism for receiving a $12,000-a-year stipend from a private foundation which at one time had connections with Las Vegas gambling interests.

It is not the quantity of justices that a president appoints that is important, of course, but their quality, and also the tenor of the times in which they serve—whether the nation is in a period of relative calm or whether great social currents are welling up to the surface in the form of landmark test cases.

It seems evident that Nixon's appointment of Warren E. Burger to be chief justice will be well received by the Senate. The Supreme Court can well use Burger's conservative approach after bending over backwards in a spree of liberalism over the past few years.

It is also heartening to find that Nixon resisted the urge to appoint a "layman" to the high post, but instead selected an outstanding jurist of proven ability on the bench.

Washington, as first president, appointed 10 justices to the high court, including two chief justices. But the court had a very tiny docket in its early years and few questions of great constitutional moment came to its attention during his two terms.

Lesser presidents, by virtue of their prerogative to appoint to the Supreme Court, have left monuments to themselves far overshadowing whatever else they may have accomplished during their administrations.

Washington's successor, John Adams, appointed only three justices, but one of them was the greatest of all—Chief Justice John Marshall, who established the power of the Supreme Court to nullify acts of Congress and, over a long tenure of 34 years, profoundly influenced the development of the nation.

"My gift of John Marshall to the people of the United States was the proudest act of my life," said Adams long after he left office.

There has been much talk that Richard Nixon has a unique opportunity to alter the nature of the Supreme Court for years to come by appointing "conservatives" who will reverse the court's present, narrow "liberal" majority.

This is not necessarily so. Even if this were the President's aim, each justice is his own man and none can be classified in iron-bound ideological categories. Each, moreover, changes and develops over the years.

For example, Justice Black, who was appointed by F. D. Roosevelt in 1938 as a "liberal" or "loose constructionist" (interpreter) of the Constitution, has in recent years tended more and more toward a "conservative" or "strict constructionist" philosophy, at least on certain issues.

On the other hand, we can be sure that Dwight Eisenhower never foresaw that Earl Warren would turn out to be Public Enemy No. 1 in the eyes of the political right.

The Warren court era is ending and we may in the future see a less active court, one more inclined to follow public opinion that lead it. But no matter how many or what kind of justices Richard Nixon appoints, the history of the past 12 years is not going to be rewritten.

While there is dissatisfaction with some of the court's decisions, there has always been dissatisfaction with every court. But there is no sign that the American people have the desire to make any significant departures from the directions upon which the Warren court has set them.

---

## MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNDS

---

## HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that each Member of Congress sympathizes with and has compassion for the poor. I believe we all are willing to help poor people in every reasonable and responsible manner.

Nevertheless, because of the war in Vietnam, and other pressing needs, we do not have resources to waste on worthless projects even when advertised as help for the poor. One of the most flagrant misuses of public funds is an OEO grant which I recently protested to President Nixon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the information of the House, OEO's grant announcement, my letter to the President, and his reply through his Assistant Bryce N. Harlow, and a letter I have today written Mr. Harlow:

GRANT ANNOUNCEMENT: OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

APRIL 8, 1969.

1. Type of grant: Legal services.
2. Amount of grant (Federal Share): $283,561 ($183,066 new Federal funds) ($100,495 reprogrammed funds).
3. Grantee: Mary Holmes Junior College (Grantee No. 3211 D/3).
4. Location: West Point, Mississippi.
5. Delegate agency: North Mississippi rural legal services.
6. Project director: Mr. Donovan Smucker (601/948–6513).
7. Areas served: Panola County.
8. Length of program: 12 months.
9. Beneficiaries: Low income residents.
10. Purpose of programs: To provide legal advice and representation to low income residents in the county and to litigate cases which have an impact on large numbers of poor people.
11. Number of nonprofessionals: 10.
12. Additional information: Local share: $30,000.

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., May 1, 1969.*

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recently learned that the Office of Economic Opportunity has approved a grant of $283,561 to Mary Holmes Junior College of West Point, Mississippi, for the operation of a legal services program through October 31, 1969. The program is designated North Mississippi Rural Legal Services.

After reviewing the administrative provisions and expenditure requirements of the program, I am convinced that the grant represents a deplorable misuse of our taxpayers dollars.

This seven month legal program costing $283,561 is $90,000 more than the annual budget of the Attorney General's office in the State of New Hampshire; is approximately the same as the annual budget of the Attorney General's office in Vermont; and, at an annual rate, essentially the same as the cost of the Attorney General's office in Rhode Island and in Mississippi.

The program does not afford representation in any felony or other criminal case in which the State of Mississippi is constitutionally required to provide counsel or in which counsel is now afforded under State or local statutes, rule of court or practice. It is therefore obvious that the results of this program would be unlawful intermeddling and the promotion of litigation. I doubt that many taxpayers approve of this type of expenditure of public funds.

Most respectfully, I suggest you cancel this program inasmuch as it is a fraudulent scheme to raid the Treasury of the United States.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. GRIFFIN.

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, May 20, 1969.*

Hon. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. GRIFFIN: I am responding to your May 1 letter expressing your concern about an Office of Economic Opportunity grant to North Mississippi Rural Services at Mary Holmes Junior College.

I now have information from OEO about this grant. It is designed to provide legal assistance to the rural indigent in Mississippi. Until very recently, efforts have been concentrated principally in a five-county area of North Mississippi where OEO says the need is the greatest.

I learn that this program operates three offices from which services radiate to the surrounding area. The office locations are: Holly Springs, Oxford, and Batesville. The central office is in Oxford at 108½ South Lamar Street.

The problems I understand this program deals with include domestic realtions, consumer credit, welfare and permissible criminal representation. The objectives are to funish advice and representation to the eligible indigent; to litigate cases which have an impact on large numbers of poor persons; to conduct educational programs for the poor; and to conduct research into the legal problems of the poor.

OEO advises that the program is staffed by the following professionals: a Director at an annual salary of $15,500; an Assistant Director at a salary of $14,000; five staff lawyers at salaries of from $9,600 to $11,247; and two social workers at annual salaries of $6,000 and $6,500 respectively. The names of the top professional staff are: Mr. Michael B. Trister, Director, and Mr. Kent Spriggs, Assistant Director.

The non-professional staff covers the following positions and salaries: a bookkeeper at a salary of $6,000; ten community workers at salaries up to $4,420; seven secretaries at salaries from $2,700 to $3,504; and an indefinite number of law students to be employed at a rate of $2.00 to $2.50 per hour.

Mr. Robert Perrin, Acting Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, advises me that OEO welcomes your counsel as to ways in which this program might be strengthened. OEO's authorizing legislation provides for the funding of Legal Services Programs "to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling, education, and other appropriate services." This Congressional declaration is what supports this grant.

Mr. Perrin has requested OEO's Southeast Regional Office to forward to your office a copy of the entire grant package for North Mississippi Rural Services, for your further information.

I hope this information will be useful and that as time moves along all such programs will find increasing approval under the direction of the new Administration.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
*Assistant to the President.*

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., May 28, 1968.*

Hon. BRYCE N. HARLOW,
*Assistant to the President,*
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HARLOW: Thank you for your letter of May 20, 1969, responding to my May 1 letter protesting a grant of $283,561 to North Mississippi Rural Services at Mary Holmes Junior College.

Your letter of explanation is at variance with the information announced by the Office of Economic Opportunity. For instance, you state that the grant "is designed to provide legal assistance to the rural indigent in Mississippi." Then you state that "until very recently, efforts have been concentrated principally in a five-county area of North Mississippi where OEO says the need is the greatest." It would appear that you have been informed that North Mississippi Rural Legal Services intends to operate under the new grant in an area encompassing more than five counties. However, the grant announcement (a copy of which is enclosed) states that the $283,561 program will operate only in Panola County.

For your information, Panola County had 28,791 residents in 1960 according to the United States Bureau of Census. Additionally, you might be interested in knowing that it is an area of 704 square miles.

Mr. Harlow, it appears that OEO has mislead either you or me.

I think it is incumbent upon you to find out the truth about this expenditure of more than a quarter of a million dollars of the taxpayers money. While you are looking into it, I would suggest that you find out why the project director has a telephone number in Jackson, Mississippi, a distance of approximately 125 miles from Panola County.

Also, I think you should find out why the grant was made through Mary Holmes Junior College, located in Clay County, Mississippi, a distance of about 75 miles from Panola County.

I think you should also find out why $19,800 of the taxpayers money will be spent for travel. Remember, Panola County has an area of only 704 square miles.

It would be interesting to know why there are three office locations as stated in your letter, two of which are located outside Panola County. Since OEO told me that this program is for only Panola County, why is there an office located in Marshall County and in Lafayette County?

There is one item in the budget which I think makes sense. $800 is provided for malpractice insurance.

You stated in your letter that the program deals with domestic relations, among other things. Do you and President Nixon really think it proper for the taxpayers to pay attorney's fees for divorce cases?

This program provides for more than 30 employees at an annual rate. I do not know how many indigent (your term) or low income (OEO's term) residents there are in Panola County. However, it would appear to me that enough Federal funds are being provided to interview every person in Panola County several times to find out whether he or she need legal services. Do you really believe this is a proper function of the Federal government?

I would greatly appreciate your immediate response and, particularly, I want your comments on why you tell me that this $283,561 grant is "designed to provide legal assistance to the rural indigent in Mississippi", and why OEO tells me that it is for only 28,791 persons residing in Panola County, most of whom are not indigent.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. GRIFFIN.

---

## PEERLESS WATCHDOG

## HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest tributes yet paid to U.S. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has been written by Mr. Paul Hope of the staff of the Washington Evening Star, and appeared Monday evening, May 26, in that newspaper.

Senator WILLIAMS has announced his retirement from Congress at the end of his term next year. He says the announcement of his retirement is irrevocable.

