

Kenneth Franzheim II, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the advisory board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:

Jacob L. Bernheim, of Wisconsin.
Foster S. Brown, of New York.
William W. Knight, Jr., of Ohio.
Miles F. McKee, of Michigan (Reappointment).
Joseph N. Thomas, of Indiana.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Bishop, Garland S. | Howell, Randle H. |
| Bryant, Murray W. | Hunter, Randolph S. |
| Byerly, Harold D. | McGuirk, Gordon R. |
| Calvin, Donald A. | Mills, Dexter |
| Cano, Guadalupe L., Jr. | Ouellette, Donald M. |
| Clardy, Bobbie J., Sr. | Owens, John L. |
| Class, George N. | Quinn, Paul F. |
| Crooker, Carol S. | Slaughter, Thomas L. |
| Dowty, Grady R., Jr. | Stoltz, Kimble |
| Ehringer, Michael A. | Terrell, Charles A. |
| Fales, John E. | Thomas, Wesley L. |
| Francis, George M. | Thorpe, Joseph |
| Graves, James W. | Walker, Henry F. |
| Hemphill, Clive W. | Windsor, Bruce M. |

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2, 1969:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Luther Holcomb, of Texas, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the term expiring July 1, 1974.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

James A. Washington, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation.

IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The nominations beginning Hilary H. Connor, to be senior surgeon, and ending Edwin P. Yarnell, to be senior assistant health services officer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 21, 1969.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 2, 1969

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

The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness and faithfulness.—Galatians 5: 22.

Almighty God, Father of all men and Ruler of nations, without whom no country can be great and no people can be good, we thank Thee for the blessings bestowed so abundantly upon us as a nation of free people. By our faith in Thee and Thy faith in us may we keep the spirit of freedom alive in our day realizing that it is a gift to be earned by just and good men of every generation.

Make us as the representatives of our Nation more responsive to Thee and more responsible to our people that we may sincerely seek the good of all and endeavor to maintain our freedom in righteousness and peace.

Awaken in our citizens a willingness to make sacrifices for peace as well as for war. To this end we pray that they and we may think clearly, plan courageously, decide confidently, and by Thy grace achieve creatively for the good of man and the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1011) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes."

POLITICS OUT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, this administration has instituted a most commendable practice of removing partisanship from the appointment of postmasters, and it is a practice with which I am wholeheartedly in agreement.

I would suggest to the administration that another department in the administration, the Department of Justice, has not gotten the message that partisanship is an undesirable means by which departments should be administered, and particularly that partisanship in the sensitive area of law enforcement is detrimental to the health of the Nation.

I have been informed the U.S. marshal in my particular area in California is to be removed from office though he has 3 years of his term to go, because his party registration does not fit the registration of the party in control. I am similarly advised that every other U.S. marshal and U.S. attorney in the United States whose party registration does not meet that of the present administration will be removed from office.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing more deleterious to the proper administration of justice and law and order than to interfere in this manner with the proper administration of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Crime and as a concerned citizen of this Nation, I am most concerned about the need for effective law enforcement. I am concerned about any effort to undermine this Nation's ability to enforce the law and to administer justice. Mr. Speaker, one of the factors contributing to the erosion of these abilities is the continuation of the practice of basing the appointment of U.S. marshals solely on political affiliation. I have written a letter to the President on this matter and include it in the RECORD to reinforce my previous remarks on this subject:

JUNE 30, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I call to your attention what appears to be a serious policy difference between two Departments in your Administration.

Postmaster General Blount has coura-

geously taken a strong position against "politics" in the Postal System. He has recommended that Postmasters be appointed solely on merit and without regard to Political Affiliation. I fully support General Blount on this long overdue reform and have supported this position in the past Administration.

On the other hand, the Patronage Committee in the Department of Justice has apparently determined to continue "politics as usual" in the sensitive appointments involving law enforcement, the U.S. Marshals.

The Department of Justice has recommended a successor be appointed in the case of the incumbent Marshal of the Northern District of California. The incumbent, Marshal Lou Martin, is remarkably qualified bearing among his distinctions a recent commendation from the Department of Justice as well as a strong endorsement for reappointment by the Presiding Federal Judge, George B. Harris.

Yet, I am told by Senator Murphy that "all Marshals are to be replaced" by the new Administration.

Surely, if political appointments to local Postmasterships are destructive of good Postal Administration, then most assuredly political appointments to Marshal positions are equally, and far more destructive of good Government and of good law enforcement.

I hope you will be able to respond that you have recommended that the Department of Justice remove "politics" from their appointments and remove only those Marshals whose records so indicate their inability to perform. The fact that they, in turn, were political appointments does not seem to me to excuse any continuation of that practice.

I cannot help but believe that Attorney General Mitchell would be the first to agree with this policy. His laudable determination to strengthen the professional aspects of law enforcement would surely be undermined and defeated by a policy of ousting exceptional and capable men merely because of their political party registration.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME R. WALDIE.

GOON SQUAD BARBARISM MUST STOP

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night in Springfield, Ill., Joseph A. Yablonski, candidate for president of the United Mine Workers

of America, was leaving a meeting of UMW district leaders when he was knocked unconscious by a blow from behind. I have sent a telegram to W. A. Boyle, the current president of the United Mine Workers of America, asking whether he condones the goon squad barbarism involved in this physical force and intimidation used on one of Mr. Boyle's opponents for the presidency. At the same time, unsigned smear sheets are being distributed to defame Mr. Yablonski's character. I have also asked Mr. Boyle to issue instructions through his top officials, executive board and district officials that this kind of despicable tactics must stop.

I talked with Mr. Yablonski this morning in his Clarksville, Pa., home, where he is confined by doctor's orders. Mr. Yablonski's doctor, Dr. Emil Spasoto of Washington, Pa., reports that Yablonski was unconscious for nearly 30 minutes as a result of a sort of karate chop behind his right ear, which also injured the third and fourth vertebrae of his neck. He had a very bad day yesterday, and is still dizzy and woozy from the attack, with numbness in his arms, hands, and in one leg. He had a neurologist in yesterday for consultation.

Mr. Yablonski told me that "the attack must have been the work of a professional, because the karate blow hit right at the nerve center." Following the attack last Saturday, Mr. Yablonski issued a statement charging that UMW President Boyle's men have been "doing everything they can" to get him to withdraw from the race for president of the UMW. Yablonski in his statement proclaimed he would stay in the race, and added: "They gotta kill me to get me out."

Likewise, last Sunday, at a meeting in Shenandoah, Pa., Mr. Yablonski's vice-presidential candidate, Elmer Brown, was addressing a meeting of coal miners, and the meeting was interrupted, disrupted, and forced to conclude.

Mr. Speaker, the breaking up of meetings, the distribution of sneak attacks through unsigned smear sheets, attempts at intimidation by force or attacks from behind are symbolic of the type of union leadership which must be changed not only in the name of fairness and decency but also in order to protect the rank and file of coal miners. I trust that we may in the future have a clean, responsible, and forthright union to represent the rank and file of coal miners all over this country.

PRESIDENT NIXON URGED TO CALL FOR CEASE-FIRE AND TO ESCALATE TROOP WITHDRAWALS FROM VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today my resolution calling on the President to propose an immediate cease-fire and to direct the immediate withdrawal of 100,000 troops from Vietnam.

When I first introduced this resolution on May 15 with seven cosponsors, the

proposal seemed radical to many. But, since that time, there have been several developments which make clear that it is in fact a most modest proposal.

Two of our Nation's past negotiators in Paris who are among the best informed on the Vietnam peace talks, Cyrus Vance and Ambassador Harriman, have called for a cease-fire. In addition, the former Defense Secretary, Clark Clifford, proposed just a few weeks ago that there be a withdrawal of at least 100,000 combat soldiers this year and that the withdrawal escalate so that next year a comparable or even larger number would leave. President Nixon has directed the withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. troops at this time and has indicated that he hopes to improve upon the figures recommended by Mr. Clifford.

On Monday, the results of a Gallup poll were released which show the following: The large majority of the American people favor withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam and 42 percent believe such withdrawal should be at a rate faster than that ordered by President Nixon. In addition, 53 percent of the American people support a U.S. call for an immediate cease-fire.

I truly believe that it would be helpful to the President if Members were to indicate their support for a prompt withdrawal of troops from Vietnam and a cease-fire in Vietnam by cosponsoring this resolution.

Today's reintroduction of my resolution adds seven Members to its sponsorship. I hope that the list of sponsors grows in the House so that the casualty list in Vietnam can be reduced and ended.

AIR FARE CRISIS CONTINUES—WHERE IS THE CAB?

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address to the Society of Air Line Analysts, Mr. Richard W. Klabzuba stressed the importance of "load factor" guidelines in establishing airline fares. He noted that in competitive markets higher fare levels produce greater costs, less efficiency and smaller economies in the form of overcapacity, overscheduling, low load factors, smaller operating margins and numerous ancillary services.

Similarly the CAB's Bureau of Economics noted in its staff study last year:

The fare level affects the volume of service offered . . . and that a fare set well above cost, based on a reasonable load factor, may contribute to the operation of excessive capacity and resulting inefficient use of resources.

Now it has come to my attention that Mahlon R. Straszheim, assistant professor, Department of Economics, Harvard University, has said the same thing:

For any fare agreed upon, the competitive adjustment is to bid up costs to that point, either through additional in flight passenger services or by adding additional capacity to the route.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 years we have been repeatedly warned by the Board's staff and others of the relation-

ship between airline fares, capacity, and costs.

We have watched with horror as the skies over our major cities have become more and more congested by overscheduling of flights while load factors have declined to historically low levels and the financial position of our air carriers has deteriorated.

What has been the answer of the Board to this crisis? An investigation, such as that suggested by 20 Members of Congress? No. Rather higher fares agreed to at an informal session between the Board and the carriers. Higher fares that support lower load factors and greater inefficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Professor Straszheim's paper before the International Symposium of Transportation Pricing at American University, Washington, D.C., on June 19, 1969, may add significantly to our understanding of this problem. Because of its length and technical nature, I have taken the liberty of placing emphasis upon those passages referring more specifically to fares, capacity, and costs. The emphasis is indicated by being printed in *italics*:

PRICING INTERNATIONAL AIR SERVICE: OLIGOPOLY MODELS AND THE ROLE OF STATE INFLUENCE

(Preliminary Paper to be presented before International Symposium on Transportation Pricing, American University, Washington, D.C., June 19, 1969, by Mahlon R. Straszheim, assistant professor, Department of Economics, Harvard University, May 1, 1969)

I. INTRODUCTION

The performance of the international airline industry in serving a rapidly increasing demand for passenger and cargo service has been notable, with substantial reductions in travel time and real costs having accrued to shipper and traveler and with the network of service having grown extensively. Air carrier profits have turned sharply upward from their depressed level in the early 1960's, largely as a result of jet technology.

This record notwithstanding, the industry currently faces difficult problems. Perhaps most obvious are those at airports and terminals, which are increasingly becoming the focal point of congestion costs and delay. The introduction of larger aircraft also presents some pressing planning questions. During periods of transition to new equipment, a year or two of lower equipment utilization rates and higher operating costs have sometimes occurred. There has also been a history of excessive concentration in the time staging of equipment deliveries, with unusually large increases in capacity for short periods of time reducing realized load factors and profit levels. The introduction of the jumbo jets and airbus will present this sort of challenge to the industry. The potential long run technological economies of larger aircraft could well be dissipated for several years if capacity increases are excessive and the transition to new equipment leads to poor equipment utilization.

The introduction of the jumbo jet and airbus technologies come at a time when the industry is again experiencing a decline in profits. The passenger load factor in the North Atlantic was 53% in 1968, down from 57%. Whereas aircraft deliveries have become somewhat bunched in 1968 and 1969, so that capacity increases are above average, the principal cause of the decline in load factors is the lowest growth in demand for almost a decade. Scheduled traffic in the

North Atlantic for IATA carriers increased only 5.8% in 1968, while charter traffic in the same market grew 24%. Thus, whereas the current profit squeeze for the U.S. domestic airline industry has its explanation almost entirely in overcapacity,¹ prospects in the international airline industry rest heavily on the demand side. Interestingly, a 5% increase in regular air fares was recently proposed, and at the same time sharp reductions in charter fares. The wisdom of this proposal or other recommendations about price or service (for example, for the SST), will depend both on the nature of demand functions and the airlines' decisions about fares and service.

The international airline market is far from the economists' model of a competitive market.² Governments play an important role, determining entry, negotiating pooling agreements, and approving fares. They are motivated by a variety of non-economic considerations. Fares are set by the International Air Transport Association, a trade organization of almost all the major airlines. Fare determination is thus a complicated process involving both carrier bargaining within IATA and state influence and approval of the results. A conference procedure for negotiating fares in an industry with so many actors spanning a wide range of economic and political viewpoints clearly presents difficult problems. The rapid pace of changes in technology and market conditions only complicates the task, and will seriously undermine marketing procedures which are not continually updated. Service and capacity adjustments in particular markets to agreed upon prices depend on the terms of the existing bilateral entry agreements. In some cases capacity and service decisions are made in a competitive environment while in other cases tacit or explicit agreements are made.

II. PRICE AND SERVICE DETERMINATION IN OLIGOPOLY MARKETS

As in most transportation industries, the fact that demand is stochastic and has daily and seasonal peaks while capacity cannot be stored implies a tradeoff between the level of prices and frequency of their change, and the amount of capacity offered. Variation in demand for a given level of capacity will be perceived as variation in the level of capacity utilization, in the case of the airlines, the "load factor." A clear tradeoff exists between the level of fares and the load factor since a higher level of capacity and hence lower realized load factors can only be financed by higher fares. Specification of any given fare level implies an equilibrium level of capacity, determined by the break even load factor. A high level of capacity implies more frequent departures and more convenient schedules, lower load factors, and hence a higher probability of a seat being available. The pricing strategy consistent with the objective of financing the highest capacity level is to price so as to maximize revenue. The alternative is to reduce prices below that point, which implies a lower average yield per seat and hence a lower level of capacity and higher realized load factors.

The appropriate choice depends upon the characteristics of demand in each particular market. There are likely to be considerable differences. In markets where tourist rather than business travelers predominate, demand will be more price elastic at any given fare and hence fares at which the elasticity equals or exceeds unity will be lower. Travelers will tend to prefer the combination of high density seating, higher load factors, and lower fares. Travelers with lower incomes who travel less frequently will also tend to prefer this sort of service. Conversely, business travelers flying more frequently will be will-

ing to pay for greater schedule frequency and a higher probability of a seat being available, and apparently for more comfort. Since markets serve travelers with a range of preferences, there will not generally be a nice segregation of particular markets into the above sort of classification according to the level of fares and type of service desired.

The actual determination of price and type of service is a result of interaction of all carriers, influenced both by the backing of their governments and by their participation in IATA. A carrier's bargaining in this environment derives from its perception of a profit maximizing price, based on its own costs and the demand characteristics in the markets it serves. For any fare agreed upon, the competitive adjustment is to bid up costs to that point, either through additional in-flight passenger services or adding additional capacity to the route. Which alternative is chosen depends on each carrier's perception of its comparative advantage in one or the other forms of service competition. There are some distinct differences. Carriers with lower labor costs have a comparative advantage in competition in passenger "amenities," whereas the U.S. carriers and others with lower capital costs and higher labor costs find it in their best interest to compete on the basis of schedule frequency and a utilitarian service on board. These sorts of competitive responses have occurred in some city-pair markets, while in others pooling agreements have led to a non competitive outcome, usually an agreement to restrict capacity.

The basis for comparative cost differences and the bargaining process by which IATA determines the overall level of fares are discussed in the following sections. The interaction of carriers in particular markets, competitive or otherwise, in making scheduling or capacity adjustments to fixed fares is discussed here. The several possible processes of this interaction and the outcomes can be illustrated by some simple oligopoly or "small numbers" models. These essentially indicate how the market will be shared by the carriers.

Use of the term "determination" in the title of this section may be misleading if it suggests that answers will be offered to a problem which economists have labored unsuccessfully over for years, namely, that of finding a deterministic solution of price and output in oligopoly or "small numbers" markets. Such an answer surely does not exist in its strict sense. The existence of small numbers of sellers implies an interdependence among actors such that to adopt a well defined course of action with regard to price or product type is almost surely a losing strategy. The situation where all firms' actions are based on expectations as to others actions and reactions, the case of "mutual dependence recognized" in the jargon of the profession,³ does not lead to a determinant solution. This situation is the arena for game theory. The major advantage of a "game theoretic" approach to modeling situations where the actors have both common and conflicting interests is that it aids in analyzing the interactions of actors in such circumstances.⁴ Which models or modes of behavior are appropriate for particular markets will depend on the particular circumstances.

One set of models begins with the assumption that any given number of passengers, as determined by the level of fares, will divide among carriers in proportion to capacity offered. The assumption is that passengers have no preference for one carrier or another (and in particular, do not respond to schedule frequency). Such an assumption is realistic only if each carrier's capacity is above a fairly substantial minimum, implying some minimal level of schedule convenience, so that schedules are not an in-

document for travelers to consider one airline over another in making their choice.

Profits for one carrier as a function of its capacity and that of its competitors is as follows: Let—

c_i = capacity of carrier i
 C = total capacity ($\sum_i c_i$)
 P = number of passengers
 F = fare
 L_i = breakeven load factor for carrier i (i.e. unit costs/fare)

Profits for carrier i are

$$\pi_i = F \cdot P \left(\frac{c_i}{C} \right) - F \cdot L_i \cdot c_i$$

Profit maximization occurs when $\partial \pi_i / \partial c_i = 0$, a solution c_i to the following:

$$\left(1 - \frac{c_i}{C} \right) \left(\frac{P}{C} \right) = 1, i$$

The solution c_i for any set of c_j ($j=1$) indicates how carrier i maximizes profits given capacity levels of all other carriers j . The meaning of this expression (a quadratic in c_i) is straightforward. The first term in brackets is the share of the market by all carriers other than i , the second term the prevailing load factor; carrier i expands capacity as long as the net addition to his traffic (the product of the two terms on the left side) exceeds its break even load factor. If he is not in the market

$$\left(\frac{C_i}{C} \right) = 0$$

he simply examines the prevailing market load factor. One extreme of this is the purely competitive case, in which a firm assumes the market load factor is constant, irrespective of its own decision about capacity. Conversely, the larger is carrier i 's prevailing share of the market, the less traffic there is available which he can obtain from other carriers by adding to his capacity.

Assuming only two carriers are involved permits these profit-capacity relationships to be depicted graphically (the analysis and the character of the solution depend only on the interrelationships of capacity, not the number of carriers). The points c_i which are a solution to the above represent the peaks of a set of "iso-profit contours" relating profits for carrier i as a function of capacity offered by each. An illustrative set is shown in Figure 1, where $\pi_{i1}, \pi_{i2}, \dots, \pi_{ij}$ represent increasing profit levels for carrier i . Carrier i maximizes profits if carrier j offers no capacity. If total capacity exceeds a level where the realized load factor drops below carrier i 's break even load factor, that firm exists. Similar contours exist for j , which may differ in shape if j 's cost level is different than i 's.

The original assumption about the demand side can easily be relaxed; if each carrier has a certain number of passengers who will choose it rather than simply choosing randomly in response to the two competitors' capacity levels (e.g. nationality, passenger services, safety reputation, type of equipment), this will shift the isoprofit contours toward the origin, and will raise the profit maximizing load factor. (This can be included by altering the market sharing term, c_i/c_j in the above expression.)

FIGURE 1 (not printed in RECORD). Iso-profit contours and reaction curves.

FIGURE 2 (not printed in RECORD). Leader-follower solutions.

FIGURE 3 (not printed in RECORD). Schedule competition and instability.