There is not a great deal more to be said in tribute to Senator WILLIAMS than has been set forth by Mr. Hope and the Senator's colleagues. I can only add that I know of no man in public life who has given more honest, fearless, and dedicated public service than has this man from Delaware and his retirement will truly be an inestimable loss to all the citizens of this Nation.

I would be remiss in these few remarks if I failed to include a word of tribute to Mrs. Williams, the Senator's good wife. No man in public life could pursue the course Senator WILLIAMS elected, with the pressures and often unpleasantness that attends such a course, without the unfailing support of his wife. Elsie Williams has given that loyalty and support in full measure.

The article by Mr. Hope follows:

WILLIAMS PEERLESS AS A WATCHDOG

(By Paul Hope)

Sen. John J. Williams is, by virtue of the alphabet, at the bottom when the roll is called on the Senate floor. But when the roll of the Senate great is called up yonder, the soft-spoken chicken-feed merchant will be near the top of the list.

There have been great orators in the Senate, but Williams is not one of them. There have been great intellects, but this simple, homey man from Delaware would not claim to be one of them, either.

But when it comes to integrity, persistence and ability to root out waste and corruption, Williams is unchallenged.

In a city where a jackass mentality is not uncommon, Williams' possession of an uncommonly large amount of horse sense has stood out.

It was with a sense of loss that senators arose on the floor the other day to take cognizance of Williams' 65th birthday (on May 17), for Williams has said he's getting too old to serve and plans to retire when his term is up at the end of 1970.

The details of Williams' accomplishments need no recounting. His pursuit of wrongdoers—from bribe takers in the Internal Revenue Service to the free-wheeling Senate aide, Bobby Baker—is well known. His pursuit of wasteful government spending is less well known to the public, but it is recognized by his colleagues and others who follow government.

Said Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen of the work Williams has done as senior Republican on the Finance Committee:

"I should observe that he has faithfully done his homework in a field which is abstruse at times and which others do not freely like to tackle, and that is the question of ceilings on expenditures, ceilings on employment, fair and equitable tax systems and all the other things to which a person can give a lifetime of attention without also being encumbered with any other public responsibility."

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield called Williams a "giant" whose place will be hard to fill.

"I must say, speaking non partisantly, that I am not happy that the senator has seen fit not to run for re-election," said Mansfield.

Senator Republican Whip Hugh Scott called him the "watchdog" of government, not only of the other branches but of the legislative branch in which he serves—"a watchdog with teeth, I might add."

"It would be difficult," said Wyoming Republican Sen. Clifford P. Hansen, "for anyone to attempt to put a dollar sign on the contributions John Williams has made through his never-ending search for an end to wastefulness and graft and for economy, or to assess how much he has contributed to this country."

Democrat Russell B. Long of Louisiana, chairman of the Finance Committee, said that Williams "has failed to convince me . . . that he is doing the nation a favor by insisting on retiring . . ."

And Sen. William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat, said he hoped "this remarkable man will reconsider his decision to retire."

But Williams, who believes that no man should serve in the legislative or judicial branches of government beyond the age of 70 (he would be nearly 72 at the end of another term), says there's no room for argument about his decision.

"I am a firm believer that a man should live by the rules he lays down for others," he said. But he said that while his decision to leave the Senate is final, it does not mean he is retiring from an active interest in public affairs.

He recalled that before he was elected to the Senate in 1946, he and his brothers had an active business career together for 24 years. When he leaves the Senate, he will have served 24 years there.

"I am going to start one more career," he said. "I shall not go into details now, but I plan on one more career of 24 years of active duty, following which, and only then, will I retire and take life easy."

Those who have watched Williams at work in Washington know he will never take life easy.

---

## POSTAL REFORM

## HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring legislation to implement President Nixon's recent proposal for postal reform. I believe these new concepts for postal reorganization mark an important step forward for the postal service in this country. The present anti-

quated facilities, methods, and procedures in use will, at long last, be checked and, hopefully, corrected.

Under this proposed system, the Post Office will be removed from its present Cabinet-level position and replaced by a Government-owned postal corporation. Employees will retain all of their present civil service annuity rights and other benefits; however, in addition, they will gain extensive collective-bargaining rights, similar to those enjoyed by workers in private industry and other Federal agencies. A nine-member board will be responsible for the overall administration of the new U.S. Postal Service—with Congress retaining veto power over proposed postage rate changes.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we work together on a nonpartisan basis to correct the existing crisis the Post Office faces today. Each year, despite increased postal rates, the Post Office continues to operate at a huge financial loss—a loss which has to be covered by the taxpayers' dollars. This new system will enable the Post Office to keep pace with the rest of our economy—in service, in efficiency, and in meeting its responsibiilty as an employer.

President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount are to be congratulated on their efforts in seeking to remove the roadblocks and clear the way for this much needed reform.

I strongly urge my colleagues in both the House and Senate to carefully review this legislation and lend their support.

## ANATOMY OF A ROAD

### HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I was privileged to join with highway officials and representatives of industries deeply involved in highway safety in previewing a film, "Anatomy of a Road."

This is a 27-minute 16-millimeter color film sponsored by the Detroit Diesel Division of the General Motors Corp., and produced by CRS Production in Detroit. It will be distributed through General Motors film libraries and Modern Talking Pictures, Inc., throughout the Nation.

Its aim is to foster public appreciation of the value of good roads by helping the layman to understand what is involved in roadbuilding.

As "Anatomy of a Road" makes abundantly clear roadbuilding is a complex, difficult process required substantial capital investment, legislative action, legal due process, engineering skill, and hard work.

Many people today are appalled at the cost of modern highways and many have even wondered whether they are worth that cost. "Anatomy of a Road" endeavors to set that record straight by showing the public where its dollars go.

The film also covers such controversial areas as funding, land acquisition, and beautification.

"Anatomy of a Road" explains and illustrates each of the major steps in highway construction from preliminary planning through completion and maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most informative and important film. I am hopeful every Member of this body will have the opportunity of viewing it. I am also hopeful each Member will advise schools, service clubs, and television stations in his district of its availability.

## COMMUNITY RALLY AGAINST THE ABM

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most reassuring aspects of the ABM controversy is the renewed interest—in cities and communities across the country—in local discussions on issues of national policy. This development started, I believe, with the popular opposition to the Vietnam war. It continues with the ABM. It will be carried forward as citizens reexamine the military budget and our international commitments in a critical examination of our national priorities.

I was fortunate in being invited to speak at a recent community rally against the ABM at St. John's University, Queens, N.Y. Over 800 persons at that meeting endorsed the following petition, which I include, along with my remarks at the meeting:

*To the President and All Members of Congress:*

We, citizens of Queens County in a public meeting held Monday, May 5, 1969 at St. John's University do hereby state our opposition to the deployment of the ABM.

ABM will not work reliably and will not provide significant protection against nuclear attack.

ABM threatens to escalate the arms race.

It is expensive and unnecessary.

We urge that you give voice and vote against appropriations for the ineffective, dangerous and wasteful ABM systems.

Our country must instead look for ways of ending the arms race and of meeting the urgent social needs of our society.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, OF NEW YORK, AT ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, MAY 5, 1969

The principal reason we are here tonight is to determine whether the ABM is really an Edsel. If it is, why are the resources of the United States Government, resources essential to coping with our domestic needs, being committed to a system that the vast majority of our leading scientists say won't work?

The answer is really quite simple.

Today we operate in a contract state. The contract state is one in which the Assistant Secretary of Defense for procurement leaves that job and becomes a Vice President of Litton Industries, a conglomerate whose defense contracts increased more than 250 per cent from 1967 to 1968. This same man in his Defense Department role supervised the 45 billion dollar a year program of contracting with private industry, including Litton, for supplies, services, and equipment. At the same time, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis, the man who computerized the Pentagon's decision making, became Vice President for Economic Planning at, of all places, Litton Industries.

It is in this context that we have to examine the reliability, the credibility, the integrity, the honesty, the objectivity of those who urge on us the construction of a costly, unworkable, provocative military defense system.

HOW DOES WEAPONS PLANNING WORK?

It starts with an idea for a new weapons system in a laboratory or "think tank" or in some research and development corporation. This idea soon becomes the property of a contractor and a group of men committed to that idea. Then, careers of defense planners, both civilian and military, become attached to the idea. The idea is developed into hardware, in which tax dollars are invested for further development and perfection. More careers are created and committed to it.

Next, the hardware demands the building of a new defense plant. It now means jobs for managers and wages for workers. It means taxes for a new school in a marginal community. It means children whose fathers have to earn a living. The weapons idea is now a part of the social structure. Towns and even cities depend on it.

Objective criticism cannot succeed because outside critics are shouted down and military and corporate competitors are quieted by trading support for their weapons systems.

The ABM is an excellent example of such trading among defense competitors. The ABM belongs to the Army, by a Defense Department decision made a dozen years ago. No other service can venture into that area. To abandon the ABM now means, for the Army, not only a sharp budget reduction, but also military careers left hanging in space. It means contractors and defense contractors without visible means of support. It means towns without factories and factories without jobs.

When a weapons system reaches this point, it becomes a decisive influence on defense policy. The weapon—in this case, the ABM—becomes part of our overall strategy. Other services count on it. Congressmen on the committees get to know the system. They become part of its constituency. Their prestige is committed to it. Outsiders, including other Congressmen, are told "You don't understand this system"; or "You don't have all the facts."

When the ABM and a dozen other systems like it become part of our defense strategy we are really in trouble. Our foreign policy is determined by the available defense strategies. The defense hardware offers certain possibilities which become the policy options which the State Department then anoints as the key to protection of our national interests.

Foreign policy is no longer made by the President or by the State Department. Policy is made by a hundred small decisions which, collectively, become our defense strategy. These decisions sometimes are made on the basis of whose congressional district shall get which contract. Or whose sub-contractor needs help in dealing with a local community. Or which branch of the Pentagon needs a little more help in building its budgetary posture before Congress. We don't even ask the State Department anymore about how we became involved in Vietnam. We ask the Pentagon.