Several behavioral variations can be illustrated using this simple model, each leading to a different outcome. One possibility is the "naive" Cournot model of oligopoly,⁵ in which each seller takes the other's capacity decision as given. His optimal strategy is then to seek the higher isoprofit contour; the locus of all those peaks has been labeled carrier i 's "reaction curve."⁶ Based on this behavioral assumption, only a point along that curve will leave carrier i in equilibrium, given

Footnotes at end of article.

a decision by *j*. If carrier *j* behaves similarly, the intersection of the two reaction curves will produce a stable equilibrium. This is shown in Figure 2. In the example here with identical costs, equal break even load factors will lead to an equilibrium in which they share the market equally and capacity just equals demand. All other points are unstable. If carrier *i* has lower costs and hence a low break even load factor the market equilibrium will involve carrier *i* providing more capacity. Retaining the Cournot behavioral premise but introducing more carriers into the market does not change the solution, which derives from the assumption that each (naively) takes the aggregate capacity of all other carriers as given.

Some alternative behavioral premises suggest themselves. One possibility is some form of leader-follower arrangement, in which the capacity of one carrier influences the other, but not vice versa. This possibility is clearly suggested by the existence of well defined "reaction curves;" if one carrier is known to act on that basis the other can "lead" the former to the leaders' preferred position by its action. Figure 2 illustrates how carrier *j* maximizes profits (given carrier *i* acting according to *i*'s reaction curve) by picking a point tangent to *j*'s highest isoprofit contour (Point X). Such a phenomenon is, of course, symmetric; if both attempt to be "leaders" the resultant outcome will leave both badly off (Point Y).

Another behavior variant of interest is that of schedule competition and in the extreme, a "scheduling war." This derives from an alternative assumption about the demand side. The assumption is that passengers tend to choose the carrier offering more (or the most) capacity (perhaps higher capacity implying more flights motivates passengers to attempt to schedule passage on that one airline). This premise is probably most applicable when carriers are small—a carrier may well have to achieve a certain level of schedule frequency relative to its competitors before it can effectively compete. (The choice of passengers is likely related both to the level of capacity and the realized load factor of all carriers. Differences in the latter imply differences in the probability of receiving service when stochastic or peaking elements are introduced.) The result is that "reaction curves" have a range in which they are both positively sloped. The reader will probably find it unnecessary to refer to Figure 3 for the consequences, an unstable supply likely; the dynamics of such a "scheduling war" are quite analogous to the "arms race" models suggested by Schelling, Boulding, and others. In some instances the motives for schedule competition are uneconomic—for example, the desire to "show the flag" or offer as frequent flights as certain competitors.

This "reaction curve" apparatus has something of a history in economics. While suggesting "deterministic" results given the premises of the models, much of the critical behavioral story remains to be told. At best the models are illustrative and educational, a means for sorting out one's thinking about interaction in such markets. The critical issues are whether or not carriers act as pure competitors, or as Cournot suggested what size in a market must carriers assume before "capacity wars" do not yield huge swings in market shares? (i.e. at what point does the first demand premise that passengers divide in proportion to capacity become realistic?) and if leadership occurs, who becomes the leader and how is information transmitted? And if collusion occurs, is it tacit or explicit, and how arranged?

Examination of airline markets suggests that almost every variant exists. In a great many of the denser international markets the competitive model seems realistic, with the market largely shared in (approximately) equal proportions by a number of large,

well established carriers who offer approximately equal schedule frequency and achieve essentially comparable load factors. There may or may not be one or more smaller carriers, usually newer entrants, who serve some smaller share, usually relying heavily on the affinity of its own nationals and public officials for survival. The North Atlantic seems a good example.

What one observes in many markets is a rather unsteady equilibrium in which each offers about the same amount of capacity and the market load factor approximates the break even level. The "stability" of this circumstance would appear to rest rather critically on the number of carriers involved and their attitudes with regard to entry and exit. If interdependence can be ignored, carriers would have no incentive to add capacity if it will depress the market load factor below a break even point.

However, once the possibility of driving out competitors arises, and carriers perceive reaction curves of the shape in Figure 3, the threat of instability tends to arise. Several reasons explain why the instability suggested by this model is not prevalent. One is that of collusion. The joint-monopoly solution is to restrict joint capacity to equal demand. The real life variant of this case is the market-sharing pools in many of the intra-European and long-haul markets from Europe to Africa and the Far East, in which the pooling partners restrict capacity and share the proceeds according to some agreed formula. While the terms of such pools are generally not public information, it would appear that one of their major motives is that of restricting capacity. In many instances their historical origins lie in the sort of scheduling war noted above. A close variant is the case where capacity is determined explicitly in the bilateral agreements.

In some instances there is no formal collusion and capacity decisions approximate a competitive result. In this circumstance the threat of state intervention serves to define some sort of mutual understanding about appropriate capacity levels. It seems unlikely that "predatory economic warfare" among firms will result given the role of governments. The understanding by all competitors that none is likely to exist tends to define bounds on how much capacity is offered. Misjudgment only leads to recurring periods of excess capacity in which load factors are low. Profits recover only over time as demand catches up with capacity. Essentially this "stability" exists because the role of governments has removed extreme competition in schedule frequency or capacity from the arena.

Finally, of course, the case of multiple "leaders" and aggressive competition in the form of capacity increases, often at the expense of all concerned after the fact, is sometimes in evidence. The competition from the Northeastern United States to Miami and the Caribbean often seems to assume that character, and indeed, the overcapacity plaguing the entire U.S. domestic trunkline industry in 1968-69 might in a very simplified way be so characterized.⁴

III. THE BASIS FOR COMPARATIVE COST DIFFERENCES⁵

The nature of airline cost functions, especially their differences among carriers, is critical in defining the competitive position of each, which in turn has much to do with carriers bargaining over prices and nations' attitudes concerning entry rights. The sources of comparative advantage in the industry are several. Differences in both factor prices and production functions are considerable. In addition, there are large differences in route systems, and these affect costs as well.

The most important source of comparative advantage arising from input price variation

is labor costs, which make up about one half of total expenses. Aircraft and fuel are purchased in world markets with little or no discrimination. In some cases landing charges are discriminatory, but the total effect on costs tends to be small. Differences in wages are dramatic. Pilots with comparable training and performing the same task as pilots of U.S. carriers may be paid a wage in some countries only half the U.S. level. Wage differences among lesser skilled personnel are even greater. U.S. labor's wages may be three or more times as high as that of their counterparts for carriers of many of the less developed countries. Some portion of this is surely accounted for by differences in productivity; however, for inflight cabin crew personnel it is hard to believe any differences in productivity are very significant. Capital and foreign exchange prices are also an important source of differences in costs, but the willingness of states to subsidize their carriers is such that real differences among countries in capital costs are not translated to industry participants.

These differences in factor prices much overstate the comparative disadvantage that U.S. and other nation's carriers with high wages face. Input substitution occurs in the choice of aircraft, the type of service offered, and the nature of ground operations. Actual differences in labor costs per seat mile are modest in comparison to wage differences.

Perhaps the most important source of inherent comparative cost differences lies in the production function, and that somewhat intangible, "management expertise." This is meant to denote an excellence in handling some fundamental scheduling problems, in particular, achieving effective utilization of aircraft and flight crews and other flight personnel. Efficient management of an airline requires the solution to a larger number of scheduling problems, many of an operations research nature. How to most effectively route aircraft over a network so as to achieve high utilization and at the same time most effectively serve the peak hour demand is a difficult optimization problem. There are many other examples. Effective scheduling of engine overhauls and maintenance can yield large cost savings. Many of these sorts of scheduling problems are most acute during periods of equipment change.

These sorts of differences in scheduling and wage differences are the fundamental basis for comparative advantage. Statistical estimation of production and cost functions using cross section data indicates the relative importance of these several factors. The author's estimates suggest that route density has far more important implications for costs than stage length, whose effects can be mitigated by proper choice of aircraft. The effect of wage rate differences on costs is much reduced by input substitution. The estimated effect on total costs of a difference in wages of \$4000 versus \$2000 to non flight crew personnel is to raise costs by only 22 percent. Input scheduling differences appear to be the more important source of comparative cost differences.⁶

The structure of comparative costs has not been static, having changed very substantially since World War II. Documenting its evolution is a considerable task. U.S. carriers had a headstart immediately after World War II because of the availability of equipment and trained personnel and their relative ease in obtaining public financial support. This advantage was gradually dissipated as Europe rebuilt and as European and other areas' governments became more inclined and able to resort to public subsidy. During the 1950's and 1960's many countries provided low cost capital financing to their flag carriers and became more aggressive in their entry policies. The public subsidy received by all carriers during the fifties was substantial.

Footnotes at end of article.

Fundamentally, U.S. and later the Canadian carriers assumed the lead in managing the most rational and efficient operations internationally, with the larger European carriers through the 1950's well financed and equipped, but not able to achieve cost levels comparable to their North American counterparts. The jet transition of the early 1960's saw many of the European and a few isolated cases such as El Al, Air India and Avianca making the transition and emerging as close cost competitors to U.S. carriers. The carriers of the less developed countries remained far behind, often sustaining huge losses. While forecasting in this industry is hazardous given the pace of technological advance, it seems likely that we are fast approaching a time when there will be two dozen odd carriers efficiently managing an all jet operation, with nearly comparable costs. Management efficiencies of U.S. carriers will do little more than offset the higher wages they must pay for labor.

IV. THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION

IATA fare agreements are made independently for several broad geographic regions covering the world, with all carriers providing service in any one region a party to the bargaining. Agreements must have the unanimous consent of all carriers. Fares receive official sanction when approved by all governments.

This procedure originated shortly after World War II. The political stake of all countries in participation in the industry and the very marked differences in competitive ability at the time were such that some form of conference procedure for price determination was necessary. The prospect of multilateral state negotiation over the details of international airline fares with all the associated problems of multilateral diplomacy involving large numbers of countries was such that a private carrier cartel, somehow publicly supervised, seemed far the more attractive alternative. Nations' perceptions of that political stake have persisted, perhaps even been magnified in the early 60's as the less developed countries become eager entrants into international airline markets with jet service. Whereas entry rights have been closely guarded by all governments and granted only on a bilateral basis, governments have seen fit to entrust to IATA this very considerable role in determining fares, and have seen fit to intervene by vetoing fare agreements or by some other means only very infrequently.

State sanction of IATA as an industry price cartel and the only limited supervision implied by the threat of state veto over fare agreements has produced fare agreements and a market environment very much following the outlines that the economic theory of "more conventional" market cartels would suggest. The secrecy associated with IATA proceedings makes it difficult to document the behavior and motives of participants and the dynamics of the bargaining interaction. However, that fragmentary evidence which is available is sufficient to sustain the credibility of a model in which individual carriers are bargaining for their own profit maximization, based on each carrier's perception of its and its competitors cost curves and comparative advantages and disadvantages, the demand for various types of services, and the extent of inherent preferences of travelers to be served by particular carriers.

How these bargaining positions are reconciled depends both on the size and economic strength of carriers and on the credibility of the threat of state action in support of its flag carrier, or perhaps in support of some other alternative.

Probably the primary basis for a carrier's bargaining position is its perception of its comparative cost position vis-a-vis its competitors. The brief sketch above of comparative costs suggests much about IATA bargain-

ing. Again, IATA bargaining is not part of the public record. Generally, U.S. carriers have bargained for lower fares, higher density seating, and a minimum of passenger services—that sort of product in which they have a clear comparative advantage and the type most favorably received by U.S. travelers. Given their cost position, U.S. carriers obviously stand to gain in a pricing and entry environment as nearly competitive and unrestricted as possible. European carriers (and their governments) have generally championed higher fares and a higher level of passenger amenities, a product consistent with their comparative advantage. The less developed countries' carriers represent an even further extreme of this view. Many have been so far from commercially viable operators in anything resembling a competitive market environment that their governments have assumed a very protectionist posture, in entry negotiations as well as fares.

These bargaining positions have evolved over time as comparative costs have changed. As the European carriers have made progress in rationalizing their operations and presumably have begun to perceive their own advantages vis-a-vis many of the younger carriers of the less developed countries in a more rational and less restricted market environment, some of the European carriers have tended to opt to bargain for lower prices and more marketing flexibility.

TABLE 1.—RATE OF RETURN ON INVESTMENT IN INTERNATIONAL AND TERRITORIAL SERVICE, SELECTED U.S. CARRIERS

| Region and carrier | Canada-Mexico, American | Caribbean, Eastern | Latin America | | | Atlantic and Middle East | | Pacific | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------|------|--------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|
| | | | Braniff | Panagra | PAA | PAA | TWA | PAA | Northwest |
| 1951..... | 3.5 | 10.1 | -10.7 | 9.2 | 3.2 | 4.8 | 10.0 | 14.1 | 5.2 |
| 1952..... | -5.9 | 23.8 | -32.8 | -17.3 | 1.9 | 6.0 | -1.1 | 18.9 | 12.2 |
| 1953..... | 4.8 | 25.2 | 20.3 | 19.7 | 9.7 | 5.2 | 1.4 | 12.2 | 7.7 |
| 1954..... | -4.0 | 7.0 | 14.2 | 24.1 | 15.3 | 5.4 | 11.8 | 12.5 | 10.1 |
| 1955..... | 14.4 | 17.4 | -7.1 | 9.3 | 4.4 | 15.0 | 3.5 | -12.7 | -2 |
| 1956..... | 12.0 | 25.8 | 9.5 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 9.6 | 4 | 6.1 | 10.8 |
| 1957..... | 6.4 | 22.2 | 6.0 | 7.9 | 2.2 | 9.2 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 23.1 |
| 1958..... | -1.4 | 7.7 | -2.3 | 2 | -2.0 | 3.8 | -5.9 | 10.7 | 19.1 |
| 1959..... | -1.5 | 17.4 | 0 | 4.6 | -2.7 | 6.7 | -8.6 | 5.8 | 13.1 |
| 1960..... | -5.3 | 2.6 | -1.8 | 1.9 | -2.3 | 6.5 | 15.8 | 10.4 | 4.5 |
| 1961..... | -7 | 4.7 | -3.4 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 4.3 | -11.2 | 10.8 | 13.0 |
| 1962..... | 19.3 | 7.7 | -10.4 | 5.4 | 3.0 | 5.6 | 12.8 | 15.6 | 14.2 |
| 1963..... | 23.3 | 3.0 | -8.6 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 11.8 | 23.6 | 21.5 | 17.8 |
| 1964..... | 32.4 | -1.6 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 10.7 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 29.4 |
| 1965..... | 35.7 | 10.9 | 7.9 | 10.9 | 4.5 | 8.8 | 23.6 | 15.2 | 32.1 |
| 1966..... | 29.2 | 23.8 | -1.6 | 7 | 6.0 | 12.5 | 23.0 | 22.8 | 37.8 |
| 1967..... | 34.1 | 17.6 | 8.9 | ----- | 5.2 | 12.4 | 13.9 | 22.8 | 28.7 |
| 1968..... | 33.9 | 19.0 | 15.8 | ----- | 3.6 | 6.2 | 15.9 | 14.2 | 29.0 |

1 Fiscal year.

Source: U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board, Handbook of Airline Statistics, various editions, and U.S. Civil Aeronautics, annual report, various editions.

In the early post-war years service competition tended to be centered on passenger amenities, and was very labor intensive. Over the last two decades there has occurred some shift toward more capital intensive means of competition, a predominant form than of more frequent schedules and lower load factors. There have been several reasons for this shift. The traveling public has indicated a considerable preference for higher density seating and less services. Schedule frequency and reliability also seem important in a successful marketing strategy. And as noted, increasing schedule frequency and accepting lower load factors rather than competing in passenger amenities is the dominant competitive strategy for carriers of the United States and several of the European countries who are least subject to capital constraints and who face high labor costs. Political motives leading to state subsidy support of flag carriers to enter the industry and expand also result in a downward pressure on load factors. Military support of much research in aircraft technology and tax laws in the United States tends to support a high rate of new aircraft development. Finally, with fixed prices, the availability of new equipment makes rapid reequipment a necessity

The level and structure of fares which have emerged from IATA negotiations very much assumes the character of a private cartel's reconciliation of these (very) divergent objectives and views. Prices have been held well above the level suggested by costs of the more efficient carriers. Since the introduction of jets, U.S. carriers have earned high returns in international operations. Rates of return on total investment (interest plus after tax profit/debt plus equity) are shown in Table 1. With debt-equity ratios generally well above one, and interest costs about comparable to the rate of other corporate borrowing, returns to equity have varied far more dramatically than the return on investment shown in Table 1. A ten percent return on total investment generally implies an equity return in excess of 20%. The extent of excess profits in these ex-post rates of return is far less significant than the dynamic consequences of the market environment with fixed prices set by IATA; this has led to the obvious strategy of service competition, in which costs tend to be bid up to the level of prices by competition in passenger amenities or additional capacity. This service competition continually pressing costs upward to the level of fares is probably the biggest price the traveling public and taxpayers in many countries who are saddled with subsidy supports have incurred as a result of the virtual absence of price competition and the prices established by IATA.

for those carriers who are serving competitive markets. All of these factors have hastened the evolution toward equipment competition and the fast development of new equipment.

IATA's virtual free reign to maintain prices well above competitive levels for the more efficient carriers leaves the traveling public's interest in lower fares virtually unrepresented. Fare reductions and the introduction of less luxurious service has occurred only after considerable outcry and debate within IATA, and usually has been done very reluctantly. Yet such changes have been commercially very successful—despite the outcries from the Chandler fare crisis, when the U.S. veto of IATA fares led to threats to close entry and seize aircraft, the resultant reduction led to large increases in demand and carrier profits.

Rather, the tendency has been for fare reductions and service innovations to arise from outside the IATA framework. Many marketing innovations have arisen through the determined action of particular carriers or governments acting outside IATA, usually with considerable opposition. Charter and inclusive tour services are notable examples of services which arose "under the umbrella"

of regular IATA rates, and, which eventually became part of the regular fare structure after proving quite successful. The appearance of such special services is the expected competitive response in a market where regulated fares provide profitable market opportunities but where entry barriers permit outside competition. In some notable instances it has been the stance of a particular government behind a special charter or group fare which eventually has undermined regular fares and produced a wholesale change in the fare structure in that particular market. Fares from New York to the Middle East are a prime example.

Non-regulated competition has made its inroads only in particular, limited markets. IATA bargaining has produced a discriminatory fare structure in which particular markets are a source of internal subsidy for others. Longer haul and denser routes have generally been overpriced relative to shorter haul service. The particular pattern of price discrimination emerging from IATA has its explanation in the relative bargaining strength of particular carriers and the support of their governments for price discrimination via entry control. The North Atlantic has historically been one of the most profitable major markets. Entry was thus a source of profits to cross subsidize other less profitable and often very politically oriented routes. The U.S. and major European gateway countries tried to protect their market position as best they could by entry restrictions, but the necessity of these countries to obtain entry rights elsewhere necessarily placed them in a position of having to concede some of their share of the North Atlantic market.⁹ Since the early 1960's, the North Atlantic has also been the arena for considerable marketing experimentation and new entry, especially from U.S. supplemental carriers and non IATA carriers in Europe. That competition has resulted in fare reductions which have reduced much of the excess profit earned in the North Atlantic in the 1950's.

The Pacific now stands as the most profitable major international air market. High prices and high profits are a very tempting target for fare cutting and charter entry. However, the limited number of gateways and the seemingly much stronger stance against more entry by the governments of Australia, the Philippines, Japan, and the United States than that which has occurred in the North Atlantic is such that these high prices and profits are likely to persist. The United States has repeatedly indicated concern over IATA fares and an open fare in the Pacific has prevailed for long periods of time. However, the carriers involved have not seen fit to engage in price competition during these periods. It seems likely that state intervention would be prompt. The United States has chosen not to provoke such a direct confrontation in the Pacific as they did in 1964 in the Atlantic. It appears likely that more extensive charter operations and selective fare reductions by special tour arrangements in the Pacific over a period of another year or two will be necessary before the responsiveness of tourist travel and growth in non-tourist demand is sufficiently clear for carriers and governments to reduce fares.