This process of giving the maximum number of people a stake in the defense system leads slowly but surely to the militarization of our society. Then, to make it work properly, the international tension must be kept up to an acceptable level. No longer neighbors in a world community, we become its police force. Talk of disarmament is discouraged. In-

ternational accords on weapons testing are dangerous. Air bases around the world become necessary. Intervention in foreign countries becomes a proper expression of American concern.

Soon we have a landing in the Dominican Republic. Next, we have advisors in Vietnam. Soon they need more advice. Then defense planners see a testing ground for weapons. Optimistic reports are then delivered from the battlefield like: "We'll have this mess cleaned up in six months." When six months pass, we start seeing the lights at the end of the tunnels. Then we prepare to start turning the corners toward victory. But the armies grow, more men are drafted, more and more money goes for their weapons. More jobs are created and more defense planners hired.

In this whole dismal picture, the great majority of Americans are taken in. Partly, it is because we tend to accept the judgments of defense "experts," whose explanations are obscured by guarded references to "intelligence reports", and classified information. Partly because it was, for a long time, considered unpatriotic to question defense expenditures.

How did this happen to a country which used to pride itself on anti-militarism?

The period after World War II was a dangerous one. But we responded to the Cold War by institutionalizing it. We drew the people away from examining international affairs by trying to make the subject obscure, complicated or dependent on classified information.

After seven years in Congress, I am more convinced than ever that people cannot only understand foreign affairs but they can also make valid judgments about them. People today recognize that we were sold a grossly defective product when we bought American participation in the Vietnam war. That judgment should have been made five years and 30,000 American lives ago.

Most of us cannot understand the details of the ABM system. We do not have to. We can understand that an expensive defense system that cannot defend us can nonetheless provoke actions by our potential enemies which in turn are very dangerous for us. This is what arms escalation means.

We know an ABM system won't work. But the Russians might wonder why the Americans would invest $5 or $7 or $40 billion if the system doesn't have some value. Their confusion would prompt fear. So they try to overcome our ABM system. In strategic terms, this is not hard to do. You can simply build many more nuclear tipped missiles and decoys to overpower any ABM system. We end up facing an augmented Soviet arsenal.

In turn, we will respond to that new threat by either building a "thicker" ABM system or by building more offensive missiles, or both. We are back where we started.

We know that reason and reconciliation must become our guide in international affairs. Yet our present defense policy challenges that truth. Since 1945 we spent $1.4 trillion dollars for defense systems, now mostly obsolete, which gave us no real security. We sought in arms a security which the machinery of war cannot achieve.

Although we do not yet know exactly how to undo what we have done, we know we must start. Tonight is a step in that direction. Another step was taken several weeks ago when Senator Nelson and I sponsored, with many House and Senate colleagues, a Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities. Right now we are working on plans to keep that Conference in permanent existence to develop a rational system of making and reviewing defense plans.

But unless average citizens begin to control the machinery which makes the basic decisions in our society, there can be no real democracy. We are beginning tonight to assert that control over the machinery of war.

## BURKE RECEIVES SERVICE TO ISRAEL AWARD

### HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, it has just been brought to my attention that one of our colleagues, Representative J. HERBERT BURKE of Florida's 10th District, was recently awarded the Zionist Organization of America's "Service to Israel Award" for his outstanding work in Congress on behalf of peace in the Middle East.

I would like to applaud my colleague, HERB BURKE, on achieving this fine honor. I have followed his actions in this regard since the Middle East has flared into a world tinderbox, and I feel that the recognition is well deserved.

HERB was one of the first House Members to speak out on the dangers of the Soviet Union moving into the Middle East with arms, technical aid, and even military personnel, and he early joined several of us in demanding that the administration concentrate its efforts on assisting Israel in her hour of need.

I have just read the speech which HERB delivered in accepting the award and feel that it should be brought to the attention of the House. I submit it as follows:

I am most grateful for this award and the honor you have bestowed upon me. I accept this with deep humility . . . for anything I have done, or have said, on behalf of the State of Israel has been, because I am convinced of the cause of the people of Israel and further I feel it is my duty as a United States citizen, and U.S. Representative, to give the full support of our country to Israel and to insure her a fair peace in the Middle East—one which will guarantee her safety and security in the future. I am convinced that unless we keep Israel strong, communism will gain a dominant hold in one of the most vital economic and resourceful areas of the world and will further jeapordize our own future security. I further believe that peace should come from talks held between the officials of the Israeli government and those of the hostile Arab states, without interference from England, France, Russia or our own County, in deciding the terms for peace in the Middle East.

Let's review these so-called peace talks, as they are held under the supervision of the four big powers. Let's not forget, that the idea for such method is predominantly Russian.

First, the Soviet Union is a major cause for continued hostilities in the Middle East because it has totally rearmed the Arab States with the most modern of equipment, and are even supplying Soviet technicians and army officers to train the Arab armies and pilots.

Secondly, we have the French government sitting at the peace table. This is the same government that after selling and receiving payment from Israel for Mirage planes, reneged on its contract to deliver the planes and refused even to deliver replacement parts for the old planes it had previously sold to Israel.

I am sure, that you are as convinced as I, that the Soviet Union will never give an inch in the Middle East, or anywhere else on this earth for that matter, without first gaining one more step in their road to world conquest. They work externally as well as internally to promote disunity among nations through their stooges, they gnaw and gnaw at the innards of a nation until they are completely in charge, and then the people of that country find that they are at the mercy of the Soviets: sans freedom; sans initiative; sans hope.

We need only to look at Czechoslovakia, and Hungary for proof of how heavy is the boot of Communism.

Communism is the base of evil in this world and until the leadership in our government and those political figures of other nations in the world face this fact, we will have no peace.

The disunity that has been promoted in the United States may, or may not, have been promoted and engineered by the Communists, but, it certainly plays into their hands all over the world and certainly dulls the blade of our defensive sword.

Such disunity was written into the Stalin Plan of world conquest decades ago, and throughout the 1930's and 1940's racial and religious unrest were the goals of the Communists in this country and their foreign henchmen and overseers.

Never before, in our history has our foreign, military or internal policy been so at the mercy of malcontents, on campuses, in our public buildings, on our streets and now even our places of worship, the communist conspiracy can indeed be insidious, though the vast majority of the people apparently do not wish to see Communism for the danger it is.

Take for instance today's student unrest . . . the militant, rebellious mood that pervades our campuses and our big cities. Who and what is behind this movement?

Isn't it becoming more and more apparent that there is a movement which has now fused together the dissidents, militants, the anarchists and the terrorists for the sole purpose of undermining our form of government and the ideals for which it stands.

Some of today's more outspoken radicals openly call today's events the third world movement. . . . And I believe its specific aim is the destruction of the capitalistic and free nations of the world, with the direct intent of converting them to socialism or communism of either the Soviet or Sino form, under the guise of liberalism.

The reactionaries that have been terrorizing our high school and college campuses are, from what I can determine, divided into three distinct groups. Namely . . the Black Militants; the White Militants, usually under the heading of Students for a Democratic Society, and more recently the fanatical supporters of Al Fatah, the anti-Semitic terrorist organization dedicated to the destruction of Israel and all pro-western nations.

These groups do seem to have different leaders, yet it appears they are united together with the single aim of changing our basic institutions and ultimately destroying the United States of America and other smaller countries, such as Israel who have struggled so hard for freedom and who have thus far resisted suppression and dictatorship which is communism.

How is it possible for these small, seemingly disunited groups to destroy a mighty nation like the United States, or other nations that are our allies? Simply by planting fear of war from the outside, but with subversion and disunity from within. In other words, with dissension and terrorism that can disrupt our lives and bring destruction to our morals, our economic fiber and sabotage our basic institutions.

Let's look at the dissension in this country today . . .

The Black Militants are more and more following the line of hate, preaching anti-white and anti-semitic lines, and calling for the destruction, among other things, of Israel as a nation. We also see these groups linking up with some of the students in our country and with foreign students who are

dedicated to the terrorism of Al Fatah, or the teachings of Mao Tse Tung.

What is the ultimate goal of this so-called third world movement? President S. I. Hayakawa of the beleaguered San Francisco State College may have had the best answer when he said before a House Subcommittee on Education recently:

"Some militants in our country are genuine in their desire to improve the education system, but there are others, especially those in the Black Student Union, who are more concerned with personal power than with education. The Black Student Union leaders keep saying they want absolute control with no accountability to anyone except their own members . . . members ruled by force, intimidation and gangster terrorist tactics."

He further stated in his description of these radicals:

"The White Militants are now as explicit as the Blacks. Their story is now familiar on every major campus. They believe our society is so corrupt that there is no hope except to destroy the entire structure and rebuild from the ground up."

In looking at these militants, whether they be the followers of the anti-semitic or the power hungry or the surly campus anarchists, one theme rings loud and clear in their cause. That is communism.

They support Ho Chi Minh in southeast Asia, who is a communist puppet . . . They pay homage to the slain Cuban communist revolutionary Che Gueverra . . . They are constantly calling for the destruction of our government charging us with being capitalistic imperialists, and at the same time they are promoting Communist ideologies of Marx, Lenin and Mao . . . They support the Arab cause in the Middle East, which also has strong Communist backing.

If you do not believe they are supporting the Arab cause . . . look at the most recent report put forth by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, an excellent report that details item after item where S.D.S. members are raising money for Al Fatah on our college campuses. Where Black Militants are openly preaching anti-Zionist tirades in their publications and at their rallies.

Some time ago, I requested the Justice Department to investigate the activities of the possible link between the Arab terrorists, the campus militants, and other radicals in our country.

As a result the Attorney General's office informed me that in accordance with my request they have directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to probe into this most dangerous situation and to prosecute anyone who may, because of their activities, be violating Federal laws.

I further requested the State and Justice Department to investigate any foreign students, who may belong to Al Fatah or other militant or terrorist organizations, with the purpose of revoking their visas and deporting these radicals as persona non grata if they are found to be engaged in activities contrary to the best interest of our country and our people.