V. PROSPECTS FOR FARE RATIONALIZATION AND POLICY REDIRECTION

The above description of pricing under IATA coupled with the commitment of governments to maintain their own flag carriers position in the industry does not suggest a very promising future. Indeed, it seems that fare rationalization occurs almost in spite of rather than because of IATA proceedings. However, there are market pressures working

toward a rationalization of the industry. Despite the fact that state policies with regard to entry seem destined to embrace the concept of a very restricted entry environment for some years to come, with negotiations on a bilateral basis, there may be some chance to achieve a more liberal pricing environment. IATA is likely to come under increasing pressure if it is not responsive in this direction.

Several market forces should lead to more rational entry and pricing policies. Perhaps most obvious is the increasing number of international carriers who are essentially viable competitors in a competitive market. It is surely becoming increasingly clear to a large number of governments that international air operations are profitable and can be sustained without subsidy support. Unlike the early post-war period, there are now many carriers who stand to gain by a more competitive and less restrictive market environment. Pressures from the "demand" side lead in the same direction. Rising incomes in Europe and Japan are producing a rapidly expanding tourist market. The prospect of attracting tourists and the associated balance of payments gains are also relevant. Gradual relaxation of restrictions on trade and capital flows indicates a public stake in a less restrictive world community.

What this is suggesting, essentially, is that the pressures both within and outside the industry almost surely are for a transformation from a very protectionist market environment, in which governments define the "public interest" very narrowly in terms of their own flag carrier's market position, to one in which the "public" being referred to is the traveler. The United States has for some time had a stake in encouraging this trend. Government pressure toward a less restrictive market environment is clearly the critical element in such a transformation since government attitudes with regard to entry rights, pooling agreements and fares ultimately determine the overall configuration of the industry.

In this regard, whereas a relaxation of entry rights in the formal bilateral negotiation process seems unlikely, more latitude in granting charter and special services is appearing. Also, price and marketing policies sanctioned by governments seem increasingly susceptible to a general philosophy of more experimentation and flexibility.

It is in IATA's own interest to shift its position in this direction as well. It is, of course, hardly customary for industry trade organizations to be given a strong mandate to pursue the public interest since this will often substantially conflict with what the industry participants collectively deem their own private interests. Nevertheless, both government interest and market forces within the industry represent a present and increasing pressure on the industry to devote more attention to the traveler and shipper. This tends to imply the need for a less restrictive market environment, with more flexibility in the pricing and marketing of airline service, and certainly more attention both to cost levels and the type of service.

Whether one favors cross-subsidy within the price structure, a practice all too familiar in transportation, often depends on whether you are recipient or payee. Leaving this sort of equity question aside, the efficacy of cross subsidy pricing schemes is almost invariably brought into question if there are competitive elements prepared to enter wherever abnormal profits exist. In this case it would appear that IATA can expect increasing pressure from both outside and within to erode "abnormal" profits through additional service. Indeed, if the availability of entry rights for charter and supplemental carriers remains as liberal as today, IATA as a trade organization may not

be able to sustain a price structure over the long run which is not in reasonable conformity with costs. Thus, the "public interest" to which both governments and IATA should be striving in the area of pricing is fares based on full marginal social costs of efficient carriers, neither requiring subsidy nor discriminatory in nature. As noted above, this involves complex relationships between costs, fares, and service and capacity levels. Capacity and service are obviously closely related to costs, with seating density and schedule frequency the service determinants principally affecting costs.

The relationship of current international airline fares to these pricing alternatives requires a detailed analysis of demand characteristics in each particular market. There are likely to be considerable differences due to the mix of tourist and business travel. Without more basic research into the characteristics of market demand, forecasting travelers' preferences for higher or lower fares or more or less schedule frequency will be an uncertain process. IATA should undertake this basic market research; its recent symposium on airline demand indicated just how extensive this research task is. Recent deliberations in the United States over the economic feasibility of the SST are noteworthy in this regard. The SST is likely to be at a cost disadvantage relative to subsonic competition. Just how much travelers will pay for the time savings involved in supersonic service is critical in evaluating the SST's potential.¹⁰ Very little satisfactory research has been done on this subject, and considerable disagreement among the profession exists concerning travelers' valuation of time.

While the evidence on demand characteristics is fragmentary, there is a strong suggestion that demand is price elastic in many markets.¹¹ This implies that fare reductions would increase carrier revenues. In the North Atlantic, for example, fare reductions and the introduction of less luxurious classes of service have been quite successful historically. If this is the case, the present proposal to increase fares by eliminating the five percent round trip discount seems particularly inappropriate.

Seating density is also an important issue, particularly timely given the current discussion of seating configurations for the Boeing 747. The lower density seating being discussed, 350-360 seats, implies a substantial upgrading in service over present standards, which would entail 450-490 seats. While the prospect of low density seating has been favorably received by many, it would be a serious mistake at this point to preclude higher density seating configurations in the 747 (or the air bus). High density seating has proven very successful. There may well be a considerable market for this sort of service at the lower rates which would be possible. For IATA to foreclose on this possibility would be a restriction on the realization of one of the potentially important benefits of this new technology. If historical precedence is of any relevance, it seems almost certain that pressure will exist within or outside IATA to offer high density service, perhaps of a charter type. Such service will likely be commercially profitable.

Brief mention need be made of the preponderance in recent years in the use of special rates and services and the associated problems, increasing complexity in the fare structure and the difficulty of enforcing adherence. It is clearly in the public interest to alter fares in conformity with costs. Reducing fares in "off peak" periods is both economically sound and commercially profitable. Since directional, seasonal, and daily peakings are all relevant, this can obviously complicate the fare structure. Much of the recent complexity in the fare structure has its ori-

Footnotes at end of article.

gin in the demand side. The variety of inclusive tour, charter and other special fares is essentially a means of tailoring service to demand in particular submarkets. There is clearly a tradeoff between reducing fares through selective rate cutting versus wider ranging, perhaps over-all fare reductions. As noted, as the umbrella of standard fares creates more marketing opportunities, pressure for special services is likely to arise, both within and outside IATA; to the extent that the associated complexity of the fare structure is deemed a problem, IATA should seriously consider more broad scale fare adjustments. Enforcement problems with inclusive tour and other special services are part of the price that the airlines sustain by shifting the marketing burden to tour operators and agents rather than more aggressively marketing their service themselves. Weighing these tradeoffs is clearly part of the critical IATA business at hand.

This should not be construed as an endorsement of any particular limits on pricing strategies. To the extent that capacity increases over the near term turn out to be quite large, imagination and flexibility within IATA in its marketing will be critical, with promotional and off peak discounts perhaps assuming special importance over an interim period. The proposed "bulk rates" offered to tour operators at considerably lower levels is an important innovation along these lines.

In general, this amounts to a considerable exhortation for IATA to shift its position toward more marketing flexibility. More importantly, it is time for IATA to start to formulate its own conception of what the broader "public interest" is all about. The changes in market conditions and the improvements in technology are such that this is in IATA's own interest as well—nothing short of this forward-seeking, flexible viewpoint will suffice to serve the demand of shippers, carriers, or governments involved.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Mahlon R. Straszheim, "Airline Profitability, Financing, and Public Regulation," *The Transportation Journal*, forthcoming, Summer 1.

² For a more thorough discussion of this market environment, see the author's *The International Airline Industry*, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1969.

³ Edward Chamberlin, *The Theory of Monopolists Competition*, 7th (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

⁴ Thomas Schelling, "What is Game Theory?" in *Contemporary Political Analysis*, (ed.) James C. Charlesworth (New York: Free Press, 1967).

⁵ A. Cournot, *Researches into the Mathematical Principles of the Theory of Wealth*, trans. Nathaniel T. Bacon., Chapter VII, (New York: MacMillan, 1897).

⁶ Stackelberg and Edgeworth developed reaction curve analysis of small numbers markets. The best exposition is in William Fellner, *Competition Among the Few*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949).

⁷ Straszheim, "Airline Profitability, Financing, and Public Regulation," *op. cit.*

⁸ This section draws heavily on, and summarizes, the author's analysis in *The International Airline Industry*, *op. cit.*, Chs. 4 and 5.

⁹ Straszheim, *op. cit.*, Ch. 5.

¹⁰ Straszheim, *The International Airline Industry*, *op. cit.*, Ch. 3.

¹¹ Charles River Associates, "Review of the Economic Feasibility Report for the SST and Supporting Materials," Report Number 122-1, prepared for the Federal Aviation Agency, Department of Transportation, Cambridge, Mass.: Charles River Associates, April 3, 1967.

¹² Straszheim, *The International Airline Industry*, *op. cit.*, Chapter 6 and Appendix C.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY IN THE AMERICAN UTILITY INDUSTRY

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include a speech.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, Chairman William H. Brown III, of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, addressed the Edison Electric Institute's Affirmative Action Conference in Denver, Colo. He withheld no punches and went straight to the facts with reference to the role of the utility industry in America as an equal opportunity employer.

The importance of Chairman Brown's remarks is in my opinion so great that I here insert that speech for the benefit of my colleagues and the public:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM H. BROWN III, CHAIRMAN, U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, MAY 15, 1969

Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be able to address this gathering today, a gathering designed to realize in meaningful terms one of the most important ideals of our times—equal opportunity for employment for all people. I say ideal without reservation, for equal employment is certainly not a reality today; not in our times, not in your industry.

The electrical power industry is of particular significance for many reasons—the large number of people employed; the geographical spread of the employment; the monopolistic nature of the industry; the tremendous value of your assets.

The significance of the utilities industry to American business and American life intensifies its importance as an equal opportunity employer. I am sure that everyone in this audience subscribes to the concept of equal employment opportunity; the fact of your inviting me to speak here today indicates your concern.

You should, then be concerned to learn that the electrical power industry has had one of the worst equal employment records of all industry groupings in America. The findings and statistics supplied to me—based on the reports that you yourselves submitted—will graphically demonstrate that the most effective methods of discrimination and exclusion are being practiced in your industry. The case histories give living shape to the story of exclusion and the hard facts of discrimination become glaring in the light of cold statistics.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has used and will continue to use statistics, not for the purposes of punishment, but to illuminate the effects of discrimination where it exists and spotlight imaginative, affirmative employment policies where they exist. EEOC dwells on differences in employment patterns to prove that in almost every industry, every city, one or more employers who concentrate on affirmative action—not just affirmative motion—themselves destroy the myth that qualified and qualifiable minorities are not available.

When we publicize such disparities we are not setting quotas for the employers on the short end of the comparison. But we are throwing down the gauntlet, and certainly firms which pride themselves on being EEO employers, or send representatives to meetings such as this, should take a hard look at themselves. And this look has to be quantitative.

You as businessmen would not applaud the salesman who writes copious sales plans each quarter and then doesn't deliver the sales.

You would call him in, show him how Mike in the next sales unit in the same district is doing much better and challenge him to do likewise. That is essentially what EEOC does with employment statistics in a context such as a White House meeting, a public hearing or this session.

In June of 1968, the facts of exclusion and underutilization were presented to representatives of the electric power and natural gas industries at a White House meeting sponsored jointly by the Federal Power Commission and the EEOC. At that time, the utilities industries—and particularly the electric power companies—were informed that according to 1966 and 1967 data, they were the worst employer of minorities of any industry grouping.

At that time—

Electric companies employed only 41 black managers out of almost 30,000.

Out of 15,000 technicians, only 59 were black.

Of over 6,000 sales workers, 27 were black.

In the nation's 11 largest electric companies, employing over 8,000 officials and managers, in 1966, 13 were black; in 1967, 12 were black—and both years 6 were employed by one company.

And for Spanish Americans, the picture was no less bleak—these 11 largest companies employed them as only 0.3% of their total workforce.

At that time these statistics were presented to your industry—possibly to many of you personally, my predecessor as Chairman of EEOC said, "We do not believe this is a picture of which you will be proud, collectively or—with few exceptions—individually. The exceptions to the patterns are encouraging in kind but discouraging in number. One matter is clear; these hours we spend today in conference will mean very little if they do not lead to action. Such action is possible only with the commitment of top industry management. Your presence here today, I think, implies that commitment. But commitment which is unfulfilled may be apathy, if not self-deception. And that is why we hope that the programs we will discuss today will help you translate your commitment into action."

The Chairmanship of the EEOC has now changed; the patterns of minority exclusion and under-utilization in the electric companies, apparently and unfortunately, has changed only marginally at best. Based on reports for 1968 and 1969 submitted to the EEOC by 115 members of the Edison Electrical Institute employing the large majority of the total workforce in the electric power industry, your industry still inhabits the bottom of the list in terms of minority utilization.

This conference is devoted to affirmative action. I hope it will not celebrate the affirmative motion that results of the past year indicate has been going on.

The figures I will relate will show better than any words the continuing failure of the electric power industry to comply with the letter and spirit of the law.

Blacks, who comprise almost 12 percent of the nation, make up only 4.8 percent of 115 electric companies' employment and hold only 2.8 percent of white collar jobs in 1969. These figures are up only slightly from 4.1% and 2.1% a year ago.

As one descends the job scale, as the jobs become less desirable—and lower paying—and as upward mobility becomes increasingly difficult, suddenly, there the black workers show up. Thus, less than half of one percent of managerial and professional jobs are filled by blacks compared to over 5 percent of the clerical jobs. The same is true in the blue collar area; while fully a quarter of the laborers are black, less than 2% of craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers are.

Gross underutilization of minorities in your industry is not limited to blacks alone—Spanish Surnamed Americans hold only 1.2% of total jobs and comprise only one-half of one percent of the officials, managers and professionals. Women are almost entirely restricted to the clerical category—almost 40,000 are employed in that category compared to about 3,000 for all other categories combined.

It is quite obvious from this recital of statistics that in the aggregate, your industry is one of the poorest performers in the field of minority and female employment. However, I have hardly begun; the scene is actually much more frightening because a few isolated companies hide the inexcusable records of the rest:

Eighty-three of 115 reporting companies in your Institute have no blacks classified as officials or managers; 34 have no women.

In 64 of the companies, there are no black professionals and no female professionals in 26.

There are no black technicians in 64 companies, no black sales personnel in 72.

Women are completely absent from the technician category in 35 companies; from the craftsmen category in 104 companies.

I cannot accept the excuse, from any of these companies which are such painfully good examples of exclusion, that qualified minorities and women just could not be found.

One large company in a southern town which is 35% black reports *no blacks in any of its white collar positions*.

In a midwestern city with 17.5% of its population black, the electric company has no black manager, professional or salesman.

A major Western utility company in a city whose black population is over 10 percent has only 1 black manager out of almost 1900 and only 20 professionals out of 2,000.

In a Southwestern city in which almost 5% of the labor force is Spanish American, one electric company has no official, no salesman, one professional and three technicians who are Spanish Surnamed Americans out of 624 employees in those categories.

Another company in the same town has *not one Spanish Surnamed American employee*.

These statistics for the major portion of the electric power industry, which show one or two or ten or twenty blacks—and often none—in job classifications which encompass thousands of workers, cast more than a shadow on your industry's protestation of vigorous policies and progress. Words and good intentions cannot act as a substitute for the provision of better jobs with better prospects for minorities and women.

In the 1968 White House meeting, one company was singled out. Although it was far from a model employer of minorities at higher job levels, it was at least far ahead of the rest of the industry. It still is and it is the *only* company which goes a way towards proving that qualified and qualifiable minorities and women can be found.

Almost half of the increase in minority employment at the managerial level between 1968 and 1969 as among all 115 companies is accounted for by this one company.

This company employs 40% of all black craftsmen in the industry while employing less than 10% of total craftsmen.

Blacks accounted for almost half of its new hires in the craftsmen category which encompasses more than ¼ of its total workforce.

If this company is removed from the aggregate data, there is an almost total absence of change in minority employment for the other 114 companies from 1968 to 1969.

One of the excuses offered for this state is the practices of unions. Undoubtedly, unions do contribute to this picture. But I want to point out that unions have nothing

to do with the white collar situation, and the white collar situation is infinitely worse than the blue collar situation. If the companies which profess equal employment policies were to implement such policies in the white collar categories, is there really any doubt that the unions would believe the companies were serious in the areas where collective bargaining agreements prevail?

I would like now to take this audience one step further along the road of illumination. Instead of overwhelming you with numbers, I want to paint for you the picture of actual cases of discrimination in the electric power industry.

Recently, the EEOC ruled on complaints lodged against some of the largest electrical power companies in this country. Their policies and practices were found to be in direct violation of Title VII. The companies were perfect examples of institutionalized discrimination, in both their physical plant and their job structure. Investigators found segregated rest rooms, segregated lines of progression and separate employee benefits such as retirement plans and pension funds.

Carelessness or lack of awareness can create the same results as overt discrimination. Seniority lines, testing procedures, training programs and promotion systems often operate to keep out minorities or freeze them at the lowest job levels with no upward mobility.

Isn't it all a little unbelievable in America in 1969?

Unbelievable that by design or by negligence human beings still don't have the right to use facilities freely; or to be promoted on merit; or to compete freely for jobs; or to accrue the benefits others receive—all merely because of race or religion or national origin or sex? Regardless of whether the *intent* of the President of those utilities was for all employees to have equal employment opportunity, his failure—by virtue of unconcern or negligence—to see that his intentions were effected, produced the situation I have described.

Just as top management must be held ultimately responsible for company profits and quality of output, so must they be for personnel action and employee relations. In addition to the concern for keeping expenses down, there must be an equal concern that non-discriminatory employment standards are being adequately maintained throughout the total organization.

Your companies should establish whatever procedures and periodic checks are necessary to enforce those standards just as you establish cost accounting procedures. And each company should take the same vigorous and severe action against employees whose discriminatory behavior violates company policy as it would against employees who carelessly squander profits.

The depressing array of statistics I have just finished relating outlines the debilitating lack of effective EEO policies in your industry by detailing the lack of real results. You met with the EEOC last year in an attempt to find avenues for improvement; they have obviously not yet been found. It is my hope that this meeting will give you the impetus to change and the tools with which to effect that change.

When top management of the electric companies applies itself seriously to implementation of EEO policies; when it responds to the statistics in its own companies, and the unlawful practices which exist in its offices and create those statistics, then and only then will the bleak employment picture of the present change—and very quickly.

And once it has *really* begun to change—at all levels, not just at the entry level—the going is easy. Improvement, in terms of numbers of minorities in meaningful jobs, is in itself a tool. Under-representation of minorities bears heavily on credibility—how can

a company be an Equal Opportunity Employer, as so many advertise, when their workforce above the lowest blue collar level is virtually all white? Minority representation in the workforce today bears heavily on the chances of recruitment success in the future. Just as there is a "take-off" point for an underdeveloped economy, when it will start to prosper without extra aid, there is one for a company, when it will no longer need to make a special effort at "communication" because the minority contingent of its workforce will recruit through the informal channels by which word of most job openings is disseminated. This work must be started; we cannot accept excuses any longer; the statistics must change and the "take-off" point must be reached.

The White House meeting last year was a call to action—a recital of grim statistics and a challenge to change them. You have not met that challenge.

You cannot in all conscience continue to attend such meetings as this and then return to your offices to do what results in nothing.

A year ago at the White House, it was noted that the time-consuming compliance process might be the inevitable alternative if real action were not forthcoming from your industry on a less formal basis. I do not mean to threaten—and the Commission presently lacks real enforcement power—but do want to make a simple statement of fact. We have seen in the intervening year what must have been more motion than action by most of you, and I am not disposed to see another such year go by.

CAPITOL HILL RESTAURANT WORKERS

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Hill food workers have formed an association for the purpose of achieving some semblance of justice in their wages and working conditions.