I honestly feel that it is time for all Americans to wake up to the reality that our nation is in grave danger, and we are facing the most serious, planned internal subversion that we have ever been confronted with.

We must wake up to this reality and stop taking dose by dose the subversive poison that is being fed to us bit by bit on humanitarian and liberal grounds.

Many of us in the government recognize the danger signs, but we alone cannot curb this movement. We need the backing and support of all of our American citizens.

Each of us who are here knows our country is not perfect, but we also know how our form of government, and our way of life, has given to the people more of the good things in life, and yet we are allowed to live with dignity as free men.

As sure as we are here tonight . . . if America falters . . . the Soviet Union is already standing ready to fill the void.

Remember when Britain moved from the Mediterranean? Who was ready, and took over the ports of Algeria, ready to man the bases in Egypt and other hostile Arab states? You guessed it. It was the Soviet Union with its arms, its fleet and its phony peace suggestions.

This is why we, as a nation must be alert, firm and strong today and stop subversion at home . . . But we must also assist and stand by our true allies overseas, not with words, but with arms when it is necessary so as to give them the strength, the courage and the will to fight for their freedom.

One ally, that needs every ounce of support we can give to her today is *Israel.*

We as a matter of conscience: as a matter of right; and as a matter of self protection must give to Israel all the help she needs to protect and defend herself from any possible attack by the red trained Arab nations.

I am happy that we are now training Israeli pilots and crews, for the Phantom jet fighters we have sold to her. But we must also make it clear to Russia and to the world that Israel is our ally, and there will be no forced peace in the Mideast, unless it is the result of conferences between Israel and the Middle East nations, and with the firm understanding that the Arab States will recognize and guarantee the sovereignty and territorial rights of Israel: rights she deserves as a free nation.

We must help to solve the serious refuge problem. One which multiplies with each day the war continues.

We must clarify our foreign policy and our foreign commitments, not only to our own people but to the world as well.

We must stop appeasing the Communists, whether they be Soviet or Sino, and this means that we should make it clear that we will not be pushed into appeasement in the Middle East.

Last, but surely not least . . . It is imperative that we keep our own country strong internally, otherwise we cannot assist our allies.

Today's anarchists and terrorists, whether they be from without or from within, are not fighting to liberate the American people or those of any other free nation . . . instead they intend to bring about world communism.

Like you, I want peace . . . I want to be able to pick up a newspaper or listen to a news report and not hear . . . another flare up has occurred in South Vietnam or Korea . . . or that an Arab Terrorist Group has just killed some Israeli soldiers or innocent people . . . or that three Cleveland policemen were shot and killed by a militant group . . . or that an innocent man was killed in a riot . . .

But to have peace in this world, whether it be in South Vietnam . . . the Middle East . . . or even our own streets, or campuses the great powers of the world must desire peace.

President Nixon has said time and again, his aim is to bring peace to all parts of the world, and he is willing to discuss peace with the Russians . . . yet the Kremlin has remained very quiet.

When was the last time you heard the Soviet leaders offer to cutback their military might in Czechoslovakia . . . in North Vietnam . . . in the Middle East? or when have they honestly indicated by action that they want peace in the world?

In truth and fact, the Soviet Union has continuously . . . year after year . . . increased her arms budget, while we sit and talk about stopping the arms race. The Soviet Union will continue to do this until we have capitulated to all her demands, including maybe even giving up our own sovereignty.

We in our country want peace, but I for one do not favor peace at any price . . . In the past, peace dictated by the communists has so often resulted in the enslavement of more and more people under communism.

Until Russia then can offer the Dove of peace without a grenade attached to her leg . . . our country must remain strong economically and militarily, and so long as we remain strong as a nation and strong as an international power the people of Israel and our other allied nations, will no longer need to fear the constant threats of mortar fire on its borders and within its cities or the death of its innocent people.

But as I indicated earlier, the need in our country for the people's support of their government at all levels, is the thing that is so sorely needed today . . .

The need for confidence in law, order, in our police, and of our basic American system of democracy.

And for those who would like to destroy our country or tear it to pieces for the small faults we do have, I ask this:

Where, in this world of ours, is there a better system of representative government, a higher standard of living, fewer people hungry, and medically neglected than in our own America.

Show me a nation of 200 million, that even comes close in comparison to us in such things and gives to its people at the same time the freedoms and the opportunities that America offers to its citizens, and I will say to them they have something to talk about.

Since they cannot show us, however, then as Americans let us drown out the voices of the dissidents and the anarchists who should be thankful to God that they are living in a free country . . . By showing our faith in our God and in our country and our friends.

---

## ADDRESS OF U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT

---


## HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, made a speech at the opening session of a conference at the United Nations on "The Second United Nations Development Decade: A Challenge for Rich and Poor Countries." I commend this thoughtful address to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

Speaking eloquently of his concern that support for international development programs is diminishing within the richer nations, U Thant made this telling point, among others:

It is ironic that many people who have suddenly awakened to the costs and injustices of neglecting poverty at home, seem unable to apply the lessons of their domestic experience to the shrinking world in which they live.

He called for greater public understanding and support for the economic work of the United Nations, pointing out that "some 80 percent of the manpower and budget of the United Nations system is devoted to economic work—yet this receives less than 20 percent of United Nations coverage in the mass media."

Some 20 years ago, the British historian Arnold Toynbee wrote that the 20th century would be remembered most of all in the future because it was during this century that mankind, through

technology, developed the capacity to eradicate poverty from the face of the earth and dared to aspire to that goal. Following the same thought, U Thant said:

We cannot accept the conclusion that the eradication of poverty is politically unfeasible:

The text of the Secretary General's address follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY SECRETARY GENERAL AT OPENING SESSION OF CONFERENCE ON SECOND UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very glad to have this opportunity to welcome you all to the United Nations, and to make a few remarks at the opening session of your conference on "The Second United Nations Development Decade: A Challenge to Rich and Poor Countries," sponsored by the Institute on Man and Science and its distinguished President, my old friend Dr. Everett Clinchy.

You know only too well that we are going through a difficult and dangerous period of international relations. Mankind is divided by deep national, racial, social and ideological antagonisms. Material and intellectual resources that are desperately needed to further common interests in peace and welfare are being diverted to the pursuit of fratricidal conflicts within the family of man.

Witnessing the ominous trend of international events I cannot but recall something Adlai Stevenson said in these halls just a few years ago:

"We, the human race, are fellow travellers on a tiny spaceship, spinning through infinite space. We can wreck our ship, we can blow the human experiment into nothingness; and by every analogy of practical life, a quarrelsome ship's company and many hands on the steering gear is a good recipe for disaster."

Adlai Stevenson's metaphor of Spaceship Earth seems more appropriate with every passing year. Like it or not, we are all traveling together on a common planet. We have no rational alternative but to work together to make it an environment in which we and our children can live full and peaceful lives.

Yet—while we waste our substance in war and in the increasingly dangerous arms race—we are neglecting threats to our civilization which should have first priority on our attention. I have in mind such urgent problem as the advancing menace of environmental pollution, the uncontrolled explosion of world population, and the vast and growing inequality in living standards between rich and poor nations.

Surely the time has come to extend our concept of solidarity to embrace the entire human race. Surely the time has come to confront through a global partnership these common threats to the survival and welfare of all. This is no Utopian dream to be realized in some distant future. It is a matter of human survival that demands immediate action.

I do not wish to seem overdramatic, but I can only conclude from the information that is available to me as Secretary-General that the Members of the United Nations have perhaps 10 years left in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to world development efforts.

If such a global partnership is not forged within the next decade, then I very much fear that the problems I have mentioned will have reached such staggering proportions that they will be beyond our capacity to control.

It is the last of these problems—world development—that you have chosen as the theme of your conference today. Your choice is a timely one. We will soon reach the end of the first Development Decade—a decade in which the Members of the United Nations pledged to "intensify efforts to mobilize and sustain support for the measures required on the part of both developed and developing countries to accelerate progress toward self-sustaining growth."

While much has been done in this first Decade of Development, I am bound to say in all honesty that the efforts of rich and poor countries alike are still inadequate when measured against our proclaimed objective—the achievement of living standards in the less developed countries compatible with minimum human dignity.

I have read with interest the questions which have been prepared for your discussion by my good friend Professor Richard Gardner. There are three main headings on your agenda—how to get better aid policies from the rich countries, how to get better development policies from the poor countries, and how to get a better system of multilateral co-operation. These are, in fact, the principal questions which we are asking ourselves at the United Nations as we prepare for the Second Development Decade. Your agenda lists many important questions under each of these three main issues. I should like to draw attention to a few of them that seem to me of particular importance.

The basic question under the first heading, it seems to me, is how to strengthen the faltering political will that is all too evident in the advanced countries in the field of international aid. It is tragic that, at the very moment in history when assistance efforts are beginning to yield results, public and official support in the aid-giving countries appears to be weakening.

It is not for me to diagnose all of the reasons for this disappointing state of affairs. Certainly one factor in many advanced countries is the growing preoccupation with domestic concerns. It is ironic that many people who have suddenly awakened to the costs and injustices of neglecting poverty at home, seem unable to apply the lessons of their domestic experience to the shrinking world in which they live.

How can we explain this apparent anomaly? How can we help people to see that the domestic war on poverty and injustice cannot be won if the international one is neglected?

How can we channel the idealism of our young people on behalf of a war on poverty that is not merely national but global in scope? How can we reach their parents—many of whom now seem cynical or indifferent to international assistance efforts?

We used to hear it said that the greatest obstacle to development lay in the less developed countries themselves—in the reluctance of their governments to undertake proper policies and the unwillingness of backward peoples to adopt new ways. But now the greatest obstacle to development may be our inability to move governments and people in the rich nations.

The truth is that now, for the first time, a number of the less developed countries are able to change and grow at a rate faster than the advanced countries are prepared to support. If you can help us find an answer to this dilemma, you will have made a great contribution to one of our central concerns at the United Nations and to one of the most fundamental problems of mankind.