True to the unenlightened labor policies of the last century from which most of his policies spring, the Capitol Architect, through his agent has, on trumped up charges, fired Wendell Quinn, a leader of the employees association. How can Congress keep a straight face when this outrage is permitted here and other employers are required by congressional act to bargain in good faith and not fire people for belonging to a union?

The plain fact is that while the Capitol Architect squanders millions of the taxpayers dollars on wasteful projects, he has denied to these food workers not only what the very lowest standards call a living wage, but also the slight increase he himself promised them last November.

Mr. Speaker, people who serve food to Senators who "have to eat too" have to eat too, also.

CAPITOL HILL RESTAURANT WORKERS

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's walkout of cafeteria employees in the other body is a prelude of disruptive ac-

tion we must also anticipate on the House side if their legitimate grievances continue to go unheeded. These grievances are as follows:

GRIEVANCES

Failure to comply with prevailing wage rates of Federal Wage Board.

Executive Order No. 10988, violated with threats of dismissals and reprisals if employees join association.

Monday sick rule.

No job security.

No written record of employees' rights. Employees working 6 days a week to have a 40-hour workweek.

Employing part time employees to avoid paying overtime for Saturday work.

Coffee shop workers denied privilege of working every other week on Saturday.

Job description not specified as to duties.

A grievance board to file complaints that are not connected with the Senate Rules Committee.

Lunch period inadequate.

No telephone calls between noon and 2 p.m.

Receiving pay in the afternoon.

Complaints to management with resignation slips.

Bus girl working in counter position and not justly compensated.

Racial bias in pay scale, lunch and coffee breaks.

In promotions, ample consideration is not given to seniority.

Cafeteria workers are not given chance at job openings in accounting section.

Cafeteria staff should be increased.

The Architect of the Capitol, who supervises all restaurants on the Hill and the legislative committees of jurisdiction, must face the fact that their employees are at the end of their patience. The public policy of our Federal Government supports fair labor standards and these employees are entitled to the protection of their rights within this context. For too long racism, cronyism, and plantationism have brought discredit upon the administration of the Capitol's restaurants. This can no longer be tolerated.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Hill food workers have formed an association for the purpose of achieving some semblance of justice in their wages and working conditions.

True to the unenlightened labor policies of the last century from which most of the Federal Government labor policies spring, the Capitol Architect, through his agent has on flimsy and unsubstantiated charges, fired Wendell Quinn, a leader of the employees' association. How can Congress justify this outrage when private and public employers are required by congressional act to bargain in good faith and not fire people for belonging to a union?

Mr. Speaker, people who serve food to Senators who "have to eat, too" are equally entitled to a living wage that they, too "might eat."

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I think it a tragedy that in this day and age—the employees of the restaurant serving the top officials of this country—should have to resort to a walkout to dramatize their

poor working conditions. This incident takes on the shape of the Charleston Hospital strike—in its absurdity. A man being fired for protesting or for organizing workers in pursuit of decent working conditions and wages—is an echo of a day we have believed was far past. That it should happen in the Congress of the United States, charged with the protection of the general welfare of the people, is beyond my understanding. It invalidates all our so-called noble attempts to represent and to serve the laboring man as well as the special interest groups. Now, in this incident, we have become our own special interest group, so where does one go to find a concern for the public interest when the Congress itself has failed to be responsive to its duty?

Surely the Congress should reward their loyal employees who serve them—and this reward need not be extraordinary—but it should be within the accepted notion of fringe benefits, decent wages, hours and working conditions. The credibility of the Congress legislating for the welfare of the common man becomes totally meaningless when the workers in its own cafeteria cannot find audience for reasonable demands.

In these troublesome times of urban strife and discontent, I think it would be a noble gesture if this great body would set precedent by settling these differences as soon as possible.

CAPITOL HILL RESTAURANT WORKERS

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address myself to the hardship and difficulties now being experienced by the employees of the Senate cafeteria and the employees of the House of Representatives cafeteria. I further wish to add my voice to that of others who decry the questionable and arbitrary act of the Capitol Architect who fired Wendell Quinn for his activities in organizing cafeteria workers to improve their working conditions in the Senate cafeteria.

Mr. Speaker, I vehemently oppose the exploitation of laboring people everywhere in the world. I especially deplore the exploitation of laboring people by the U.S. Congress. Wages of many cafeteria employees of this Congress are less than the national minimum wages. This body has an obligation to provide decent working conditions and living wages to its employees. This body should instruct the Capitol Architect to rehire Mr. Quinn immediately and begin negotiations with the cafeteria employees to improve their conditions.

CAPITOL HILL RESTAURANT WORKERS

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is paradoxical that Congress, which tells other employers the minimum terms and con-

ditions under which they should bargain with their employees, itself is unwilling to recognize those conditions and terms.

I find it difficult to understand why the Capitol Hill food workers are not guaranteed these minimum rights that we insist other employers of our country recognize and protect. I believe Congress ought to be purer than Caesar's wife. I think we ought to instruct the Capitol Architect to recognize the rights of these employees, and protect those rights, rather than to derogate them.

CAFETERIA WORKERS PROTEST WORKING CONDITIONS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), and those who have followed the gentleman here in the well of the House, in commenting on the disgraceful conditions under which the food workers on Capitol Hill are compelled to work. This is supposed to be 1969, but when one views the shocking wages and employment conditions of those who serve the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate—employees of the Congress of the United States—one would think that the year was 1869.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for the House to put its own house in order.

PROJECT COMMITMENT

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a project in my congressional district that may point some useful directions for coping with the conflict-ridden area of race relations in our country. Solutions to problems of race are not simple as the Kerner report of little more than a year ago made clear.

Mr. Speaker, one effort to meet this challenge is Project Commitment, an interfaith human relations program launched in January of this year at the Center for Continuing Education of the University of Notre Dame.

Headed by Dr. James P. Danehy, a University of Notre Dame chemistry professor and chairman of the South Bend-Fort Wayne Diocesan Human Relations Commission, Project Commitment is directed toward mobilizing the energies and ideas of representatives of some 34 selected Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish congregations in the South Bend-Mishawaka-Elkhart area of Indiana—people chosen by pastors, rabbis, and lay boards for their capacity for leadership.

As Dr. Danehy explains it:

This project is an attempt to take white people who have not yet developed convictions concerning their responsibilities for interracial and interreligious justice, and

to give them the motivation to go back to their congregations and parishes and change prejudicial social patterns. And, although it is an "integrated" program, it is primarily a program aimed at changing whites; black people taking part primarily as resource people.

Dr. Danehy explains that Project Commitment is based on two assumptions:

One is that white people have the responsibility of hastening the change in attitude of their brothers toward the black minority. The other is that full advantage must be taken of religious motivation.

Project Commitment has had staff assistance from the South Bend-Mishawaka chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews—NCCJ—and financing through participating congregations and other interested groups and individuals in the area.

Recently, Project Commitment concluded a series of eight consecutive weekly meetings attended by up to 20 representatives of different denominations and faiths. At each meeting expert speakers—black and white, young and old—addressed themselves to some phase of community life in which racial attitudes play a significant part; this was followed by group discussion.

In this program topics included: "The Psychology of Prejudice," "Power and the Lack of Power," "Education," "Housing," "Employment," "Examples of Community Effort in the Area of Race Relations," "The Responsibility of Religious Communities To Facilitate Social Change," and "The Crime Behind the Crime in the Streets."

A similar program with its fresh approach to racial issues was first tried out by the archdiocese of Detroit, under the leadership of Cardinal-designate John Dearden. Since then the concept has been tested in other cities, usually under Catholic auspices.

The South Bend project, however, is the first ever attempted on an interfaith basis. Eventually, Project Commitment hopes to involve every congregation in the Indiana counties of St. Joseph, Elkhart, Marshall, and Kosciusko, as well as Cass and Berrien Counties in Michigan.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that religious and lay leaders in Fort Wayne, Ind., are planning a Project Commitment program there, and the Indiana Interdenominational Commission on Human Equality, based in Indianapolis, is promoting the project on a statewide basis.

Mr. Speaker, the overall goal of Project Commitment is to develop a sense of solidarity and common responsibility among people of all races and religious denominations. It represents a constructive, grassroots approach to racial problems.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Project Commitment effort. It is a tangible followup to the warnings issued by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders last year. Other communities in America may find the Project Commitment approach worthy of emulation.

CAFETERIA WORKERS PROTEST WORKING CONDITIONS

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who have spoken on the problems of the workers in both the Senate cafeteria and in the other food services on Capitol Hill. I believe—and I am sure that my colleagues who have spoken will join with me in this thought—that we should request the appropriate committees of the House and of the other body to report to this body on what is occurring in terms of wages being paid, the hours being worked, and the services that are being required of these workers.

We have heard from time to time, and there have been many comments, as to the fact that these men are not being paid any more than the bare minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour, and that often they are required to hold two jobs. This becomes impossible when they are required to serve the House of Representatives and the other body on a very irregular schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these appropriate committees of the House and of the other body will report to the Members of the House on this situation.

I join with my colleagues in saying that we must put our house in order. It is certainly a disgrace that we are trying to tell the other employers in the United States what they should be paying their people, and defining wage and hour laws, and then find that we are not complying with them ourselves.

CAFETERIA WORKERS PROTEST WORKING CONDITIONS

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to join my colleagues on this subject. I think that it is necessary to do justice to our restaurant and the cafeteria employees. I rise to urge justice, and also to assure myself quicker service when I go downstairs for lunch in a few moments.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was advised of the situation, and talked to the man who has charge of the Wage Board setup in the District of Columbia to try to find out what the wage orders for the cafeteria employees are. At one time he did recommend to the Architect of the Capitol what the Wage Board rates should be, but he informed me that at the present time he is not even required, and does not certify to the Architect of the Capitol what the Wage Board employees of the District of Columbia receive. So I think that we should take some steps to see that at least the employees of the cafeteria and the other parts of the Capitol are receiving Wage Board rates, at least, that are paid in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOELSON. I believe they should receive that at least, but I also believe they should not just be made to take

what is thrust upon them. There should be some meaningful labor relations legislation that will protect their rights to do so.

I think we are too patronizing to them. They are entitled to present their requests and they are entitled to be bargained with. I do not think they are entitled to be fired when they speak up for their rights.

SEEK A MUTUAL MORATORIUM ON MIRV

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with Representative JOHN ANDERSON and 102 cosponsors a resolution urging the President to seek a mutual moratorium with the Soviet Union on development of MIRV's—multiple independently-targetable re-entry vehicles.

This resolution further urges the President to promptly enter into strategic arms limitation discussions with the Soviets. It also urges him to declare the intention of the United States to refrain from further flight testing of MIRV's so long as the Soviets do so.

The United States defends against nuclear attack by deterrence. The greatest current threat to our deterrent forces is the possibility that the Soviets might deploy enough missiles with sufficiently large and accurate warheads to threaten the ability of our land based forces to survive a surprise attack. To defend against this threat President Nixon had proposed the deployment of the Safeguard ABM to protect our ICBM's and air bases. But there is a safer and more sure method of protecting our forces against the threat of Soviet MIRV's.

That method is to secure an enforceable arms control agreement with the Soviets prohibiting either side from deploying these multiple warheads on their missiles.

Whether we will be able to achieve such an enforceable ban on MIRV deployment depends in part on how far both nations proceed with development and testing of these weapons.

At the present time satellites can count and locate missile silos and other military targets. But these satellites cannot see through the concrete silo doors or the shrouds which cover missile nose cones. Thus satellites cannot determine whether a missile is equipped with a single warhead or with multiple warheads.

Thus intrusive on-site inspection will be required to police an agreement limiting MIRV deployment if either side proceeds so far with its testing that the other side cannot be certain that the MIRV warheads are not being secretly deployed.

Because both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are well along in their testing programs for these weapons, the point at which they may be deployable is very near. As this time runs out, it is increasingly urgent that both sides, the United States and the U.S.S.R. seek a moratorium on further testing. If they do not, the possibility of an enforceable agreement limiting MIRV may be foreclosed.

Accordingly, it is urgent that we seek such a moratorium.

I believe that the fact that we have more than 100 cosponsors for this resolution indicates the recognition of both Democrats and Republicans in the House of the gravity of the MIRV issue and the urgency with which it must be regarded.

I believe that the President and the public should note this congressional concern and proceed as expeditiously as possible to seek agreement with the Soviets on the banning of MIRV's.

I would like to insert at the close of my remarks a summary of the remarks I delivered on the MIRV issue last week, and the press statement, resolution text, and complete list of cosponsors of this resolution:

SUMMARY STATEMENT ON MIRV BY JEFFERY COHELAN, JUNE 24, 1969

I would like to state at the outset that it is my firm conviction that the United States should at this time halt all testing of our MIRV system, and that further testing should be deferred at least until the arms limitation talks begin, and longer if the Soviets refrain from testing their multiple warhead systems. And in any event the United States should strongly press for mutual moratorium on MIRV's in these talks.

I recognize that not all Members of this body share this conviction. Moreover, I recognize that not all Members of this body are as familiar with the MIRV issues as they would like to be. Accordingly, I would like to take a few minutes to outline the issues as I see them, and to explain the reasons underlying my conclusions.

THE STATE OF THE ART

At the outset it is important to understand how very far along in MIRV development we are, and to understand what it is that we know about Soviet developments in this area.

The United States has present plans to use MIRV's on two types of missiles—the Minuteman III land-based ICBM's and the Poseidon submarine-based missiles. These plans call for the deployment of MIRV's on 500 out of 1,054 of our ICBM's and on 496 of the 656 missiles on our nuclear submarines. The Minuteman III is a new last stage which will be fitted on the existing missile launchers for the Minuteman force. The Minuteman III will carry one to three warheads and is assumed to contain sophisticated penetration aids like chaff and decoys. The Poseidon will carry 10 to 15 warheads, and can apparently also carry penetration aids.

Minuteman III missiles are expected to cost about \$10 million each. The Poseidon missiles are expected to cost between \$7 and \$10 million each. It will also cost about \$80 million to overhaul and convert each of the 31 Polaris nuclear submarines to carry the large Poseidon missiles. Thus total MIRV costs may be on the order of \$10 to \$15 billion, without including research and development costs.

In the current fiscal year 1970 budget there is \$2,074,000,000 for the Minuteman III and Poseidon programs. This is more than twice the amounts in the budget for the Safeguard ABM.

The Poseidon and Minuteman III MIRV's both employ a bus concept. This means that one propulsion and guidance mechanism directs all of the individual warheads carried by the missiles. After the main missile boosters have cut off, the propulsion unit on the bus makes minute adjustments in speed and direction, and after each of these adjust-

ments releases another warhead, directing it to a different target.

The Soviet Union is at the present time testing at least two different concepts employing multiple warheads. In one concept, three warheads each in the 5-megaton range can be delivered in a pattern. Intelligence data available in the United States has not conclusively determined whether these warheads are independently targetable or whether they are merely multiple warheads like the ones we have had on our Polaris missiles since 1962 which deliver three warheads in a fixed shotgun-like pattern. President Nixon indicated last week, however, that even if the Soviet warheads are not independently targetable, he regards them as a threat to our ICBM's because the pattern of the Soviet warheads is much like the layout of our Minuteman fields.

The second Soviet concept being tested involves the delivery of a string of up to 10 warheads. Each of these warheads would land in a separate location, but they would not be capable of being independently targeted.

THE STRATEGIC SITUATION

MIRV's have at least two strategic roles. MIRV's can increase the number of targets which can be struck by a given missile launcher force. And MIRV's can increase the probability that an enemy ABM will be penetrated.

MIRV's will affect the strategic balance only if one side perceives the MIRV warheads of the other to be either so large, or so accurate, or so numerous, as to be able to destroy a significant portion of its land-based ICBM's in a first strike, and thereby threaten the credibility of its deterrent.

Thus the crucial question with regard to the MIRV is whether one side sees its adversary's MIRV as a hard target—ICBM—killer. If so that side may perceive a threat to its deterrent and may have to take steps to maintain its assured destruction capability.

The U.S. Defense Department and the President have seen the possible Soviet deployment of large numbers of SS-9 ICBM's with MIRV's as potential hard target killers and not as mere ABM penetrators. Accordingly, the administration has perceived a threat to the land-based portion of our deterrent forces, and has recommended the deployment of an ABM to add to the credibility of our deterrent.

It is not clear how the Soviet views our plans to deploy MIRV warheads on our Minuteman III ICBM's and on our Poseidon submarine-launched missiles. There is information in the public domain which might induce the Soviets to fear our MIRV's as first-strike weapons, and there is other evidence which might convince the Soviets our MIRV's did not pose such a threat.

It is clear that U.S. experimentation with MIRV began, not to develop a system to penetrate antimissile defenses, but to develop a system to increase the number of military targets we could strike with our given force of missile launches. In July 1968, Dr. John Foster testified to the Senate:

"The MIRV concept was originally generated to increase our targeting capability rather than to penetrate ABM defenses. In 1961-62 planning for targeting the Minuteman force, it was found that the total number of aim points exceeded the number of Minuteman missiles."

Since there are scarcely 200 Soviet cities worth targeting, and there were their plans for 800 Minuteman missiles, it must be assumed that these numerous "aim points" were missile sites and other military targets. However, experimentation in the early 1960's showed that with the guidance systems then available, MIRV's could not be made accurate enough to effectively take out these military targets. Accordingly, the early MIRV concept was dropped. But today

both the Pentagon and the Soviets are aware of the hard target kill potential of MIRV's.

As far back as November 1967, Paul Nitze testified to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that with the same accuracies, ten 50-kiloton warheads were 1.2 to 1.7 times more effective in destroying hardened missile silos than was a single 10-megaton warhead. And since 1967, high defense officials have been making public statements indicating that the MIRV's now being developed will have greater accuracies than any of the single warhead missiles now deployed. Public reports have indicated that our MIRV's are designed to accuracies of less than a quarter of a mile. Furthermore, public reports also indicate that we are working on guidance technology which would permit warheads to actually home in on missile silos.

And perhaps most convincingly of all from the Soviet's point of view is the statement made at least three times this year by Secretary Laird in support of the \$12.4 million request for improved guidance for the Poseidon MIRV. Secretary Laird testified:

"This is an important program since it promises to improve the accuracy of the Poseidon missile, thus enhancing its effectiveness against hard targets."

Thus, there are a good many reasons for the Soviets to fear that our MIRV is a first-strike weapon—just as we fear their MIRV is a first-strike weapon.

Recently, perhaps in an effort to allay Soviet apprehensions, the Pentagon has been putting out information on the size of our MIRV warheads—Minuteman III, 200 kilotons; Poseidon, 50 kilotons, and their expected accuracies—one-quarter mile—which indicates that our MIRV's are not particularly good weapons for destroying missile silos. But it is not at all clear that the Soviets either believe the information as to the size of the warheads or as to the expected accuracies. Moreover, conservative Soviet defense planners would have to assume that our MIRV's were both larger and more accurate than we claim them to be.

Thus, there is good reason to believe that the Soviets will see our MIRV deployment as a threat to their land-based deterrent and that they will thus have to take further action to expand or project their ICBM forces.

In presenting this evidence on the first-strike capabilities of our MIRV's, I do not contend that we are trying to achieve a first-strike posture with regard to the Soviets. But I do contend that it is perfectly plausible, if not exceedingly likely, that the Soviets fear our MIRV as a potential first-strike weapon.

If they do not feel threatened by our MIRV's they will certainly respond with further deployments, just as we have done with the Safeguard ABM. And thus the arms race will be escalated another costly notch.

FIRST STRIKE

One more point is worth making about MIRV and the possibility of a first strike. Not only is MIRV deployment likely to escalate the arms race by forcing the other side to deploy offsetting offensive or defensive weapons, but MIRV deployment actually makes the likelihood of a first strike greater.

If a MIRV-equipped missile is destroyed on the ground in its silo, several warheads will be destroyed. Thus, there is a considerable advantage to an attacker if he can destroy MIRV missiles in their silos, as in a first-strike attack.