We shall also be deeply interested in your advice on the second subject on your agenda—how to get better development policies from the poor. We need to know much more than we know now about the nature of the development process.

Some years ago there was a tendency to regard the problem of development of the less developed countries as but an extension of the problem of European reconstruction. A certain amount of capital investment or technical assistance was thought likely to be sufficient.

We learned early in our development efforts that the European analogy did not work. Disappointed by past failures, policymakers and scholars have turned to a succession of different remedies—stimulating the private sector, undertaking tax and land reform, closing the trade gap, raising agricultural productivity, developing human resources and family planning.

All of these things are important. Yet I do not think we yet have a coherent development strategy or a clear sense of development priorities in most of the less-developed countries with which we are concerned.

One thing, however, is clear: Development means more than redistributing world income. It means internalizing the wealth-creating processes within the developing countries. And this in turn means profound political, economic, social and cultural transformations within most of these countries.

In the past we have focused much attention on the economic aspects of development. Perhaps now we need to think more about political modernization and socio-cultural change—about the measures that can be taken to increase local initiative and local responsibility for formulating and executing local development plans—about strengthening those modernizing forces within developing countries which will work for the changes in attitudes and institutions necessary for effective development.

Here again, we will look with interest to any insights you can give us.

I turn now to the last of the three headings on your agenda—how to improve our institutions for multilateral co-operation.

I welcome the inclusion of this subject on your agenda. The institutions set up within and outside the United Nations for promoting economic development need not be regarded as sacrosanct. Arrangements that were adequate to channel the modest levels of activity of the past may not be adequate to cope with the expanded efforts of the future.

I have had occasion in recent years to express concern about our proliferating conference schedule, our mounting load of documentation and the complex problems of coordination between the United Nations, its semi-autonomous units, affiliated programmes and specialized agencies.

I note that you intend to consider these questions and also the relation between global and regional organizations. Here again we shall await your report with interest.

As we in the United Nations approach the Second Development Decade, we have taken steps to increase public understanding and support for the economic work of the United Nations. As all of you know, some eighty per cent of the manpower and budget of the United Nations system is devoted to economic work—yet this receives less than twenty per cent of United Nations coverage in the mass media.

I hope you will consider how this situation can be corrected—how we can stimulate broader public understanding and support for our efforts in the economic field, possibly making use of new instruments of mass communication which technology is making available.

As I look toward the second Decade of Development, I am struck by the magnitude of the changes that will be necessary in the aid policies of the rich and the development policies of the poor. Perhaps we will need to consider a series of inter-related commitments—commitments to increased assistance from the aid-giving countries matched by commitments to more effective self-help by those receiving aid. How successfully the United Nations and other international agencies assist in the negotiation and the implementation of such a set of inter-related

commitments will do much to determine the fate of the second Development Decade.

Permit me to offer one final thought. As you confront these and other problems on your agenda, there may be those who raise the familiar objection that a particular solution is not "politically feasible". Of course, we cannot ignore political considerations. But words like "political feasibility" must not be allowed to disguise what may really be failures in the hearts and minds of men in countries on both sides of the great economic divide.

We cannot accept the conclusion that the eradication of poverty is politically unfeasible—any more than we can accept that conclusion with respect to the responses that are necessary to meet the other dangers that threaten the survival and welfare of mankind—the arms race, the destruction of the human environment and the population explosion. On the other hand I firmly believe that what man must do to prevail, he can do.

I wish you all a fruitful discussion and a successful meeting.

## THE LATE HONORABLE FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to say a few words in memory of one of our former colleagues, Mr. Fred A. Hartley, Jr. For nearly two decades he represented New Jersey's 10th District which embraced Newark and Bayonne. When he was first elected to Congress in 1928 at the young age of 26, he was the youngest man to sit in the House of Representatives at that time.

Most of the people today remember Fred because he was cosponsor of the very controversial Taft-Hartley Labor Act of 1947. The New York Times obituary about Fred devoted most of its columns to this subject. Mr. Hartley himself gave up his seat in the House in 1949 to undertake an extensive lecture tour in support of his controversial bill. He spent the remainder of his life defending the bill from its opponents like myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the other Fred Hartley, the Fred Hartley no one has mentioned. This was Fred Hartley, the humanitarian.

Fred Hartley was a personal friend of mine. We both came from towns in New Jersey separated by only a few miles from one another. Today my 13th District embraces what used to be a part of Fred's old 10th District.

I remember Fred when I was a very young boy. When my father died during the depression from wounds compounded by a severe gassing he received in France during World War I, Fred was the Representative from my hometown of Bayonne, N.J., to whom we looked for help. He did everything he could to help my family as he did for thousands of others.

Fred gave me my first glimpse of how a Congressman can personally help a constituent from his district. The kindness and understanding with which he treated my family has made a lasting impression on me.

He held office during the critical years when Americans were starving; when a job offering even 1 day a week's pay meant the difference in a family eating or not. To all of these people he sought tirelessly to offer and obtain help and hope. These were the post-World War I days when large numbers of veterans and their families had nowhere to turn for help. But in the 10th District of New Jersey, when the poor, the hopeless, and the veterans turned to Fred Hartley for help, he never turned them away.

It is with a heavy heart that I address these words of praise to the memory of Fred A. Hartley, Jr. Though a member of the opposite party, he held a respect from me that transcended politics. He was an outstanding American who had courage and compassion.

No one tried to serve his country and the people he represented in a better fashion than did Fred A. Hartley, Jr. He was a great deep man. America will miss him.

## THE NEW CONSUMER MILITANCY

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1969, Walker Sandbach, executive director of Consumers Union, carried the message of consumer militancy to the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers during its meeting here in Washington.

Mr. Sandbach, whose organization publishes Consumer Reports, warned the manufacturers that the consumer dissatisfaction will not subside with more consumer legislation and that the present unrest among consumers is indirectly related to the products on the marketplace today. He warned the manufacturers:

It is important for us to realize that we are only at the beginning of what will probably be a long period of consumer militancy.

I agree with Mr. Sandbach's appraisal of the situation.

I would point out, however, that the consumers' demands can be met by reputable manufacturers who charge a fair price for a product which is safe to use, free of defects, and performs as advertised.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. Sandbach's speech, "The New Consumer Militancy," be printed in the RECORD:

THE NEW CONSUMER MILITANCY

At Consumers Union, perhaps our greatest contribution to the welfare of the consumer is in the testing of products and reporting the results in our magazine, Consumer Reports. We test household items as small as thermometers and as large as refrigerators. We test products as inexpensive as a can of orange juice and as expensive as a Cadillac automobile. We test products as varied and as interesting as contraceptives and liquor.

As you can imagine, we have had many amusing incidents with regard to our testing and reporting on contraceptives. One letter received from a subscriber goes as follows:

"Some weeks ago I filled out a blank establishing my eligibility to receive your pamphlet, 'A Report on Contraceptive Materials,' and enclosed 25 cents. Yesterday I received a form post card informing me that instructions on how to attain high fidelity reproduction would be ready in about three weeks. While I appreciate the language being in the open mail would necessarily have to be *somewhat* guarded, I wonder whether there has not been some misunderstanding. Please let me again make my needs and wishes clear. I do not in this instance want high fidelity reproduction; in fact, it is my wish to avoid reproduction altogether."

What had happened of course was that her order for the contraceptive report had by mistake been acknowledged as an order for our instructions on how to build a high-fidelity radio-phonograph combination.

In our testing we have found over and over again that well-known brands, or price, are very seldom an accurate guide on which the consumer can depend in choosing the best product for his intended use.

When we take action by testing a product and publishing the results, a reaction is inevitable because of the fact that our magazine goes into more than one and one-half million homes each month. If we rate a product favorably, the manufacturer of that product loves us and is frequently inclined to brag about our ratings in his advertising, which we do not allow. If he does not heed our request to cease and desist from such advertising, we take him to court and seek damages under the copyright law. The reaction of the manufacturer is not so predictable when we give his product a poor rating, or rate it unacceptable. Some then say, in the words of one manufacturer: "Consumers Union is biased, unfair, and incompetent." Others have responded by improving their products, which we believe is the best response for the consumer, the manufacturer, and the retailer.

Donald Turner, the former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, in looking for remedies to counteract the adverse effects he felt advertising had on competition, suggested the possible use of government funds to support the work done by organizations such as Consumers Union. I have been asked many times what my reaction would be if such funds were offered to us. As you know, Consumers Union is a nonprofit, *independent*, organization. I have discussed this possibility with our Board of Directors. We have decided we would not be adverse to receiving such government funds if they could be channeled in such a way that we would retain our complete independence of government and industry. Our allegiance has always been, and I hope it always will be, to one group—consumers Turner is right in saying that we would need more money if we were to make our information more current and more widely available.

Is there any doubt that Mr. Turner is also right when he says that the average consumer is in great need for more information about many products than is presently, or is likely to be made available by advertising. Mr. Turner feels this would make for more competition, which is important for our economy. But also important is the fact that such information can have a substantial effect on improving the consumer's standard of living. Let me give you two examples from many.

Liquor is a potentially noxious product, the advertising of which, in my opinion, should be under even more stringent federal regulation and control than is now the case. Although many of us enjoy a drink at the right time and place, I firmly believe that liquor should not be glamorized and thus tempt our youngsters to start drinking at an early age. Misuse of alcohol can bring too much tragedy.

In our report on our tests of Canadian Imports and Domestic blends of whiskey, we said:

"A recent advertisement for Seagram's Crown Royal comments that "A man needs a good excuse to buy a bottle of $9 whiskey for himself." Our reply was, "True." And after having a panel of professional tasters evaluate 31 brands of Canadian and American blended whiskies, we'd say that a good enough excuse may be mighty hard to come by. All the products were judged both good and remarkably similar to each other in quality and character, though the prices our shoppers paid for them ranged from $3.99 a fifth to $8.80."

You know and I know that many people buy Seagram's Crown Royal and other prestigious name whiskies in part for status reasons. Many of us like to impress our friends. But if we knew it was costing us $5 extra per fifth for a product in which one cannot distinguish the expensive whiskey from the cheap one, *perhaps* we would achieve our status, and save a lot of money, by buying one bottle of Seagram's Crown Royal—and a funnel.

Last year CU reported on a major testing of automobile tires. We found that the lack of reliable indicators of tire quality is very nearly total. You'd be as well off, in our opinion, to believe a Ouija board as to give faith and credit to the advertised claims of labeled grades ("Premium," "first-line," "second-line" and the like) or replacement tires on the market today.

A look at the ratings in our August report will give some notion of the very wide range of cost and performance we found. For example: Relative tread life ranged from about 15,000 miles to about 40,000 miles. Cost per 10,000 miles of driving on a set of four tires could range from $40 to $127, depending on which tires you bought and what you paid for them.

Isn't this the kind of information that all consumers should have and shouldn't they be able to get it without having to subscribe to Consumer Reports? Certainly CU's tests demonstrate the crying need for the quality grading system that the Secretary of Transportation was supposed, by law, to propose by September 8, 1968.

I am a member of the Secretary's National Motor Vehicle Safety Council, and I can tell you that we are a long way from getting a quality grading system on tires. None was proposed by September 8th, and it may be a long time before one is proposed. Most of the tire industry is dragging its feet at every turn—saying again and again that a quality grading system is more likely to mislead the consumer than to assist him. We at CU believe that our tests give ample evidence that it will be possible to develop a quality grading system which will be of tremendous help to the tire buying consumer, I am pleased to report that there has been a major breakthrough. At least one of the major tire companies now agrees with us and is publicly supporting a grading system. A Washington newspaper reported this startling news as follows:

"As news, a man biting a dog isn't a patch on a corporation executive calling for government grade-labeling of the product his company makes. This has now happened.

"George R. Vila, board chairman and president of Uniroyal, has announced that America's tire buyers have a right to demand some standards to help them buy intelligently from among more than 1000 tire lines and descriptions offered—even if the federal government has to set the standards.

"Vila concedes that not all of his competitors may share his views, but believes 'that it is in our enlightened self-interest not only to endorse the concept of grade-labeling and uniform testing but to cooperate in making certain that the system adopted is a help, not a hindrance, to the consumer. Let us be leaders, not reluctant dragons, in the wave of 'consumerism' that is sweeping the country. Let us adopt as our basic marketing philosophy an attitude of *'cognoscat emptor'* (let the buyer be informed')."

The newspaper article concluded with an editorial comment: "Amen, brother, and hallelujah!"

Perhaps some of you should take the lead in your own industries in calling for some form of grade labeling of your products. It is going to take that kind of leadership to convince consumers that business is in truth willing to make the consumer's welfare its No. 1 priority.

AHAM has already shown admirable leadership in securing the adoption of BTU standards for air conditioners. Why not expand that small beginning by establishing standards for other qualities which consumers consider important—for example—noise level and the ability of air conditioners to dehumidify?

Or with regard to washing machines, why not establish industry-wide standards on capacity and a grade labeling system with regard to washability. We think that consumers would like to know how well a washing machine will wash clothes. If that is too difficult, and I realize it is very difficult, you could first tackle something easy, such as a grade labeling system for spin-drying ability of washing machines. Recently one of the major washing machine manufacturers started putting an information tag on its washing machines. The tag tells many things about the machines which consumers would like to know—except how well they perform.

At CU our interest is not limited to just testing of new products. We also are concerned as to how these products stand up in service and in the kind of problems consumers must face when a household item needs repair.

In 1967 we were involved with the New York CBS–TV affiliate in a TV repair study. We placed 20 TV sets in homes and checked them to make sure there was nothing wrong with the sets except for one small tube, which retails at $1.95. We marked every part in the set with invisible ink so that we could check if parts were replaced. Only four repairmen out of 20 charged what would be within reason in the New York area for the cost of a service call and the replacement of a $1.95 tube. The other 16 overcharged for the necessary repairs in one way or another, with several charging for parts which were not replaced. Some charged over $25, with the largest bill $34.95.

Is something like what he found with regard to TV repair in New York City happening with regard to the servicing of other home appliances? I hope not, but the letters we receive and the responses to our Annual Questionnaire, which is answered by over a quarter million subscribers would lead me to believe that your industries, to put it mildly, do have some service problems. I know you are aware of these problems and are making major efforts to find solutions to them. Perhaps you are already looking at possible innovative solutions. Such as appliances that would be much easier to repair. As you may have noted, one of the selling points of the new Ford Maverick is that a reasonably handy person can do his own repairs. Wouldn't that be possible with many appliances?

I doubt if I have to tell you that business is in trouble with consumers in many areas. This was confirmed by a confidential nationwide survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation which found that seven out of ten Americans think that present Federal Legislation is inadequate to protect their health and safety. Also in this survey a majority were found to believe that more Federal laws are needed to give shoppers full value for their money.

Will the present consumer malaise or unrest disappear if we have more consumer legislation? I personally doubt it. I am convinced that the present malaise has its roots in areas only indirectly related to products.

I can illustrate from a personal experience. My wife and I spent our honeymoon in a tent on the shores of Lake Erie. At that time, just 30 years ago, Lake Erie was a beautiful body of water magnificent for swimming and boating.

I don't need to tell you what has happened in those 30 years, this great natural resource has been destroyed, largely due to industrial pollution. I read recently that if all pollution into Lake Erie were to be stopped today, it would be 400 years before Lake Erie would again be pure water. So we have destroyed for ourselves, for our children, and for many succeeding generations this magnificent natural resource.

What does this do to the confidence of consumers in the business community? Or take the recent oil leak catastrophe in the Santa Barbara Channel off the coast of California. Do you agree with me that these disasters, which are only two examples from among many, have played a role in leading consumers to believe that business cannot be trusted to look out for their best interests?

It is important for us to realize that we are only at the beginning of what will probably be a long period of consumer militancy. The next generation of consumers is likely to be even more difficult to convince that businessmen have their best interests at heart than has been the case with the present generation. *Fortune* magazine recently carried an article in which the editors attempted to synthesize the views of student critics of U.S. society. In capsule form, this is what *Fortune* says these students are saying: "Our most wrenching problem is that of finding a place for ourselves in society. By all indexes we should have no anxiety about our future. We are told that we are the best prepared, best educated, most talented crop of students ever produced in this country. What we fear is not that society will reject us; we fear that we cannot accept society.

From what I read, from what I hear from my own boys—17-year-old twins—and what I hear from college students as I speak to them on campuses, the statement I have quoted to you from *Fortune* rings true for a large number of idealistic students—not just the militants—but a large number of the moderate students as well all around the world. As Margaret Mead said recently: "Never has there been as wide a generation gap as exists at the present time."

It *is* true, as Stephen K. Bailey of Syracuse University has said, that, "We have so many advantages over (the young): the cops, the Army, the registrar's records, the keys to the library. We can beat them in a fight. But they have a life to live and the best of them are trying to tell us something."

I am convinced that what these idealistic youngsters are trying to tell us is that in an America where we have the ability and the resources to send astronauts to the moon, we can't be satisfied with destroying our natural resources, we can't be satisfied with shoddy products, we can't be satisfied with misleading advertising, and we can't be satisfied with anything less than making an all-out effort to do away with poverty, racism and war.

Further, I am convinced that it is the hypocrisy of our society that seems most of all to affect our youth—in and out of the ghetto. This hypocrisy has resulted in literally thousands of students participating in demonstrations, dropping out of school, using drugs, rioting, and, shouting, "Hell no, I won't go!"

Many of our young people think of us as phonies just because of the kind of behavior so well illustrated by our handling of cigarettes. On the one hand our medical experts give us the facts about the danger, but on the other hand, the right to advertise and make millions off their sale must not be interferred with. It is an incredible fact that we are spending millions of dollars to point

out the dangers of smoking while at the same time we spend millions to subsidize the production of tobacco.

I realize that many of the problems facing us seem so enormous that we are inclined to say, "What is the use of trying to do anything, and turn away." But I can't turn away and I hope that you can't either. Recently I read some words that buoyed my spirits and gave me new hope for the future:

"Each time a man stands for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope.

"And crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance. Few are willing to brave the disapproval of their fellows, the censure of their colleagues, the wrath of their society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence. Yet it is the one essential vital quality for those who seek to change a world that yields most painfully to change.

"And I believe that in this generation those with the courage to enter the moral conflict will find themselves with companions in every corner of the globe.

"For the fortunate among us there is the temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who enjoy the privilege of education. But that is not the road history has marked out for us.

"Like it or not, we live in times of danger and uncertainty. But they are also more open to the creative energy of men than any other time in history. All of us will ultimately be judged and as the years pass, we will surely judge ourselves, on the effort we have contributed to building a new world society and the extent to which our ideals and goals have shaped that event.

"Our future may lie beyond our vision, but it is not completely beyond our control. It is the shaping impulse of America that neither faith nor nature nor the irresistible tides of history but the work of our own hands matched to reason and principle will determine our destiny."

Don't those last few words sum it up as to what we must do? ". . . The work of our own hands matched to reason and principle will determine our destiny."

## ELI LILLY & CO. OF INDIANAPOLIS CONTINUES TO STEP UP RESEARCH IN FIELD OF DIABETICS

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Eli Lilly & Co., the great pharmaceutical house of Indianapolis, was the first drug company to manufacture insulin, and continues to accelerate its research in diabetes.

It is a common but mistaken impression that once a drug is discovered no more work or research is necessary. This is simply not so. For instance, in the case of insulin, further research by Lilly and others has succeeded in reducing the number of times the drug has to be taken. Purity has been increased; newer forms of the drug make it easier for patients to adapt to it, and, most important of all, the price has been drastically reduced. Insulin now costs less than 5 percent of what it cost when first developed.