Furthermore, once a MIRV-equipped missile is launched, it has the potential to destroy several of the enemy's missiles in their silos. Thus, again there is an advantage to the side that launches first.

This foreboding pressure to strike first is further heightened when one or both sides have city defense ABM systems. That side which has both MIRV and ABM might conclude that by attacking first, enough of the

other side's missile force would be destroyed so that the ABM would be effective in meeting the diminished retaliatory attack by the other side.

Thus, should one or both sides deploy MIRV's or both MIRV's and ABM, in times of high tension, there will be greater pressure to strike first than there is now.

ARMS CONTROL

If MIRV deployment both makes the threat of a first strike greater and further escalates the arms race, it seems fair to ask what can be done to stop its deployment by both sides.

This question is, of course, the subject of the arms limitation talks. But whether those talks will ever have a realistic opportunity to discuss and decide the possibility of a mutual moratorium on MIRV deployment is in doubt. This doubt arises for two causes.

First, surveillance satellites which are capable of counting and locating ABM and ICBM missile sites, are not capable of distinguishing missiles with MIRV warheads from those with single warheads. The photographic and other equipment carried by these satellites is not capable of piercing the shroud covering the missile, nor of seeing through the concrete covers of the missile silos. Thus without on-site inspection, it is not possible to police an arms control agreement barring MIRV development.

Second, if a MIRV deployment moratorium cannot be enforced through satellite verification, and on-site inspection is not allowed, such a mutual moratorium could only be enforced if both sides were convinced that the other side had not proceeded far enough with its MIRV testing to justify deployment in secret of the MIRV warheads.

This point—the time at which one side is observing the MIRV test of the other concludes that even if tests were halted immediately they could no longer have high confidence that the tests had not proceeded far enough that the MIRV might be deployed secretly—is the point generally referred to as the point of no return in MIRV testing.

There is a good deal of controversy as to whether the point of no return has already been passed in the U.S. testing program. If it has not already been passed, it seems certain that it will be passed if the tests are continued successfully through this summer. By that time the tests will be better than half over, and most of the major tests will have been completed.

At this point the United States has conducted at least 13 MIRV flight tests. The tests of the Poseidon MIRV have been called "highly successful" by the Pentagon. The Minuteman III tests have been stretched out, but Secretary Laird still expressed confidence that the system would perform as intended by the time it is deployed in 1971.

Thus, there is some question as to whether the Soviets could ever be convinced that we were not secretly deploying MIRV's even if we were to stop testing right now. However, there is a chance that they might be so convinced. In order to offer them that chance in the arms talks, it might be that we have to halt testing of MIRV's now and provide the Soviets with the opportunity to agree to a MIRV moratorium before the point of no return is passed.

TIMING

In deciding whether the United States can afford to defer MIRV testing and therefore MIRV deployment for a while longer, it is important to remember that the Pentagon justifies the MIRV as an ABM penetration system. In fact in this year's posture statement, the Pentagon notes:

"MIRV deployment is necessary because we must continue to plan our strategic offensive forces on the assumption that they (USSR) will have deployed some sort of an

ABM around their major cities by the mid-1970's."

Yet at this time we have no intelligence estimate which indicates that the Soviet Union will have such a city defense ABM deployed in 1971 when the first U.S. MIRV's will become operational. In fact, the lead time for city defense ABM deployment is considerably longer than the lead time for MIRV deployment. Thus, we could actually wait until there was firm evidence of a Soviet nationwide ABM before we put MIRV's on our missiles.

These leadtime differentials, and the fact that the U.S. MIRV deployment is scheduled for several years in advance of the threat it is said to meet, indicate that we could tolerate a few months delay in MIRV development with no loss in security.

CONCLUSION

Thus, Mr. Chairman, with MIRV development we face another costly escalation in the arms race which will not contribute to the increased security of either side. Moreover, this development will make a nuclear first strike strategy considerably more attractive than it is now.

These awesome prospects can be voided if we can get a mutual moratorium on MIRV testing and deployment with the Soviet Union. Whether we can work out such a moratorium depends in part on not going too far in our MIRV testing. Since deferring these tests for a few months would not jeopardize the national security, and might actually contribute to that security should an agreement be reached, I strongly urge the members of this body to advocate and support a halt on U.S. MIRV development pending the commencement of the SALT talks and continuing thereafter so long as the Soviet Union refrains from testing its multiple warheads, and in any event pressing for a mutual moratorium on MIRV development in these talks.

ANDERSON AND COHELAN OFFER MIRV RESOLUTION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—More than one-hundred members of the House of Representatives today joined in introducing a bipartisan resolution urging the President to propose to the Soviet Union a mutual moratorium on the flight testing of MIRV (multiple independently-targetable reentry vehicles).

The resolution was jointly introduced by Congressman John B. Anderson (R-ILL.), who is chairman of the House Republican Conference, and Congressman Jefferey Cohelan (D-Calif.). It is identical to a resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator Brooke and cosponsored by 40 other Senators.

Anderson and Cohelan told their colleagues, "The greatest current threat to our ability to deter nuclear war is the possible deployment by the Soviet Union of missiles with multiple warheads capable of destroying our land based ICBM force. In order to induce the Soviets to halt their MIRV deployment, we are urging the President to propose a mutual moratorium on MIRV testing.

"We believe this is a safe and sure manner in which to protect our deterrent force. Certainly it is worth a try."

Satellites cannot distinguish between missiles with single warheads and those with multiple warheads. Thus, once these MIRV warheads are fully developed and tested, it will require intrusive on-site inspection to assure that multiple warheads are not being secretly deployed. It is probably not possible to negotiate an agreement which would call for mutual on-site inspection of ICBM forces. Thus, to have the opportunity to negotiate an enforceable limitation on the deployment of MIRV, it must be done before either side is so far along in its testing that the other side might think that even if tests were halted, MIRV's might still be deployed in secret.

Cohelan and Anderson warned, "Since both the US and USSR have been conducting tests of these weapons for some time, the point at which we may no longer be able to achieve an enforceable ban on MIRV's is very close."

The two Congressmen said, "MIRV could put the arms race on a perpetual one-way escalator. Each side may perceive the other side's MIRV as a threat to its ICBM force, and thus to its deterrent. If such a threat is perceived, new deployments of offensive or defensive weapons will be required."

"The Pentagon justifies the MIRV as an ABM penetration system. Yet at this time we have no intelligence estimate which indicates that the Soviet Union will have such a city defense ABM deployed in 1971 when the first MIRV will become operational," Cohelan noted. "These lead time differentials indicate we could tolerate a few months delay in MIRV development with no loss in security," he added.

Anderson said he was pleased by President Nixon's reference to the resolution as "a very constructive proposal" and the willingness of the Administration to consider a mutual moratorium. "We are in no way attempting to dictate to the President," Anderson added, "But we do want to convey to him the sense of urgency which we in the Congress attach to the MIRV issue."

Anderson and Cohelan concluded, "The thesis of the MIRV moratorium resolution is that both sides must stop development of MIRV before it is deployable and impossible to inspect unilaterally.

"Because the possibility of deployment is only a few months off—because the point of no return is imminent—we must act with a sense of mission and urgency.

"The unusually large number of cosponsors indicates the strong and bipartisan concern over this crucial issue.

"We urge the President to promptly propose a mutual moratorium to the Soviets on further MIRV testing."

H. RES. 467

Whereas the competition to develop and deploy strategic weapons has reached a new and dangerous phase, which threatens to frustrate attempts to negotiate significant arms limitation and weaken the stability of nuclear deterrence as a barrier to war; and

Whereas development of multiple independently-targetable re-entry vehicles by both the United States and the Soviet Union represents a fundamental and radical challenge to such stability; and

Whereas the possibility of agreed controls over strategic forces appears likely to diminish greatly if testing and deployment of multiple independently-targetable re-entry vehicles proceed; and

Whereas a suspension of flight tests of multiple independently-targetable re-entry vehicles promises to forestall deployment of such provocative weapons; and

Whereas a suspension of such tests could contribute substantially to the success of prospective strategic arms negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States should seek prompt negotiations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to reach agreement on limiting both offensive and defensive strategic weapons; and

Resolved further, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should urgently propose to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics an immediate suspension by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of flight tests of multiple re-entry vehicles, subject to national verification or such other measures of observation and inspection as may be appropriate; and

Resolved further, That the Government of the United States should declare its intention to refrain from additional flight tests of multiple independently-targetable re-entry vehicles so long as the Soviet Union does so.

COSPONSORS

Addabbo, Joseph P. (D., N.Y.).
 Anderson, Glenn M. (D., Calif.).
 Anderson, John (R., Ill.).
 Ashley, Thomas L. (D., Ohio).
 Beall, Glenn (R., Md.).
 Blester, Edward (R., Pa.).
 Blatnik, John A. (D., Minn.).
 Boland, Edward P. (D., Mass.).
 Bolling, Richard (D., Mo.).
 Brademas, John (D., Ind.).
 Brasco, Frank J. (D., N.Y.).
 Broomfield, William (R., Mich.).
 Brown, George (D., Calif.).
 Burton, Phillip (D., Calif.).
 Button, Dan (R., N.Y.).
 Cahill, William T. (R., N.J.).
 Carey, Hugh L. (D., N.Y.).
 Chisholm, Shirley (D., N.Y.).
 Cohelan, Jeffery (D., Calif.).
 Collier, Harold R. (R., Ill.).
 Conte, Silvio (R., Mass.).
 Conyers, John (D., Mich.).
 Dellenback, John (R., Ill.).
 Dent, John H. (D., Pa.).
 Diggs, Charles C. (D., Mich.).
 Edwards, Don (D., Calif.).
 Erlenborn, John N. (R., Ill.).
 Esch, Marvin L. (R., Mich.).
 Eshleman, Edwin D. (R., Pa.).
 Farbstein, Leonard (D., N.Y.).
 Fraser, Donald M. (D., Minn.).
 Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B. (R., N.J.).
 Friedel, Samuel N. (D., Md.).
 Gilbert, Jacob (D., N.Y.).
 Halpern, Seymour (R., N.Y.).
 Hamilton, Lee H. (D., Ind.).
 Harvey, James (R., Mich.).
 Hastings, James (R., N.Y.).
 Hathaway, William D. (D., Maine).
 Hawkins, Augustus F. (D., Calif.).
 Hechler, Ken (D., W. Va.).
 Helstoski, Henry (D., N.J.).
 Horton, Frank (R., N.Y.).
 Jacobs, Andrew (D., Ind.).
 Joelson, Charles (D., N.J.).
 Karth, Joseph E. (D., Minn.).
 Kastenmeier, Robert W. (D., Wis.).
 Keith, Hastings (R., Mass.).
 Koch, Edward I. (D., N.Y.).
 Lloyd, Sherman (R., Utah).
 Lowenstein, Allard (D., N.Y.).
 McCarthy, Richard D. (D., N.Y.).
 McCloskey, Paul (R., Calif.).
 McDade, Joseph (R., Pa.).
 McDonald, Jack H. (R., Mich.).
 McEwen, Robert C. (R., N.Y.).
 Macdonald, Torbert H. (D., Mass.).
 Matsunaga, Spark M. (D., Hawaii).
 Meskill, Thomas J. (R., Conn.).
 Michel, Robert H. (R., Ill.).
 Mikva, Abner J. (D., Ill.).
 Mink, Patsy T. (D., Hawaii).
 Mize, Chester L. (R., Kans.).
 Moorhead, William S. (D., Pa.).
 Morse, F. Bradford (R., Mass.).
 Mosher, Charles (R., Ohio).
 Moss, John E. (D., Calif.).
 Obey, David R. (D., Wis.).
 Olsen, Arnold (D., Mont.).
 O'Neill, Thomas P. (D., Mass.).
 Ottinger, Richard L. (D., N.Y.).
 Pike, Otis G. (D., N.Y.).
 Podell, Bertram L. (D., N.Y.).
 Powell, Adam C. (D., N.Y.).
 Preyer, Richardson (D., N.C.).
 Railsback, Tom (R., Ill.).
 Rees, Thomas (D., Calif.).
 Reid, Ogden R. (R., N.Y.).
 Reuss, Henry S. (D., Wis.).
 Rodino, Peter W. (D., N.J.).
 Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (D., N.Y.).
 Roybal, Edward (D., Calif.).
 Ruppe, Philip E. (R., Mich.).

St Germain, Fernand J. (D., R.I.).
 Scheuer, James (D., N.Y.).
 Schneebeli, Herman T. (R., Pa.).
 Schwengel, Fred (R., Iowa).
 Stanton, J. William (R., Ohio).
 Steiger, William C. (R., Wis.).
 Stokes, Louis (D., Ohio).
 Thompson, Frank (D., N.J.).
 Tiernan, Robert O. (D., R.I.).
 Tunney, John V. (D., Calif.).
 Udall, Morris K. (D., Ariz.).
 Van Deerlin, Lionel (D., Calif.).
 Vanik, Charles A. (D., Ohio).
 Whalen, Charles (R., Ohio).
 Williams, Lawrence G. (R., Pa.).
 Wilson, Charles H. (D., Calif.).
 Yates, Sidney R. (D., Ill.).
 Yatron, Gus (D., Pa.).
 Zwach, John M. (R., Minn.).

HOUSE RESTAURANT WORKERS
DESERVE FAIR TREATMENT

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), and to indicate my great concern about the dismissal of Wendell Quinn. The inadequacy of the wage level of those who work so hard in the restaurants of the Capitols buildings is an embarrassment to the Congress, and an unacceptable hardship to those who have endured it for so long.

As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) pointed out, the people who work in the restaurants must also be able to eat. It is time we face up to our responsibilities for the conditions of employment of those who work in these buildings.

The sense that Mr. Quinn was dismissed because of his activities on behalf of cafeteria workers hovers over this episode and makes his abrupt dismissal profoundly unacceptable to many of us who are concerned about fairplay and about the rights of working people.

Beyond the immediate question of Mr. Quinn's employment it should be clear by now that Congress ought not to pockmark its processes by condoning demeaning and inadequate wages and working conditions for people who give dedicated service here, at the same time that we seek to legislate the end to such conditions in the rest of the country.

I am confident that the Speaker of the House, whose record of concern for the working conditions of his fellow men has made him one of the outstanding figures in the enactment of progressive legislation for more years than many of us have been alive—I am sure that the Speaker will share the concern of many Members of both parties about this situation.

I do not believe there is a public figure in American life who cares more about the right of American working people or who wants more earnestly to see that all Americans get paid a living wage. I cannot believe that the Architect of the Capitol will not see to it that Mr. Quinn is restored to his job. I cannot believe that it will be long before steps are taken to assure that the cafeteria employees are accorded treatment in the humane

and wise tradition personified by the Speaker.

TERMINATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF WENDELL QUINN

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join with our distinguished colleagues led by Congressman JACOBS of Indiana in decrying the action of the Architect in terminating the employment of Wendell Quinn on the grounds that he was leading the organization of an employees' association over in the Senate. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, we have been charged with the responsibility of setting forth minimum working conditions and pay scales for working people throughout this Nation, and yet we find that within the very Halls of this Congress we are unable to maintain those very basic minimum standards for our own employees.

I would like to join my colleagues in calling upon the leadership of this House to make certain that these minimum guarantees are made available to all of our employees and, most appropriately, to the employees of our restaurants.

THE 1965 VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to insert in the RECORD the excellent testimony of Mr. Clarence Mitchell, who heads up the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and who is also legislative chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee has been hearing testimony on the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I want to congratulate the many members of the Judiciary Committee on both sides of the aisle who have joined in opposing the administration version, which would distract the Nation from the central issue of extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I think it is urgent that this Congress make certain that this very simple, basic civil rights bill is continued for at least 5 more years.

I would like to include the following material: Clarence Mitchell's testimony before the subcommittee and three news articles relating to the current dialog on the extension of the Voting Rights Act.

The testimony of Clarence Mitchell and the other material is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP. I appear here today on behalf of our organization and also as the legislative chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. We urge that the 1965 Voting Rights Act's ban against literacy tests be extended for an additional five year period as pro-

vided in bills introduced by Chairman Emanuel Celler and ranking committee member William M. McCulloch.

These bills would strike out the words "five years" in each place where they appear in the first and third paragraphs of Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973b(a)) and "inserting in lieu thereof 'ten years.'"

In order that there will be no mistake about what we support, we cite 42 USC 1973b subsection (b) in full:

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a state which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November, 1964.

"A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 1973d or 1973k of this title shall not be reviewable in any court and shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register."

The wording of this subsection would remain unchanged. We have heard of several suggestions to change the date of November 1, 1964, in subsection (b) to a later date. Such a change would be a travesty in that it would reduce the coverage of the law—especially in those areas where diligent effort by citizens has increased the voter registration in the face of great odds.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of the effectiveness of the 1965 Voting Rights Act is the recent victory of Charles Evers in his race for Mayor of Fayette, Mississippi. For many years the State of Mississippi has been synonymous with terror, oppression and total deprivation of all of the Negro's constitutional rights. Mr. Evers' own brother, Medgar, was murdered by an assassin. There is a long, tragic and bloody history of how that state has tolerated and encouraged the consignment of colored Americans to a sub-human status.

Although the great and small cities of Mississippi were notorious for their mistreatment of colored people, the small towns justly earned the reputation of being worse than the large cities of that state. It is, therefore, especially gratifying that Mr. Evers won in a small community and that the entire campaign was conducted in a spirit of fairness.

I would like to state for the record that immediately after he won, Mr. Evers announced that he would work to make his community a place of fairness and prosperity for all people without regard to race or color. He has already embarked on a campaign to attract business and money to his town in order that it may be a credit to the state and to the Nation.

Mr. Evers is one of approximately 400 men and women who have been elected to public office in the South. Most of these office holders won because of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In contrast to the turmoil and hostility that plagues some areas of the country, many of the men and women, white and black, who live in the states affected by the act are making quiet but determined efforts to move forward in a spirit of brotherhood and good will.

These elections have provided high drama in many communities. For example, while the mayor of Leesville, Louisiana, was personally leading his police force in arresting NAACP officials on May 17, a colored man, Rufus Mayfield, was being elected as the first of his race to serve in the city council of Lake Charles, Louisiana. It is important to note that the NAACP officials were being ar-

rested because they had set up a tent for the purpose of receiving complaints of Negro servicemen stationed at Fort Polk in Louisiana.

The Evers victory and the action of the Leesville mayor should serve to remind us that while the 1965 Voting Rights Act opened the door for progress, the battle is by no means over. It is still possible to be jailed for exercising even the most obvious constitutional rights in many of the states of the so-called Old South. Vernon Dahmer, who died from injuries after his store was burned to the ground and peppered with a hail of bullets in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, was a leader of a registration and vote drive. Like many others before him he paid with his life for the right to vote.

Mr. Dahmer had announced on January 9, 1966, that he would receive poll tax payments at his grocery store from persons wishing to register to vote. On January 10 he was dead of wounds received in the fire-bombing of his store, his home and his car. Those who have been determined to deny the right to vote have not spared victims merely because they were white. Let us not forget that on August 20, 1965, Jonathan M. Daniels, a white man, was shot and killed just after he had been freed from jail in Lowndes County, Alabama. A Roman Catholic priest with him was also severely wounded but recovered. Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, who was also white, was shot and killed on the night of March 25, 1965, while ferrying marchers in her car from Montgomery, Alabama, to their homes in Selma, Alabama.

These crimes have been supplemented by official state action designed to prevent Negroes from voting. This subcommittee, and especially the senior members, know the long and shameful record of state sanctioned obstruction. Immediately after passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act the Mississippi Legislature, meeting in regular and special sessions, passed twelve bills and resolutions which substantially altered the state's election laws. Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina have all resorted to various devices to slow down or prevent registration, voting and election to public office. These devices include abolishing offices, switching to so-called "at large elections," consolidation of counties, "full slate voting," barring or intimidating poll watchers and giving misleading information to would-be voters.

The continuity of these attempts to defy the law is illustrated by a recent happening in Friar's Point, Mississippi. On May 17, 1969, the Department of Justice asked a federal court to block a June 3 town election in Friar's Point unless a slate of Negro candidates is placed on the ballot.

The Department of Justice charges that the Municipal Election Commission changed the qualification procedure for candidates and the city clerk failed to notify the Negroes of the change in time for them to be placed on the ballot, in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the 15th Amendment to the Constitution.

Prior to this year, candidates for city offices have qualified to be placed on the ballot by notifying the clerk and filing a statement that they were not subversives.

After a slate of six Negroes complied with this procedure to be placed on the ballots as candidates for mayor, town marshal, and four alderman posts, the defendants "without general notice to the public, altered the procedure for qualifying."

The new procedure required petitions to be filed by candidates and the clerk failed to notify the slate of Negro candidates and did not furnish them forms for the petitions as she did for the other candidates.

The change in procedure was made without the approval of the Attorney General, as required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and will "deny and abridge the right of Negroes

to vote on account of their race by denying them the right to vote for the candidates of their choice."

Even without the sanction of law, slow downs, indifference and hostility have been used to keep down registration. Barnwell County, South Carolina, is a good illustration of how unofficial efforts to intimidate have been used to back up official action. In 1965, large numbers of would be colored registrants were kept waiting in a line and finally not permitted to register. Some of those who were not permitted to register began picketing and were arrested on a charge of parading without a permit. The Negroes then staged a register and vote rally in an open field. At the same time the Ku Klux Klan held a rally beside the main road that the Negroes had to use going to and coming from the rally.

The Virginia State Conference of NAACP branches made a statewide check on registration conditions in 1967, two years after the Voting Rights Act became law. Insufficient time to register and inconvenience of the place of registration were the most common complaints. In Lancaster County it was necessary to make an appointment in order to register. In Southampton County registration was on Thursdays only. In Halifax County the registration dates were set at the "convenience of the registrars." In one county a "registrar stopped registering to go play golf."

With so many risks of losing the progress that has been made since the 1965 Voting Rights Act became law, it is imperative that the ban against literacy tests be extended before the end of this session of the Congress. There are those who suggest that the law can be improved. This may be so, but let us extend the law that we know can and does work before seeking a change that may not get through Congress until after the present ban against literacy tests has expired.

Just to illustrate one of the pitfalls that may lie ahead if we consider new legislation without first extending the present law, let us consider one proposal which is said to be under consideration. It provides that a sixth grade education would establish proof of literacy.

I invite the subcommittee's attention to the cover photograph on the Washington Post Magazine Potomac, for Sunday, May 25, 1969. It is the picture of a fine looking white man and his two children. Inside the story relates that "Ten years ago Brother Leonard Barton came out of the hills with a fifth grade education and a hungry family . . . he rose to a full time job as the \$9,000 a year shop foreman for an engineering firm in College Park, Maryland." Mr. Barton is a relatively young man. There are thousands of Americans like him and many of them live in areas where they would be lucky if they could get a third grade education. What a travesty it would be to say to these people that although the Internal Revenue Service does not care whether you finished kindergarten—you must pay your taxes. But when it comes to electing the officials who impose the taxes on your property, on your necessities of life and on your income you have got to prove that you have finished the sixth grade.

It would serve no useful purpose to take up this subcommittee's time with other illustrations. However, I would like to close with a reference to a story that appeared in Jet Magazine on page 14 of the March 20, 1969, issue.

When President Johnson left office a number of persons decided to pay a tribute to him by presenting a replica of the first voting certificate issued under the provisions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It turned out that the certificate was issued to Mrs. Ardles Mauldin of Selma, Alabama. Mrs. Mauldin is a practical nurse in a Selma hospital and the mother of seven children. I offer her words

as a plea for prompt action in extending the present law. She said:

"It is hard for people in the North to know how we feel about voting. It's changed everything in the South and we'll not forget it. We in Selma have seen a lot of hard times but a lot of good has come from the struggle of our young people."

The voice and words of Mrs. Mauldin cannot always be heard above the cries of racists and demagogues who say that laws are worthless. Yet, she is one of an overwhelming majority of Americans who still rely upon the law for redress of wrongs. Let us vindicate her faith by extending the statute which made it possible for her to vote.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1969]

NIXON RIGHTS BILL APPEARS DOOMED BY A GOP ATTACK—MITCHELL DEFENSE OF PLAN TO REVISE VOTING LAW MEETS HOUSE PANEL HOSTILITY—BOTH PARTIES CRITICAL—McCULLOCH URGES FIGHT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH PRESENT ACT AND NOT REPEAL

WASHINGTON, July 1.—The Nixon Administration's five-day-old voting rights proposal ran into such uniform and intense opposition on Capitol Hill today that it was regarded as all but dead.

Completing the testimony he began last week before a House Judiciary subcommittee, Attorney General John N. Mitchell won a response that ranged from criticism through outright hostility to near abuse, with members of both parties chiming in.

As a result, any prospect that the Administration bill would be substituted for the extension of the present voting rights act favored by many Congressmen appeared to have dwindled to the vanishing point.

Asked after the hearing whether the Administration would fight an extension of the 1965 law on the House floor if its own bill lost in committee, Mr. Mitchell replied with his customary tartness: "I've made my pitch here."

When the Administration voting rights package was sent to Congress, there was speculation that President Nixon's strategists were aware that substantial numbers of Republicans would oppose it. This led some Capitol Hill observers to conclude that its purpose was largely political, aimed at increasing Republican popularity in the South.

MCCULLOCH LEADS ATTACK

Leading the attack on the Nixon proposal was the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, Representative William M. McCulloch of Ohio, a courtly conservative with strong views on the importance of civil rights legislation.

The Administration proposal, Mr. McCulloch declared, "creates a remedy for which there is no wrong and leaves grievous wrongs without adequate remedy." "I ask you, what kind of civil rights bill is that?" he said.

Mr. Mitchell had recommended radically revising the section in the present law under which the Justice Department or a Washington-based Federal court must clear state or local changes in Southern election laws.

CALLS FOR HARDER FIGHT

"The bad jurisdictions have not obeyed it, he says," Mr. McCulloch continued. "But I would have hoped that the party of civil rights, the party of human rights, the party that voted 82 per cent in the Senate and 94 per cent in the House for the 1965 act, would not have thrown up its hands in surrender."

"There is an alternative to surrender, and that's to fight harder. Noncompliance does not justify repeal. That's not the way to promote law and order throughout the land."

A letter of protest against the Administration proposal from the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, who was named chairman of

the Civil Rights Commission by President Nixon three months ago, was put in the record by Representative Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn Democrat who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Father Hesburgh, who is also president of the University of Notre Dame, called the Nixon proposal "a distinct retreat" that would "turn back the clock to 1957" in providing protection for the registration and voting rights of Southern Negroes.

"It is an open invitation to those states which denied the vote to minority citizens in the past to resume doing so in the future through insertion of disingenuous technicalities and changes in their election laws," he wrote.

In a letter to Chairman Celler, John W. Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition Action Council, strongly urged extending the present voting rights law before dealing with any of the "complicated issues" raised by the Administration proposal.

One of the sharpest rejoinders to Mr. Mitchell came from Representative John J. Conyers Jr., Democrat of Michigan who is the unofficial leader of the House Negro delegation.

In supplementary testimony today, Mr. Mitchell had maintained that a major beneficiary of the Administration bill would be the "under-educated ghetto Negro" in the North, whose voting rights, he said, are obstructed by literacy tests that the Nixon program would ban.

"I suggest to this committee," the Attorney General said, "that it is the psychological barrier of the literacy test, long associated with the poll tax is a discriminatory tool to keep the Negro from the ballot box, that may be responsible for much of the low Negro voter registration in some of our major cities."

Mr. Conyers charged that "for this Administration to discuss psychological barriers to the Negro is the most presumptuous act I've ever heard."

"Black people in the North are not being prevented from voting because of their education," Mr. Conyers continued. "But I can tell you that black people are losing faith in large numbers every day that this system had the promise of being what it says it is."

Following Representative McCulloch's lead, the Republicans on the subcommittee one by one registered their preference for a five-year extension of the present law or their objections to various aspects of the Administration bill, or both.

Representative Clark MacGregor of Minnesota spoke favorably of a national ban on literacy tests but made it clear he would vote for a renewal of the present law first.

Even Representative Edward Hutchinson of Michigan, who had been regarded as likely to back the Administration bill, objected because it included what he regarded as unrelated material on residency requirements for voting.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1969]
MONKEY WRENCH

The operative, conspicuous and altogether damning fact about the Attorney General's statement on Thursday before a House Judiciary subcommittee is that it opposes the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That act expires in August, 1970. There is no doubt whatever that, with Administration support, the act could be extended for five years. With Administration opposition, a simple extension bill may well be defeated. The extended hearings and bitter controversy to which Attorney General Mitchell's proposals will surely give rise may end by leaving the country without any Federal voting rights legislation at all.

There is much to be said for some of Mr. Mitchell's proposals. Unfortunately, there is also much to be said against them. For our part, we heartily agree with the Attorney

General that "all adult citizens who are of sound mind and who have not been convicted of a felony should be free to and encouraged to participate in the electoral process." We would, therefore, support Federal legislation to ban literacy tests everywhere in the United States. But some states are going to resist such legislation.

We are no less heartily in favor of the ban suggested by Mr. Mitchell on state residency requirements for national elections. In this mobile Nation, such parochial and artificial restraints on the basic right of national citizenship should long ago have been abandoned. But the reform is likely to engender a lot of opposition. Similarly, there are substantial arguments to support the change recommended by the Attorney General in the mode of attacking state legislation which may operate to deprive minorities of voting opportunities. But the change is an extremely complex one calling for the most careful analysis and debate. Let Congress take up these proposed improvements at leisure and on their individual merits—and not when they can be used as devices for preventing the enactment of any voting rights legislation whatever.

The most cogent argument for continuance of the 1965 act was stated by Mr. Mitchell himself. "Since 1965," he testified, "more than 800,000 Negro voters have been registered in the seven states covered by the Act." And a few of them, he might have added, have been elected to public office. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has given to black Americans the means to make themselves felt and heeded politically where they were previously ignored. And that, of course, is precisely why there is such bitter opposition to it among so many white Southerners.

The Attorney General can dress his proposals up as much as he likes in high-sounding phrases about putting voting rights on a national rather than a regional basis; but he is not going to fool any of the people who have fought the long hard battle to make voting a reality for Negroes in the South. He is not going to fool Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP who said with characteristic straightforwardness that the Justice Department bill is "a sophisticated but nonetheless deadly way of thwarting the progress we have made." He is not going to fool Joseph L. Rauh, the seasoned counsel of the Civil Rights Leadership Conference, who called the Administration measure "a monkey wrench." He is not going to fool Rep. William M. McCulloch, ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee and a stalwart champion of civil rights who said he favors a simple extension of the present law.

These men have implored the Attorney General not to open the way now for prolonged, divisive debate and the ugly possibility of a Southern filibuster if the voting rights issue carries over into next year. The country is not going to be fooled, either. It knows that the Southern stratagem now embraced by the Administration poses two tragic dangers. One is the danger that if Negroes are deprived of a chance to advance their welfare through orderly political action, they will be pushed toward disorder and violence. The other is the danger that the country will find itself in default on a moral commitment it has undertaken in the name of democracy and justice.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1969]
EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS BY MITCHELL AND MCCULLOCH ON THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Attorney General MITCHELL. The proposal for a simple five-year extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act leaves the undereducated ghetto Negro as today's forgotten man in voting rights legislation.

He would be forgotten both in the 13 States outside the South which have literacy tests now and in the 30 other states which

have the ability, at any time, to impose them.

It is not enough to continue to protect Negro voters in seven states. That consideration may have been the justification for the 1965 act. But it is unrealistic today to ignore the ghettos of Harlem, Watts, Roxbury, Seattle, Hartford and Portland, Ore.—all of which are located in states which have literacy tests.

I believe the literacy test is an unreasonable physical obstruction to voting even if it is administered in an even-handed manner. It unrealistically denies the franchise to those who have no schooling. It unfairly denies the franchise to those who have been denied an equal educational opportunity because of inferior schooling in the North and the South.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIER

But perhaps most importantly, it is a psychological obstruction in the minds of many of our minority citizens. I don't have all the answers. But I suggest to this committee that it is the psychological barrier of the literacy test—long associated with the poll tax as a discriminatory tool to keep the Negro from the ballot box—that may be responsible for much of the low Negro voter registration in some of our major cities.

A higher percentage of Negroes voted in South Carolina and Mississippi, where literacy tests are suspended, than in Watts or Harlem, where literacy tests are enforced. A higher percentage of Negroes vote in Philadelphia and Chicago where there are no literacy tests, than in majority Negro neighborhoods in New York City and Los Angeles.

I want to encourage black people to vote. I want to encourage Mexican-American and Puerto Rican citizens to vote. I especially believe that minority citizens, who may feel alienated from our society, should be given every opportunity to participate in our electoral processes.

CALLS VOTE IMPORTANT

I want to encourage our Negro citizens to take out their alienations at the ballot box, and not elsewhere. I want them to know that their ballot is important and will be significant in determining the policies of the officials who govern.

It has also been suggested before this committee that our proposal to extend the coverage of the Voting Rights Act would result in weakening some of its provisions.

This criticism is untrue. Our proposal would broaden the act but would, in many ways, considerably strengthen it.

Our bill would maintain the authority of the 1965 Voting Rights Act for the Attorney General to send examiners and observers into the seven Southern states. But it would extend this authority to all states and counties where the Attorney General had received any complaints of possible violations of 15th Amendment rights.

Under the 1965 act, the Attorney General is required to go to court to request voting examiners and observers in non-Southern states. Under our bill, he has the authority to send the observers and examiners any place without first applying to the court. Our proposed bill would authorize the courts, on the application of the Attorney General, to temporarily enjoin discriminatory voting laws and to freeze any new voting laws passed by the state or county against whom the lawsuit is filed.

Representative McCULLOUGH. I regret the necessity of opposing the Administration proposal as a substitute for the Voting Rights Act of 1965. As a Republican, I would like nothing more than to embrace and support a program sponsored by the present Administration. But in good conscience, I cannot support the one outlined last Thursday for two reasons:

The Administration bill is actually a weaker bill. It also jeopardizes the chances of passage of voting rights legislation.

As I understand the provisions of the Administration bill which pertain to the heart of this controversy, they sweep broadly into those areas where the need is the least and retreat from those areas where the need is the greatest.

We are asked to extend the Section 4 ban on literacy tests or devices outside the South into 14 other states from which the Justice Department and the N.A.A.C.P. have never to this day received a complaint alleging the discriminatory use of literacy tests or devices.

We are asked to repeal the Section 5 requirement that the covered states must clear their new voting laws and practices with the Attorney General or the District Court of Columbia in the face of spellbinding evidence of unflagging Southern dedication to the cause of creating an ever more sophisticated legal machinery for discriminating against the black voter.

GRIEVOUS WRONGS

In short, the Administration creates a remedy for which there is no wrong and leaves grievous wrongs without adequate remedy. I ask you, what kind of civil rights bill is that?

That is not the kind of civil rights legislation that gives hope to black America. It is the kind of civil rights legislation that is favored by Attorney General Summer of Mississippi. It is the kind of civil rights legislation that is opposed by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and by the Civil Rights Commission. I repeat, what kind of civil rights legislation is that?

The Attorney General of Mississippi came all the way to Washington for only one reason. He well understood that Section 5 finally had to be obeyed. He wanted it scuttled. Discrimination will find it hard to survive under Section 5 if it is retained. But it will thrive again under the Administration proposal.

The Attorney General testified that Section 5 cannot work. The bad jurisdictions have not obeyed it, he says. But I would have hoped that the party of civil rights—the party that voted 82 per cent in the House and 94 per cent in the Senate for the 1965 act—would not have thrown up its hands in surrender.

URGES FIGHTING HARDER

There is an alternative to surrender, and that's to fight harder.

Noncompliance does not justify repeal. That's not the way to promote law and order throughout the land.

In considering the Administration proposal, it is equally important to note how its various provisions increase the number of "no" votes. No matter how many protests are voiced, the issue under the Administration bill is whether literacy tests as a philosophical question are desirable, whereas under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 the issue is whether discrimination in voting is desirable. The broad philosophical question would be far more divisive than a simple extension of the act would be.

Therefore, those who believe that only intelligent people should be allowed to vote, those who believe in either a strict or a moderate construction of the Constitution, and those who believe in economy in Government may—even if they favor civil rights—vote against the Administration package.

I do not know what others may think, but as for me, I find the cause of civil rights too dear to jeopardize the chances of success. And if the risk were taken, what is the prize? A weaker civil rights law.

What kind of civil rights legislation is that?

HEARINGS ON BILL TO INCREASE THE SIZE AND WEIGHT OF TRUCKS ON INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 8 the House Public Works Committee will begin hearings on H.R. 11870, a bill to increase the size and weight of trucks on Interstate Highways.

As was the case last year, I am strongly opposed to the enactment of this legislation. Since I will be going into more detail on this legislation during the hearings, I will briefly outline the reasons for my opposition.

During the election campaign last fall President Nixon said about the truck bill:

This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public.

There is no doubt that this is true, and is the key issue. In addition, President Nixon stated during the campaign:

I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interest of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce.

Up to now I have not been able to find any evidence that the "hard look" called for by the President has taken place. There have been no new studies or research projects undertaken. I have talked to officials in the Federal Highway Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, and the National Highway Safety Bureau at great length. None of those to whom I have talked has any knowledge of any restudy or review of the situation. They have not been able to produce any reliable data.

In fact, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, stated before the Public Works Committee recently that—

As to the specific of what extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am unaware of any work specifically in that area.

Therefore, it is incredible to me that there have been published reports recently indicating that the Department of Transportation is going to support the big truck bill. This is an irresponsible position to take for two obvious and compelling reasons. First, President Nixon's own directive for a complete restudy of the bill and its effects has not been undertaken, and second, the administration's own top safety people say there is no credible research on what effect this will have on highway safety.

It seems to me the Department of Transportation has given absolutely no consideration to the important issue of the "safety and convenience of the traveling public" to use President Nixon's own words.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of this unreasonable position of the Department of

Transportation, I will continue to fight this special interest legislation, I find it difficult to understand how this legislation can be considered at all until we know what effect a wider and heavier truck will have on safety.

It is my hope that the rumors and press reports are in error and that the Department of Transportation will instead call for postponement of consideration until the studies ordered by the President are started and completed. To do anything else would violate President Nixon's campaign statement and pledge.

Now Mr. Speaker the House should know that at 6:30 p.m. last night, after I had prepared the statement I just made and after I had notified the Department of Transportation as a matter of courtesy indicating the contents of the statement, I received a phone call from the Department of Transportation that the study mandated by President Nixon supposedly began on Monday.

It is my understanding that the Department of Transportation has requested a 30-day extension from the House Public Works Committee on its date for testifying on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is utterly unrealistic to think that the kind of credible research data, needed to be reliable, can be gathered in 30 days and be used as a basis for making a recommendation on this big truck bill.

At this point Mr. Speaker, I include a letter I wrote to Secretary John Volpe last February 5 in the RECORD, along with a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on June 21:

FEBRUARY 5, 1969.

HON. JOHN VOLPE,
Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you may recall, a rather substantial effort was made last year in the Congress to pass a bill to increase the size and weight of trucks.

Dubious about the merits of the bill and completely at odds with the tactics used by its supporters, I led the opposition to the legislation. Standing alone at first, my efforts gained support and the bill never reached the floor of the House.

During the campaign, President Nixon was asked about his position on the legislation. His response was heartening. In it he called for a thorough review by the Department of Transportation of the entire matter of truck size and weight and related issues such as user tax and safety.