There is no real substitute for insulin. Continued work on this drug by the Lilly Co. is discussed in the following story from the May 25, 1969, Indianapolis Star:

LILLY JOINS ACCELERATION IN INSULIN RESEARCH

(By Leila Holmes Clowes)

Scientists throughout the world, including several at Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, are accelerating their research into insulin—activity that could lead to knowledge about the causes of diabetes and other associated disorders.

Hopefully, the findings could lead to a prevention of conditions causing the diseases.

Insulin, discovered in 1921, has been studied ever since as a model protein, and has played an important role in the treatment of diabetes. The Lilly company is one of the world's leading manufacturers of insulin.

Although the chemical structure of insulin was elucidated in 1955 by the Nobel prize-winning work of Dr. F. Sanger at Cambridge University, the manner in which insulin is synthesized in the body has been uncertain. In recent years, chemists from several laboratories have synthesized the two chains of insulin and combined them to make insulin.

Yet many scientists doubted that insulin is made this way by the pancreas since many other body proteins are known to be formed from larger single-chain forerunner proteins and then converted by enzymes to the active biological proteins.

Although a forerunner or precursor form of insulin has often been suggested, the proof for such a substance was only recently provided. Two years ago, Dr. D. F. Steiner of the University of Chicago isolated a single-chain "proinsulin" from a tumor of the pancreas of man. He observed that the single-chain proinsulin could be converted to insulin with the enzyme, trypsin. This released the connecting link which joined the two insulin chains together.

Steiner suggested that this inactive single-chain protein is the forerunner or precursor of the double-chain active insulin, which then regulates the use of sugar by fat and muscle in the body.

The proinsulin breakthrough has provided new impetus for scientists to try to understand both insulin production and diabetes. Some laboratories have reported more proinsulin circulating in the blood of diabetics than in normal people. They are wondering if the conversion mechanism of proinsulin to insulin is faulty in certain forms of diabetes.

Perhaps, the scientists reason, diabetics may lack sufficient enzymes to break the link in the chain to convert proinsulin to insulin. The result may be an excess of protein existing in a less active state which could cause an imbalance in blood sugar regulation.

Genetic or family differences in enzyme systems now are being studied since a tendency for diabetes is inherent in some families. Maybe the detection of pro-insulin in the circulation could be a screening tool for predetermining diabetes or could serve as an indicator of diabetes.

Steiner's discovery of proinsulin has been confirmed and extended by numerous investigations at the Lilly Research Laboratories. Dr. R. E. Chance, R. M. Ellis and Dr. W. W. Bromer have isolated pork proinsulin and have determined the chemical composition of the connecting link between the two insulin chains. In further studies, Dr. B. Frank found that the insulin portion of proinsulin is in about the same three dimensional shape as insulin existing alone.

"We found, says Dr. Chance, "that while the insulin part of the protein is very similar in pork, beef and human proinsulins, the connecting link in each case contains a different variety, number, and arrangement of amino acids."

Unfortunately this means that the readily obtainable pork or beef proinsulins will not be useful standards in a test for human proinsulin in the blood. This has been verified in immunological studies by Dr. Mary Root, who is currently developing specific methods for testing in each species for proinsulin.

Drs. W. N. Shaw, R. E. Toomey, and J. A. Galloway also from the Lilly Research Laboratories, are interested in the biological action of proinsulin. Their findings indicate that pronsulin mimice insulin actions but is far less potent. Insulin is 8 to 10 times more active, biologically, than proinsulin.

Dr. D. R. Challoner, assistant professor of medicine and biochemistry at the I.U. School of Medicine, is collaborating with Lilly researchers on proinsulin, studying its effects on fat cells. Dr. Challoner hopes someday to be able "to easily measure circulating proinsulin in normal individuals vs. diabetics."

Research on proinsulin is still in the early stages of development, and much more knowledge must be obtained before the full significance of proinsulin in relation to diabetes is understood. As proinsulin researchers share new ideas and discoveries through frequent conferences and publications, they hope the future for diabetes and associated diseases may be revolutionized.

## REA ADMINISTRATOR SPEAKS

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David A. Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, recently addressed the North Central Generation and Transmission Conference. His remarks are most enlightening. Of particular interest are his remarks with respect to the outstanding efforts of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative at Wilton Junction. This cooperative, and its general manager, Mr. F. E. Fair, are to be commended for their efforts to hold down the cost of electric power.

Mr. Hamil's remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF DAVID A. HAMIL ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE NORTH CENTRAL GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION CONFERENCE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MAY 14, 1969

One day last week the New York Times had this head over a story in its Business and Finance section: "Con Ed Chief Cites Cost-Crunch Woes."

In the second paragraph the Times reported that Charles F. Luce, chairman of the Consolidated Edison Company of New York, said that technology has reached its limit in fighting inflation and there appeared to be no relief in sight.

This is the story of almost any business today, but it has particular significance for power supply cooperatives which have been following the trail of technology and scale to lower cost operations. While the trail has not disappeared completely, it has narrowed considerably and become difficult for most of our G & T borrowers as it has for other power suppliers. The cost-crunch is a reality, not just a catch phrase.

The question, then, is where do we go from here? Do we take the easy way out, toward higher consumer costs, or do we look for ways to reduce costs further? Are there

places where costs can be trimmed, or do we crank up a campaign to increase sales so as to spread fixed costs over a greater number of kilowatt-hours?

Inflation has become such a flood, sweeping everything movable before it, that it is possible to lose one's perspective and balance, winding up in the torrent. But the chances are just as good, perhaps better, that a critical search will turn up desirable alternatives to floating along for a while and then sinking.

What are some of these alternatives?

Certain costs are called fixed costs, but they are not so immovable or sacred as to be beyond question. If you have any flexibility—meaning that the next unit is still on the drawing boards or not fully loaded—put that flexibility to the stretch test. Can you stretch out your schedule—defer the next unit for a few years while you buy power from a neighbor with reserve capacity—so that you can move up to a larger unit offering lower costs?

This is what your hosts from Eastern Iowa Light and Power Cooperative did to get extra savings from REA-financed generation. When we approved the loan originally, the plan was to build a second 22,000-kw unit for service in late 1963. Through its arrangements with the City of Muscatine and other power suppliers, Eastern Iowa was able to postpone the installation of its second unit. Better yet, the cooperative stretched the size of its second unit to 33,000-kilowatts—fifty percent larger than originally planned. By getting more kilowatts for the same amount of loan funds, Eastern Iowa has a saving of four mills per kilowatt-hour, or double the estimated saving of two mills over previous power costs.

The story would have been different if Eastern Iowa had tried to go it alone, independent of other power suppliers in self-generation. But Eastern Iowa faced the facts of life in the power generation business and worked with its neighbors and area power pools.

On a larger and different scale, two other REA-financed power supply cooperatives are working with larger neighbors toward a joint venture in nuclear generation in which they will have an ownership interest.

This arrangement will be an extension of an established joint venture—originating in 1946—between Iowa Electric Light and Power Company and the Central Iowa Power Cooperative. This venture, as I have said on other occasions, has provided proof that there can be great advantages when neighboring power systems work together closely, despite basic organizational differences.

Last month I attended meetings in Cedar Rapids where a new dimension is being added to this beneficial partnership, and the partnership enlarged. The directors and operating officers of Iowa Electric Light and Power, CIPCO and Corn Belt Cooperative, were present to work out arrangements for a combined venture in nuclear generation. The plan under consideration then called for the two power cooperatives to share in the benefits of the company's first 550-megawatt nuclear unit through each having a 10 percent ownership in the unit and its generating capacity. The three systems would be intertied through bulk transmission facilities which will enhance the reliability of the individual systems and bring the advantages of larger scale generation than each could have operating independently.

These meetings were spread over an afternoon and evening of one day and most of the following day. The most remarkable aspect of these meetings, these negotiations, to me, at least, was the representatives of Iowa Electric Light and Power were just as enthusiastic about working with cooperatives in this nuclear venture as the cooperatives were in developing a working interest with a larger operating utility system with all the advantages that association will bring.

Since that meeting the Iowa people have raised their sights somewhat. As I have been told, they are now thinking in terms of an 800-mw plant with other Iowa electric companies taking part. The expanded arrangement would bring still greater economies of scale associated with nuclear units of 800-mw and above to the joint benefit of cooperative members and company consumers.

I know that other cooperatives represented here today have also learned that working together is good business—good for each system individually, good for the areas it serves, and productive of mutual benefits for all participants.

Possibly no other region has gone farther in its approach to coordination of power planning and pooling of power resources than the group of states represented here today. This approach has led to creation in recent years of Associated in Missouri, United in Minnesota, Basin Power in North Dakota, Cooperative Power in Minnesota, and the strengthening of older power cooperatives such as Dairyland and Minnkota.

The trend toward group action and participation—with the potential benefits to be realized—will grow as the power business becomes more complex, and as the price tags go up.

In just one new area—air and water pollution—we can expect the emergency of new controls at city, state and Federal levels. To meet this, economically and effectively, it may be better to concentrate the problem at a large, more efficient generating plant, than to deal with it more expensively and less effectively in several smaller power stations.

This is one of the reasons REA is interested in the wise step taken by the cooperatives which are members of the Upper Mississippi Valley Power Pool to study the possibilities of meeting power deficiencies in the 1970's. Out of this study may come a formal group to purchase power or to build new generating capacity.

This brings me to money—and eventually to REA policy on loans for generation and transmission.

Right now we are faced with loan requests far in excess of lending authority—more than $440 million in loan applications, with about $50 million of lending authority available for the remainder of the fiscal year. We expect to start the fiscal year 1970 with about $415 million of applications on hand. The proposed budget is $345 million. Whatever is made available will be used according to our best judgment to meet the most pressing needs of borrowers, both distribution and power type.