It seems to me that it would be appropriate to begin the re-evaluation and review called for by the President in the very near future.

Undoubtedly, efforts will be made again during this Congress on behalf of the truck bill. The position and attitude taken by the last Administration was less than friendly. They exhibited a closed mind attitude. Therefore, a fresh study and evaluation would be of great value.

The opportunity to discuss the entire matter with you or one of your staff certainly would be appreciated.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRED SCHWENGEL,
Member of Congress.

HINT WHITE HOUSE MAY BACK BIG TRUCK
BILL

(By William Steif)

Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner strongly hinted today that the Nixon

Administration will endorse a new bill permitting larger, heavier trucks on the Interstate Highway System.

In an interview, Mr. Turner said "we haven't endorsed any bill yet," but noted that the revised measure introduced two weeks ago by Rep. John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill., was "close" to what he recommended last year.

"That's a pretty good tipoff," he said.

Rep. Kluczynski's bill would permit states to increase truck width limits on the interstate system from 96 to 102 inches, increase maximum single-axle weight from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds, and increase maximum tandem-axle weight from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds.

It would eliminate the Federal weight limit of 73,280 pounds, substituting in its place a formula based on axle spacing.

The new feature, which last year's defeated bill did not have, is a 70-foot length limit on trucks, thus limiting a vehicle's greatest possible weight to about 92,000 pounds. Previously, there was no Federal length limit.

The proposed new bill would permit double trailers to be operated in tandem on the interstate system in states which go along with the 70-foot length limit. But it would bar triple-trailer truck trains such as would have been possible under last year's bill.

The effect probably would be to permit double trailer trucks to continue to operate in Western states, but leave it to the state legislatures to determine whether they would be permitted in most Eastern states which now ban them except on a few toll roads.

Mr. Turner pointed out that his agency last year recommended a 65-foot length limit under the axle-spacing formula. The formula is designed to spread weight safely.

Mr. Turner also had recommended horsepower, braking and linkage standards, but now feels his National Highway Safety Bureau has sufficient power to set these standards without legislative authority. There are indications the bureau will set such standards soon, just as it recently set new fitness standards for truck and bus drivers.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the unreasonable and undue delay of DOT in beginning the study ordered by the President and the newspaper article indicating support by DOT of the present truck bill indicates some hesitancy, to say the least, by DOT to seriously attack this problem.

I am apprehensive about the sincerity of the Department of Transportation in dealing with this whole issue, especially in light of the 30-day wonder or quickie study evidently underway. It does not appear to me that this kind of procedure carries out either the spirit or the letter of President Nixon's directive.

COMPUTERS FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of modernizing the Congress is a matter of continuing concern to all of us. We must avail ourselves of every possible tool and technique if we are to function effectively. One powerful asset which has not been adapted to any appreciable extent in the congressional struggle for survival is the computer. In my chapter of the book "We Propose: A Modern Congress," I stressed the fact that "knowledge is power." Every Member of both Chambers is aware of this, but

all too often we fail to take those steps which will lead to an upgrading of our inadequate resources. Knowledge is based on information—information that is timely, accurate, and relevant—and the computer can be instrumental in providing the information which we need in our decisionmaking, committee work, and constituent support.

The House Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment, chaired by the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. JOE D. WAGGONER, has been assigned the responsibility for charting a course which will allow the Congress to utilize fully the power of the computer. As a member of that group, I believe it is imperative that all Members of the Congress be cognizant of the legislative applications where automatic data processing can help. To this end, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent study prepared by Robert L. Chartrand, the specialist in information sciences of the Legislative Reference Service. This report, entitled "Computers for Congress," is a succinct, factual discussion of the information needs of the Congress, legislation which has been introduced to create a computer support for the Federal Legislature, private sector studies of the information problems facing us, and commentary on those legislative tasks which might be carried out better with computer support and those already being implemented through the efforts of the Clerk of the House, the Senate Sergeant at Arms Office, and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I include this excellent study in the RECORD:

COMPUTERS FOR CONGRESS
(By Robert L. Chartrand)

INTRODUCTION

The United States Congress, as it prepares to enter the 1970's, is confronted with governing problems of unprecedented severity and complexity. Each of its Members must function effectively in three roles: as a legislator rendering decisions on national and international issues, as the prime representative of his State or district, and as an unofficial ombudsman accessible to every constituent. The ability of the Congressmen and their committees to perform responsively often is impeded by the sheer volume of routine tasks to be performed, the almost infinite variety of information to be acquired, and the diverse issues to be considered.

The stresses upon the Members and their staffs have been augmented by the effects of the "information explosion." The profusion of books, articles, analytical reports, and miscellany threatens to overwhelm even the most sophisticated information handling centers. The Federal legislator, in discharging his many duties, must be able to obtain information relevant to a variety of topics in a timely fashion. All too often, traditional procedures for acquiring, indexing, abstracting, storing, processing, retrieving, and disseminating priority information do not suffice. This condition is causing the Congressman to seek out new techniques and tools which can assist him in the performance of his legislative and administrative tasks. Computer technology, developed only during the past quarter-century, now possesses the proven potential to support the Congress in a number of application areas.

Not only is Congress considering the ways in which automatic data processing (ADP) can enhance chamber, committee, and indi-

vidual Member performance, but it is examining how this innovative technology can be applied to societal problems. The social and community problems of our times have, in many instances, reached a critical point. Transportation planning, environmental pollution control, systematic urban design—these and other equally important issues are taxing the capacities of the government. Information concerning the nature and status of numerous issues, plus possible approaches for their analysis and solution, is needed both by the executive branch and the Congress.

The burden imposed by an expanding Nation and increasingly intricate technology is awesome, and in turn places demands upon the human beings responsible for establishing the policies and programs of the future. In the volume *The Year 2000*, the focus is placed upon the projected man-machine balance which must be achieved: "Greater wealth and improved technology give us a wider range of alternatives; but once an alternative has been chosen, much regulation and imposed order is needed. Thus with geometric increases in the complexity and organization of modern life, corresponding, even if not directly proportional, increases in the scope and complexity of human and organizational controls will become necessary."¹

The role which computers play in western civilization is enormous, and growing in quantum steps. Today, more than 70,000 computers are in operation in the United States alone.² The Federal Government, a heavy user of electronic computers and punched card equipment, now has an inventory of more than 4,200 computers.³ These are utilized by virtually all departments and agencies in hundreds of routine and exotic applications. The Congress did evince an awareness of the growing use of computers by the executive branch, and passed a bill introduced by Representative Jack Brooks providing for "the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment" by Federal elements.⁴ Public Law 89-306 also directed the National Bureau of Standards to develop data processing standards, conduct research in computer sciences, and render technical assistance to Federal agencies.

CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

An awareness of the acute need for improved information handling and the possible use of ADP was not articulated within the Congress until the early part of this decade. A series of statements by the then Senator Hubert H. Humphrey emphasized the needs of his colleagues for "more, better or more varied information."⁵ A discussion of the importance of having the right information at the right time gradually developed. Dialogue involving Congressmen, scholars, industrial systems analysts, and governmental planners took place in congressional hearings, debates, professional journals, and the popular communications media.

One much discussed aspect of the problem was that of equal access to narrative and statistical information by all three branches of the Federal Government. Especial attention was paid to the effect upon the balance between the executive branch and the Congress. Interplay between these functioning elements can be affected by many factors, among which are access to vital information and the time to assimilate, weigh, and apply it. The typical legislator, working a 60-hour week which includes multiple committee duties, chamber debates and votes, and the omnipresent constituents demands, increasingly operates at a disadvantage. The seriousness of the problem is noted in this statement by a management consultant team studying congressional functioning:

"Congress is burdened by an ever-increasing workload, caused by continuing growth of the nation and the government, and Congress' failure to relieve itself of unnecessary work detail. The weight of this workload as felt personally by legislators is a serious impediment to a greater Congressional effectiveness."⁶

The Congressman spends a great deal of time and energy making decisions. His staff must be highly selective in screening out and preparing information for his use. The problem usually is not too little information, but *too much*. The Member needs information with which to consider alternatives. While his own files may be bulging—and are seldom purged except under the threat of leaving no space for staff existence—the need for yet more information is insatiable.

The sources of information for the legislator are many, and often the greatest single resource is his own staff. The diversity of issues confronting any Congressman today, however, rules out the possibility that any congressional office or committee staff can perform effectively without external assistance from time to time. In many instances, information will be solicited from executive branch agencies, many of which maintain liaison personnel responsible for fulfilling congressional needs. Lobbyist groups, universities, and the business community are also tapped for advice and source information. One of the major sources of information support for the Congress is the Legislative Reference Service located in the Library of Congress. This non-partisan research facility has a staff of more than 200 specialists and reference librarians responsible for preparing special studies and furnishing background material in an almost infinite variety of topical fields. In 1968, more than 130,000 Member, committee, and constituent requests for information were sent to LRS for action.

While specific requests for facts, discussions, or judgments allow greater precision in the fulfillment of the inquiries, quite often there is a requirement for an information seeker to simply "browse" through a file or bookshelf. A classical statement on this situation was made by Malcolm Rigby:

"For subject searches, no system can yield just what, and only what, is desired, no matter how carefully the question is formulated. There will always be some element of subjective judgment. Hence the need for browsing to find (or eliminate) what is most probably relevant (or irrelevant). The user sometimes looks for very specific data by subject; but more often he has vague or ill-defined or not definable ideas, or is merely looking for interesting information."⁷

The potential of the computer in assisting the Congressman is not unlimited, but there are many repetitive tasks which consume unwarranted amounts of Member and staff time which might be better performed through ADP techniques. Cognizance of the innovative tools and techniques has led to congressional action to harness such technology in coping with both legislative and administrative problems.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO CREATE A CONGRESSIONAL ADP CAPABILITY

Sensitivity to the potential of the computer and systems methodology led to the introduction of the first bill calling for the creation of an ADP facility exclusively dedicated to serving the Congress, by Representative Robert McClory late in 1966. This bill provided for the Legislative Reference Service to "make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions."⁸ A similar provision was inserted in the Reorganization Act of 1967 (S. 355) by Senator Hugh Scott. This bill, which passed the Senate in 1968, also provided for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, which would be responsible for "continuing study of auto-

matic data processing and information retrieval systems for Congress."⁹ Another section dealt with the creation of a "standardized information and data processing system for budgeting and fiscal data for use by all Federal agencies"¹⁰ by the Comptroller General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The recommendations contained in S. 355 resulted in large part from the staff work and hearings conducted by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

During the 90th Congress, a group of House Members from both parties supported the McClory concept and introduced similar bills. In a separate piece of legislation, Representative John D. Dow placed emphasis on the selection of information to be handled in any computer facility servicing the Congress, charging the Joint Committee on the Library with being attentive to: "... the policies and procedures governing the use of automatic data processing by the Legislative Reference Service, and the appropriateness and effectiveness of such policies and procedures not only in promoting the beneficial utilization of the capability but also in restraining; wasteful use thereof."¹¹

A proposal to establish an independent facility was sponsored late in the 90th Congress by Representative William S. Moorhead. His approach was to have an ADP center under the jurisdiction of a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing. Reintroduced in the 91st Congress as H.R. 7012, the bill provided for a professional staff to operate the facility, and an independent Advisory Board comprised of key legislative branch individuals and outside data processing experts.

Activity in the 91st Congress has reflected a transition from a period devoted to the development of tentative proposals and a greater understanding of the nature of computer hardware and software to one featuring a resolve to create a tangible computer-centered support capability. Early in the first session, Representative John Brademas originated a resolution which later was endorsed by the Democratic Study Group and the Democratic Caucus:

"Resolved, that the Committee on House Administration be fully supported by Democratic members in efforts to improve the efficiency of operations of the House of Representatives, and we urge that these efforts include, but not be limited to, the use of computers and of a centralized mail processing system."¹²

This course of action stressed the careful review of existing ADP activities within the legislative branch and provided for a coordinated planning of their future development and mutual supportability. The Committee on House Administration has assigned the responsibility for investigating the potential of ADP for Congress to the Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment.

The importance of assigning authority and responsibility for the development of a congressional capability resulted in the introduction of a bill by Representative Jack Brooks requiring the Comptroller General to:

"(1) cooperate with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the development, establishment, and maintenance of a standard data processing and information system (including uniform classifications of programs, activities, receipts, costs, and expenditures, as well as other necessary standards) for budgetary and fiscal data for use of the Federal Government.

"(2) coordinate the development, establishment, maintenance, and operation of data processing systems necessary for the effective and efficient fulfillment of the substantive responsibilities of the Congress. Other units of the Congress utilizing data processing techniques to carry out the re-

Footnotes at end of article.

sponsibilities Congress has delegated to them shall adhere to the guidelines the Comptroller General may establish to assure optimum effectiveness and efficiency in the overall acquisition and use of computers by the Congress."¹²

The final version of this bill, H.R. 10791, was co-sponsored by a group of House Members of both parties, and approved by the House Committee on Government Operations on May 14, 1969. The Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Government Activities reflected an understanding of the complexity of the projected assignment for GAO, and noted that the creation of such a system perhaps should be "the responsibility of the Congress itself in order that it could have complete control over the system and thus be assured that its needs will be fully served."¹⁴

Both chambers of the Congress, then, will have an opportunity to consider the various options for planning, establishing, and operating a computer capability dedicated to the support of all Members and committees.

PRIVATE SECTOR GROUPS CONSIDER THE PROBLEM

In the 1965-1966 period, a few private sector groups began to address themselves to the problem of congressional information—its sources, acquisition, handling, use, and political ramifications. Twelve scholarly monographs were commissioned by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. These focused on various facets of legislative functioning and were published as *Congress: The First Branch of Government*. Discussion of congressional decision-making, key aspects of committee and Member information requirements, and the possible application of computer methodology were featured in the writings of political scientists James A. Robinson, Charles R. Dechert, and Kenneth Janda.

A "Management Study of the U.S. Congress" was prepared by a team from Arthur D. Little, Inc., concerned with the problems of organization, staff support, committee procedures, and the need for analytical resources of the Congress. These recommendations were transformed into a special television presentation by NBC News called "Congress Needs Help," and subsequently were published under that title in book form. As the topic of congressional effectiveness attracted wider attention, several writings began to appear containing observations on the implications of the use of advanced equipments and techniques by the Congress.

Industrial firms prepared proposals for designing and implementing a computer system to serve the entire Congress. Management studies of individual office operations (e.g., mailing operations and correspondence files) were undertaken by consultants. A concurrent effort meriting mention was the book entitled *We Propose: A Modern Congress* prepared by the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, which contained a chapter on the potential of ADP for Congress by Representative Fred Schwengel.

At the beginning of the 90th Congress, the Brookings Institution sponsored a special seminar for a score of House Members who desired to discuss informally the need for improved means of carrying out their legislative and constituent support responsibilities. At the request of congressional offices, seminars were organized for staff members by the Legislative Reference Service, which also was called upon to prepare general studies on the application of computer technology and systems analysis to various problems. These ranged from "Automatic Data Processing and the Small Businessman" and "The Federal Data Center: Proposals and Reactions" to "Systems Technology Applied to Social and Community Problems."

As a broader group of responsible individuals became oriented to the problem of congressional needs for and use of information, the utility of a forum was recognized by the American Enterprise Institute. A two-day seminar designed to encourage exploratory discussion—involving government information specialists, industrial analysts, and academicians—was held, with these primary objectives: to examine the information requirements of the Congress, including the possible use of computers, and secondly, to discuss the impact of the Federal Planning-Programming-Budgeting System on congressional authorization-appropriations functions. The formal papers and edited dialogue were published in the volume *Information Support, Program Budgeting, and the Congress*.

During 1968 and 1969, the Washington Operations Research Council, supported by The Institute for Management Sciences, sponsored a series of evening meetings in an effort to establish communication between the legislators and the systems analysis community. Featured topics at these "Congressional Seminars" included "Improving Congressional Operations," "Crime Prevention and Law Enforcement," and "A Systematic Approach to Urban Planning."

The increased awareness and involvement of Members regarding "like systems approach" are reflected in their willingness to participate in such symposia and seminars. Dr. John S. Saloma, in "System Politics: The Presidency and Congress in the Future," stresses yet another aspect of the emergent situation. He points out that a "number of competitive dimensions in Congress are likely to accelerate acceptance of innovations in decision-making" developed elsewhere; these are enumerated:

- "1. the built-in tension between authorizing and appropriations committees both eager to control program decision;
- "2. the publicity incentive for committee and subcommittee chairmen generally to identify themselves with innovations and to push for their implementation;
- "3. the perennial congressional fear that Congress is yielding initiative and authority to the President;
- "4. party competition; and
- "5. the generational divide between "activist" and high seniority congressmen."¹⁵

Decision-makers, whether in Congress, the executive branch, or the private sector, are feeling the effects of the computerization of data. A warning has been voiced by Dr. Donald N. Michael *not* to ignore those problem elements which defy machine handling:

"Already planners and administrators are tending to place undue emphasis on—that is, coming to value most—those aspects of reality which the computer can deal with just because the computer can do so. The individual—the point off the curve—becomes an annoyance."¹⁶

CANDIDATE APPLICATIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL USE OF ADP

With the concurrent advancements in the state-of-the-art of electronic technology and the level of understanding of the role of ADP by legislators, it has been possible to identify a spectrum of applications where systems technology could be useful. The exercise of discovering and discussing these applications has not been limited to the Congress. State legislatures have initiated a number of improvements involving the use of automatic data processing and systems methodology. In States such as New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, Iowa, Wisconsin, Hawaii, and North Carolina, the computer has been used to index, store, and retrieve statutory information, draft bills, maintain key data on the status and content of pending legislation, trace appropriations activity, and record committee schedules of hearings.

A thorough review of candidate applications for congressional use of ADP and systems techniques was conducted during the

hearings held by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Students of the legislative process such as the late Dr. George B. Galloway¹⁷ have offered suggestions as to which tasks and procedures might benefit from technological support. In some cases, computer-oriented information would be most valuable on the basis of chamber operations, in other instances, the committees (or subcommittees) or the individual Congressman might be the best point of receipt for information from the system. Dr. Charles R. Dechert enunciates several questions which may arise when the desirability of furnishing computer-stored data to the Congress is considered:

"The problem of congressional access to information might be better defined as a problem of information management. What specific elements of information are needed to make what judgments? Where are these elements located? How are they to be retrieved? And how should they be presented in order to be meaningful?"¹⁸

There are certain legislative and administrative functions of the Congress which might be improved by a modification of traditional procedures, the establishment of a one-line capability for immediate access to data files, or provision for ADP services performed on a less accelerated basis (e.g., the grouping or "batching" of requests to be handled by the system). A discussion of specific applications follows.

The advantages of maintaining a centralized, computer-oriented store of information have been proven in countless government and business environments. In the case of the Congress, there is a recurring need for such information as that on the *contents and status of bills*. With more than 29,000 bills and resolutions introduced during the 90th Congress, the problem of knowing even the most rudimentary facts about a given piece of legislation is significant. Action to improve the quality and timeliness of the *Digest of Public General Bills* through the use of computer techniques is discussed later.

Another type of information of recurring utility is that on *committee activity*. Not only are the time and place of committee and subcommittee sessions sometimes difficult to find out about, but related information such as the names of witnesses to appear and the topics to be discussed may not be available.

Congressional needs for *topical research information* are endless and highly varied. Since the establishment of the Congress, complaints have arisen concerning the availability of subject-oriented information, both narrative and statistical, that is comprehensive, accurate, timely, and relevant. The usefulness of a "Selective Dissemination of Information" (SDI) system has received much favorable comment. The concept of creating an "interest profile" for each individual Congressman or committee, and placing that profile in computerized form, first was developed in industry. The system featured the matching of profile keyword descriptors against a set of keyword descriptors which reflects the contents of books, articles, and other types of documents. The flexibility of the SDI system has been scrutinized in the light of the changing nature of congressional activities. Each recipient is informed of the new acquisitions which match his interest criteria; then he may indicate his desire to acquire the document for review. Figure 1 (not printed in RECORD) depicts the SDI process.¹⁹ For example, a Congressman might wish to be provided with material related to his committee assignments or a committee staff might wish to monitor new information pertinent to a certain category of bills being considered by the committee.