In the light of this set of facts and the amount of funds that may be available from the Treasury next year, we will need the cooperation of borrowers and all existing power suppliers in finding ways and means for meeting the power needs of REA borrowers with a minimum of Federal investment. This and the possibility of supplemental private financing will be the main planks in our long-range plans.

I have brought with me copies of REA Bulletin 20–6, "Loans for Generation and Transmission," which is being put in the mail today. This and a press release announcing issuance of the loan policy bulletin will be available after this session.

I think the policy speaks for itself, and its merit will be determined more by subsequent events than anything I might say here. Our purpose has been to state REA policy as simply and realistically as possible, and to bring it into line with present realities and trends in power supply. In the revision, Paragraph II C of the previous version, adopted May 31, 1961, has been omitted. This was the so-called third criterion.

* * * * *

Now let's get back to the ranch—and the crunch.

I am sure you are concerned, as we are, at the ability of operating expenses to keep up or run ahead of year-to-year growth in income—operating revenues. When this happens consistently, then it is time to look for places to trim the budget and the actual expenditures.

In the days when money was in generally better supply and the terms were easier, some of us may have gotten somewhat slack in watching costs and where the money goes. Now there is good reason to check and to tighten the reins.

This is particularly true in the REA programs which are dependent on 2 percent loan funds. There is a heavy obligation to live frugally and to treat all cooperative funds as if they were public funds.

What it comes down to is this: is it more important to have money to do our jobs—getting power out to the farms—or a few extra frills? This is the question that you as managers and directors face each time you meet to hear a new financial report and approve a budget. And it is roughly the same question I have to face in REA in making decisions on loan priorities and loan requests.

* * * * *

I have talked here today, and on many other occasions, about the need to work with other segments of the electric power industry in matters of common interest and mutual advantage.

We also need to work together—REA with its borrowers and borrowers with borrowers—in the rural electrification family. We can make greater progress and use our resources more effectively through cooperation than in competition with one another.

I hope this will be the spirit and the outcome of this conference. You can count on my full cooperation.

---

## CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD UNCOVERS RUNAWAY COSTS FOR NEW TRANSPORT

---

**HON. FRED B. ROONEY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, syndicated columnists Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden focused attention on the C–5A transport scandal uncovered by our colleague, Representative WILLIAM MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.

Waste of tax dollars within the Defense Establishment is a serious matter which cannot be overemphasized. Within the past year, I have found unbelievably shoddy procurement practices being utilized by the Department of the Navy in awarding contracts for spare parts for the Mark–12 20-millimeter aircraft cannon.

The General Accounting Office, on July 1 will begin a Defense-wide investigation of so-called "sole source" procurements as the result of the GAO's investigation of Mark–12 gunpart contracts. These sole source procurements—contracts awarded specific firms who are regarded by the Defense agencies as the sole producers of certain parts and equipment—account for $5 billion worth of defense spending annually.

Sole source procurements presuppose noncompetition. Undoubtedly the Navy was stunned early this year to learn that the 1968 "sole source" supplier of the

Mark-12 breechblock lock now has encountered competition from 11 other prospective suppliers in a competitive procurement. And competitive bidding cut the cost of the breechblock lock to less than one-third the price paid last year.

Congressman MOORHEAD's discoveries regarding the fantastic cost escalation of the C-5A transport underscore the critical need for vastly improved spending controls within the Defense agencies. I include the Mankiewicz-Braden column in the RECORD at this point because I believe every Member of the Congress is concerned about the continuing series of revelations regarding waste in defense spending.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle, May 6, 1969]

PENTAGON IN DEEP TROUBLE IN C-5A CONTRACT

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

WASHINGTON.—A memo by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird and an exasperated speech by Sen. Harry Byrd, Jr., to point up the mounting crisis facing the Pentagon.

Both involve the major scandal unearthed this week by Rep. William Moorhead, D-Pa., concerning the Air Force's huge C-5A transport. The contract will cost some $2 billion more than estimated, and the Air Force, it seems, covered this up for more than two years, at least in part over concern for the financial position of Lockheed Aircraft, the prime contractor.

In March, Laird sent a memo to his top assistants.

"I am increasingly concerned," he wrote, "about the allusions in the press and elsewhere to 'runaway' costs on such key or major programs as the C-5A." He asked which studies and reviews were under way on program costs. He also asked, significantly, "What can and-or should be said publicly about these costs?" And finally, "What sorts of actions on DOD's (Defense's) part can be taken to thwart or ameliorate the continuing adverse commentary on program costs and suspect technical effectiveness."

At the time he wrote the memo, Laird must have known the fantastic cost overrun had been apparent for two years and that Air Force reports had been changed to conceal this fact for more than one year. The cost, in fact, had gone from $2.9 billion to over 5.2 billion, with the end not in sight.

Sen. Byrd took another tack. "The entire military establishment," he said, "has the responsibility to handle tax funds as a public trust—and drive hard bargains with the manufacturers."

It is, alas, an empty wish, as Sen. Byrd, perhaps the Senate's leading advocate of both economy in government and defense preparedness, must know. The unfortunate fact, as the C-5A flap and others reveal most clearly, is that the Pentagon cannot drive hard bargains with the manufacturers—it is the manufacturers who drive the hard bargains.

For example, an assistant secretary of the Air Force wrote his chief on March 15, 1967, expressing concern that Lockheed's trouble with the C-5A might damage its standing in the financial community. Lockheed was about to issue $125 million of convertible debentures. People might think, he said, that the C-5A contract was "in serious trouble," since by this time the Air Force had sent Lockheed a "cure notice," a device by which the Pentagon hints that a contract may even be terminated if deficiencies are not corrected.

This is, in fact, precisely what is meant by "the military-industrial complex." It is a complex in which buyers and sellers move easily back and forth across the lines, in which each is intimately involved in the financial and public relations welfare of the other and in which arms-length bargaining is quite impossible.

Rep. Otis Pike, D-N.Y., has also been doing some digging. The contract with Lockheed for the ill-starred Cheyenne helicopter, he says, was entered into by the Army at a time when the assistant secretary of the Army for research and development was a former vice president of Lockheed—who has since returned to the corporation. That contract, for 375 helicopters, had an original cost estimate of less than $1 million per helicopter. The cost is now estimated at more than $2.8 million each, and a spare-parts contract has yet to be negotiated.

It is a bad season for the men who now will try to cap these triumphs with an ABM system. No one here has ever talked about a "Labor Department-poor complex" or an "Agriculture Department-hungry complex" or, for that matter, a "HEW-dependent child complex" for a very good reason: they do not exist. In those areas, as is right and proper, bargains are hard and dollars are watched. But if you are a defense manufacturer and you run over a few billion dollars, or the thing won't work, your friends will cover up and the extra cost can be added to the next contract. Elsewhere in the federal budget the law is a terrible, swift sword.

---

## PARENT POWER—AN AMERICAN TRADITION

---

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 28, 1969*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, once again some of the American people, asserting themselves at the polls in a typically American manner, have eliminated what they regarded as a threat to the safety and well-being of their children. By a landslide vote they replaced two school board members who were obviously not representing them to their satisfaction. In their places they elected two men who campaigned for the wishes of the great majority of the electorate.

The lesson is plain—that the American people will not be perpetually conned into school policies, whether it be in the guise of "balance," of "sex education," or any other do-gooder gimmick, which they know to be dangerous to their children.

I insert a clipping from Time magazine for May 30, 1969, as follows:

INTEGRATION—THE DREAM IS OVER

Because they regard the city as an ideal mirror of U.S. tastes, dozens of companies use Denver to test-market new products. If the same holds true of racial attitudes, then a key election in Denver last week suggests that Americans oppose school integration (at least via bussing) by 2½ to one.

The vast majority of Denver's elementary schools are *de facto* segregated. Almost two-thirds of the white pupils attend schools that are more than 85% white; in predominantly black schools, the pupils are rapidly falling behind in their studies. Goaded by the murder of Martin Luther King last year, the Denver school board sought a drastic remedy: make each Denver school reflect the overall ethnic composition of the city's 96,000 pupils—65% white, 20% Mexican-American and 15% Negro.

By a vote of 5 to 2, the board approved a bussing plan, due to start next fall, that would have sent more than 500 whites to predominantly black schools and guaranteed, that no minority-area school would be less than 70% white. The plan was less than satisfactory to the Rev. Jesse R. Wagner, co-chairman of a black-white group called Citizens for One Community that wanted fuller integration. Still, he worked hard for the bussing scheme—in contrast to Denver's black separatists, who told Wagner, in effect: "Do your things and you'll see."

What he and other Negro integrationists saw was a strong backlash by anti-bussing whites. Last week the whites got a chance to express their feelings when a record 50% of Denvers registered voters turned out for the schoolboard election. At issue were two six-year seats on the seven-member board. In seeking those seats, Lawyer James C. Perrill and Frank K. Southworth, a real estate man, ran primarily "against forced bussing and for neighborhood schools." They won by a landslide, switching the board majority to 4 to 3 against integration.

In Negro precincts, the pro-integration vote ran as high as 10 to 1; the heaviest vote against it came from white precincts that were totally unaffected by bussing now but fearful of it in the future. As a result, bussing is highly unlikely in Denver. Said Jesse Wagner: "The dream is over. The white majority is not willing to take on the commitment and make our country one."

---

# SENATE—*Thursday, May 29, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our spirits, we give Thee thanks for the blessed memories and enduring hopes which bind us to the unseen world of the heroic dead who encompass us now like a cloud of witnesses. We thank Thee for all who have nobly lived, bravely died, and kept the faith. May we who have entered into the heritage of their heroism and self-sacrifice so honor their memory and so preserve and further their high purposes that the Nation they served may stand evermore for righteousness and peace.

We remember before Thee all whom war has left weakened in body, mind, and spirit and pray that they may live brave, cheerful, and useful lives amid grateful regard and deserved honor.

Bless the work of the peacemakers and by Thy grace put down the pride and anger that turn man against man and nation against nation, so that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.