The difficulty of obtaining access to certain categories of *Federal fiscal and budgetary data* long has bothered many Congressmen with responsibilities in the authorization-appropriations cycle. With the advent of

Footnotes at end of article.

PPBS, the outlook is for additional confusion as program versus agency activities are presented for review. Appropriations subcommittees often have had to make their decisions on the basis of sampling information. Dr. Richard F. Fenno categorizes this as (1) program information, (2) confidence information, and (3) support information.²⁰ At the present time, the Bureau of the Budget prepares certain selected aggregate budget data in ADP form, but there are indications that heavier use of computer analysis will be made in the future. As the executive branch use of ADP in handling these data increases, it will become imperative that Congress have timely access to comparable information. The importance attached to enhancing congressional knowledge about budgetary proposals and the status of program funding is indicated both in the Brooks Bill for a computer facility for Congress and the Reorganization Act of 1969.²¹

Information about Federal assistance programs often is not readily available, hence a number of proposals to place such information in machineable form and provide regular listings. Representative William V. Roth has introduced legislation providing for the issuance of a catalog on Federal assistance programs, and has been joined by a large number of House Members. Concern over the absence of assertive control of Federal programs, and in particular a lack of measurement of program performance, has led to a number of bills being introduced in the 90th and 91st Congresses calling for the use of "objective, scientific, and empirical analysis" in evaluating all Federal programs and activities. This would be achieved through the establishment of an Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation and its legislative counter-mechanism, a Joint Committee of Congress on Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Information on Federal contract awards (by subject, contract recipient, and congressional district) often is requested, and if maintained in ADP formats could be used for periodical listings and to respond to special inquiries which might arise during debates on R & D appropriations. Also, these data could allow an examination of industrial resources applied to Government projects.

The handling of various committee information, such as legislative calendar material and historical documentation on committee and subcommittee legislation, meetings, memoranda, and other memorabilia, continues to be the subject of study for possible ADP support. With the development of reliable computer terminals, as discussed below, committee staffs may now maintain up-to-the-minute status information on information ranging from bills before the committee to related bibliographic items of value to Members.

Repeated criticism of the indexing of key congressional documents—the *Congressional Record*, for example—has focused on the limited and often arbitrary retrieval word list available to the users. In many instances, hearings are not indexed at all, or only in such general terms as to be almost useless. Members and other interested parties have pled for the improvement of such indexing, pointing out that the utility of the document should dictate where the costs are to be allocated: in the data collection, conversion, indexing, processing, or retrieval.

A related but discrete area allowing improvement is that of creating, through the computer, a master listing of all congressional documents. Incomplete listings are prepared by the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and other establishments, but the importance of developing such a data base cannot be denied. Here again, the criticality of devising and publishing a listing (i.e., thesaurus) of retrieval

terms which will allow public and private users to find that which they seek is all-important. A commercial enterprise²² has initiated a "Congressional Information Service" on an experimental basis to cover all committee hearings, prints, and reports; the monthly abstracting and indexing service will deal with other essential congressional documents, but will not include the *Congressional Record*.

Information on the status of activities in each chamber of the Congress would be of value according to the comment of various analysts. Congressmen often are summoned to the floor to vote with virtually no information as to the legislation under consideration. A new service provided Members of the House allows them to dial a special number and be given the number and title of a bill next to be voted upon or related information on current legislation. This system was established by the Office of the Clerk of the House, and is being studied by the Senate for possible implementation.

Registration data on lobbyist groups and individuals, described as "one of the most valuable sources of independent information available to Congress,"²³ would lend itself to computerization. Such a file could contain the name of the individual (or group), the name and address of his employer, the area of his special concern, the amount of contributions made during the calendar year, and any papers, periodicals, or publications in which he has caused editorials or articles to be published.

Legal information of several types is much used by the Congress. Available today in machineable form are numerous bodies of data, in full text or abstract form. The Department of Defense, through its Air Force Accounting and Finance Center in Denver, maintains the Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics) file of more than 60 million words, including the contents of:²⁴

"United States Code (1964 ed.)."

"Unpublished Comptroller decisions (from June 1955 to January 1967)."

"Published Comptroller General decisions (vols. 1-45)."

"Armed Services Procurement Regulations (through revision 22)."

"Appropriation acts of 1966 and 1967."

"DOD international law material (treaties and agreements of interest to DOD)."

In addition, the data base includes numerous Air Force manuals and regulations, Court of Military Appeals material, and certain directives.

Other types of legal information are obtainable through the services of the ASPEN Systems Corporation, an outgrowth of the University of Pittsburgh Health Law Center group which pioneered full text retrieval using computers. This capability makes available the Internal Revenue Code and Regulations, decisions of the United States Supreme Court and Circuit Court of Appeals, the United States Code, the statutes of all fifty States, and other Federal, State, and municipal legal opinions and rules.

Exclusive files for each Congressman also may be established and maintained with the help of ADP. Information related to a given issue or bill, including the Member's recorded statements, can be stored in the computer, and made available either through a terminal or regular printout form. It may be useful to file electronically pronouncements on an issue made by national party figures, opposition spokesmen, outside opinion makers, and leading newspapers. Procedural and equipment safeguards make it possible for the integrity of the individual office file to be assured.

Each Member has files on certain groups of constituents, and the maintenance of these in a current fashion requires following a procedure which consumes much staff time. Many Congressmen are commencing to

have mailing lists prepared on magnetic tape, sometimes at their own expense and often with the assistance of a party facility (such as the Democratic National Committee ADP center). The retention and retrieval of key constituent information—name, address, family composition, vocation, voting record (if known), extent of political activity—are expedited through the use of computers. Certain types of mailing operations also may be performed with computer and ancillary equipment.

There are some basic housekeeping functions, such as payroll preparation and the maintenance of current telephone directories, which are suitable for ADP execution. As the performance qualities of the equipment and programs increase, other applications are possible, and the Congress must become knowledgeable about what technology can do for it. During his visit to the United States, The Lord Snow remarked to the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics:

"We must get the ideas of what is happening to us because of the computers, and of what is going to happen, right into the open world of the Congress and of Parliament; for it is their duty not to be supine, not to be just carried along dumbly by the technological tide."²⁵

During the past few years, steps have been taken to use ADP in support of certain congressional activities, thus fulfilling the expressed need for action on the part of a growing number of public and private proponents of progress through the proper use of technology.

CURRENT LEGISLATIVE BRANCH ADP ACTIVITIES

There have been three points of developmental activity within the legislative branch insofar as the use of computers is concerned: the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Office of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and the Legislative Reference Service. In each case, a computer facility has been established, programs for selected applications obtained or prepared, and an operational capability established. Similarly, each facility has followed a pattern of growth in terms of size of equipment, number of software elements, and services provided.

The initiative taken by the Clerk of the House resulted in the installation of a small computer (NCR-500 system) in the Rayburn House Office Building in September, 1967, to be used primarily for the purposes of handling payroll, special accounting, and inventory applications. At present, this configuration is providing full-time, operational service for: a payroll of 7,000 employees, an inventory and accounting for 8,000 items of electrical and mechanical equipment, and an inventory of 43,000 pieces of furniture and property. In addition, the staff of the Clerk plans to implement during 1969: inventory and accounting procedures in the House Stationery Room, an accounts payable application for the House Recording Studio, and a budgeting application in the Finance Office.

With the acquisition of a larger computer, the NCR Century Series Model 100—with a speed of operation allowing a five-fold increase in production and greater storage capacity—in January of 1969, the Office of the Clerk will be positioned to undertake more extensive ADP services. Three major applications reportedly are under study and investigation:

1. A computerized addressing service, similar to that being implemented in the Senate, which will allow mailing list conversion, address printouts, and envelope preparation. Systems design and implementation would be accomplished by an external (commercial) group.

2. An electronic voting system for the House Chamber has been under considera-

Footnotes at end of article.

tion for more than a year, and has included a study of possible display devices capable of presenting statistical data, running totals, and proposed amendments, as well as allowing key House officials to monitor proceedings from remote locations.

3. An information retrieval system capable of providing Members with rapid access to information related to the status of legislation, committees, budget, Federal agencies, and other significant subject areas. The staff of the Office of the Clerk was assisted in its study of this system by a consultant group, and a demonstration was held for a two-week period featuring a CDC-200 CRT terminal and several sample applications.

The Senate, in undertaking to apply ADP to some of its information handling problems, has focused upon the development of an automated mailing system, featuring an IBM 360 Model 20 computer. With data conversion and programming support by a commercial firm, the Office of the Sergeant-at-Arms has converted more than one-third of the mailing addresses of Senate Members to magnetic tape. Expansion of the computer configuration to a large Model 40 system is planned, which will allow improved service of the kind planned by the Office of the Clerk of the House.

The Legislative Reference Service began providing support to congressional Members and committees in the information sciences in 1966. Late in 1967, the first application of ADP to a product for the Congress was effected. The *Digest of Public General Bills*, summarizing the essential features of all public bills and resolutions, was prepared by inserting essential identifying information on each piece of legislation—name of sponsor(s), date introduced, bill number, and committee to which assigned—plus synoptic and indexing information into the computer via an ATS (special electric typewriter) unit. In addition to these data, published bi-weekly, certain information on the status of the bill appeared in the five or more cumulative issues each year. Experience has shown that preparation time has been reduced significantly, and that the textual material can be edited with greater flexibility during the pre-publication phase.

Six computer terminals currently are used for insertion, recall, and editing of the "Bill Digest" information. Once the copy is ready in final form, the computer types out the completed page which then is ready for offset reproduction. The system is advantageous since it allows simultaneous alteration of already stored data and the addition of new textual entries; in addition, copy with justified margins and selected type fonts is ready for the Government Printing Office operation. The next step will be to deliver the "Bill Digest" tapes to GPO for direct insertion into the Linotron photo-composition system.

The *Legislative Status Report*, which serves as a handbook of major (i. e., approximately 250 bills and resolutions) legislation of the current Congress, also is prepared with computer support. The ability to add data elements without regard to sequence and to rapidly change obsolete material has proven to be particularly useful. A typical entry in this publication is shown below:

"DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

"S. 953:

"H.R. 6501:

"To promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict through the establishment of a Department of Peace, including an International Peace Institute for the preparation of U.S. citizens to work in programs which promote international peace and understanding; and through the establishment of a Joint Committee of Congress on Peace and International Cooperation.

"Status: S. 953 referred to Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations, February 7, 1969; when reported therefrom it is to be referred to Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 6501 referred to House Committee on Government Operations, February 6, 1969."

Another use of ADP within the Legislative Reference Service is the preparation of an index to the several hundred reports and memoranda of general interest to the Congress which are authored and stockpiled by LRS. The range of subjects is quite broad and although monthly notices are sent to each congressional office, it has been found useful to prepare with the assistance of the computer network a cumulative index by subject, as shown below, and a separate listing by originating LRS division (e. g., Economics, Foreign Affairs):

"Arab-Israeli Conflict:

"U.S.S.R. involvement, F 271.

"United Nations involvement, F 254.

"Arab Refugees, Bibliography on, F 108.

"Arab Republic, Political parties in the United, F 289.

"Arabs and the arm race, F 334.

"Area Redevelopment, E 125 Rev.

"Armed Services:

"Retired pay recomputation, S 100.

"Strength of components in principal U.S. wars, F 309.

"By states since World War I, F 309.

"Automatic Data Processing:

"Judicial process, SP 134.

"Bibliography on, SP 124.

"Legal information application, SP 108.

"Legislative use, Bibliography on, SP 123.

"Redistricting of political boundaries, Bibliography of use in, SP 125.

"Small business application, Bibliography on, SP 135.

"Automation and employment, E 114.

"Bibliography on, Ed 182.

"Aviation Noise, Background and legal problems on, A 256."

Use of the ATS network allows this type of material to be added to, revised and updated frequently, with the final result that camera-ready copy can be recalled at will.

Another application of ADP with a great long-range potential for the Congress is enhancing research control of publishing on congressional issues. In January 1969, a modular developmental project was begun which was designed to give the LRS research staff bibliographic control over all English-language books, government publications, magazines, and private sector (i.e., universities, lobbyist groups) studies related to congressional issues. More than 30,000 items are involved in the process annually. Basic bibliographic entries such as subject and author plus a brief, descriptive paragraph on the contents of the piece, are entered via ATS into the computer. Each week separate subject and author catalogues are printed. During the "pilot project" phase, this has been done for two of the LRS divisions. Perhaps the most valuable aspect of this new service, however, is the establishment of a "Current Awareness" procedure, similar to that found in a Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) system. Each research analyst in the two divisions has prepared a list of terms reflecting his areas of interests, and this "profile" has been matched against the descriptors which reflect the contents of the publications entered into the system.

If the utility of the project is as high as now anticipated, it will be expanded to all LRS divisions during mid-1969. A study of congressional office requirements for similar information then would allow expansion of the service to selected committees and Members.

A requirement has developed for LRS to provide certain ADP support to congressional committees. Beginning early in 1969, the House Banking and Currency Committee

has worked with LRS to develop a computer-supported system for the preparation and maintenance of its official calendar. A typewriter terminal in the committee office is linked with the Library of Congress computer, to which the committee has access during any working day. Not only can the committee operator enter, recall, and edit any data belonging to the committee, but with permission can call out certain types of information maintained in the computer by LRS, such as the Legislative States Report.

Emphasis is being placed within LRS upon the development of other ADP-centered services with a high utility factor to the Congress. With a computer-supported network of 20 typewriter terminals, and plans for a more-powerful equipment capability, services are being planned for providing Congress with quick responses to such questions as: "Send me a list of all legislation dealing with 'demonstration cities'". "Provide a selection of articles on 'gun control'". "Which Senators have introduced bills on solid waste disposal?" The intention is to replace current manual research with computer searching either of full text material or selected citations and abstracts. Legislative histories often are needed by the Congress and their preparation was stated as a priority item for LRS action in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.²⁸ The two-fold objective in this area will be, then, to have the ability to search bodies of textual information on the basis of keyword (retrieval) descriptors, and second, to provide current information on where a bill is in the legislative process.

THE POTENTIAL AND THE RESPONSIBILITY

Cognizance of the value of ADP to the legislative branch now has reached the stage where there is serious consideration as to the resources to be allocated, the need to designate areas of responsibility, and above all the requirement for sustained coordination of the burgeoning ADP activities. Both chambers of the Congress, the Legislative Reference Service, and the General Accounting Office—which has created a Systems Analysis Section in its Office of Policy and Special Studies—share the responsibility to use innovative devices and techniques in every way possible. The concomitant burden is, of course, to understand their limitations. Dr. Jerome Wiesner, formerly the Special Assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson in the realm of science and technology, offered his judgment that: "... the computer, with its promise of a million-fold increase in man's capacity to handle information, will undoubtedly have the most far-reaching consequences of any contemporary technical development. The potential for good in the computer, and the danger inherent in its misuse, exceed our ability to imagine."²⁹

As the complexity and diversity of the tasks confronting the Congress increase, the importance of utilizing every possible means of acquiring and analyzing selected priority information preparatory to making decisions will grow apace. The role of electronic technology will assume broader proportions as the legislator strives to fulfill his responsibilities and is willing to rely where appropriate upon the support possible from such systems.

SELECTED REFERENCES

American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Congress: the first branch of government. Washington, D.C., AEI, 1966. 515 p.

Dechert, Charles R. Availability of information for Congressional operations.

Janda, Kenneth. Information Systems for Congress.

Robinson, James A. Decision making in Congress.

Footnotes at end of article.

Brooks, Jack. Data-processing techniques to aid Congress. Extension of remarks in the House. Congressional record. [Daily ed.] (Washington), v. 115, January 3, 1969. pp. 129-131.

Chartrand, Robert L. Computer oriented information for the United States Congress. In Law and computer technology, v. 1, n. 2, February 1968. p. 2-7.

Automatic data processing and American political campaigns. Extension of remarks of Honorable Richard Bolling. Congressional record. [Daily ed.] (Washington), v. 113, July 27, 1967. p. A3829-A3834.

Chartrand, Robert L., Kenneth Janda, and Michael Hugo, ed. Information support, program budgeting, and the Congress. New York, Spartan Books, 1968. 231 p.

Chartrand, Robert L. The Congressional milieu—information requirements and current capabilities.

Janda, Kenneth. Future improvements in Congressional information support.

Knox, William T. External sources of information for Congress: the executive branch and the private sector.

McClory, Robert. Automatic data processing as a major information tool.

Schwengel, Fred. Problems of inadequate information and staff resources in Congress.

Congress looks to computers for legislative help. In Congressional quarterly, April 11, 1969. p. 524-525.

Donham, Philip and Robert J. Fahey. Congress needs help. New York, Random House, 1966. 203 p.

Janda, Kenneth. Information retrieval—applications to political science. New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1968. 230 p.

Kravitz, Walter. Preparation of committee legislative calendars by computer: description of a working system. Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, March 3, 1969. 8 p. plus appendices.

McClory, Robert. Congressman McClory suggests computer uses for Congress. Extension of remarks of Honorable Tom Railsback. Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 1, pp. 1322-24.

Moorhead, William S. Computers for Congress—a step in the right direction. Extension of remarks in the House. Congressional record. [Daily ed.] (Washington), v. 115, February 18, 1969. p. 3864.

Computers for the Congress: the challenge and the potential. An address before the 15th Annual EDP Conference of the American Management Association, New York, New York, February 28, 1969. 15 p.

Saloma, John S. III. Systems politics: the presidency and Congress in the future. In Technology review, v. 71, n. 2, December 1968. p. 23-33.

Schwengel, Fred. Information handling: 'for a vast future also.' In We propose: a modern Congress (Mary McInnis, ed.). New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966. p. 303-317.

The Legislative Reference Service and automatic data processing: a summary of the LRS' experience with ADP applications to congressional research. Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, May 1, 1969. 14 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on Government Activities. Effective and efficient use of computers in Congress. Hearing before the Subcommittee. 91st Cong., 1st sess., April 23, 1969. Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969. 53 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. Use of computers in the legislative process. Report together with supplemental views of the Committee. 91st Cong., 1st sess., Report No. 91-258. Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969. 39 p.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Kahn, Herman and Anthony J. Wiener. The Year 2000. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1967. p. 346.

² Computers and automation. Newtonville, Massachusetts, Berkeley Enterprises, Inc., October 1968 [See Monthly Computer Census, p. 70-73.]

³ Inventory of automatic data processing equipment in the United States government. Fiscal year 1968. Prepared by the General Services Administration. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969. p. 17-19.

⁴ U.S. Congress. Public Law 89-306. House Report No. 4845 (89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965). p. 1.

⁵ Humphrey, Hubert H. The computer revolution—address by Senator Humphrey before the Eastern Spring Computer Conference. Remarks in the Senate. Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 7, p. 9075.

⁶ A. D. Little Company, Inc. Management study of the U.S. Congress. (Report to NBC News, November 24, 1965). p. 11.

⁷ Rigby, Malcolm. Browseability in modern information retrieval systems: the quest for information. In Proceedings of the Symposium on Education for Information Science, Warrenton, Virginia, September 7-10, 1965. Washington, Spartan Books, 1965. p. 49.

⁸ Kravitz, Walter. The legislative reorganization act of 1967. Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, September 5, 1967. p. 40.

⁹ U.S. Congress. Senate. Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Legislative reorganization act of 1967. (90th Cong., 1st sess., Report No. 1, 1967). p. 38.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 22.

¹¹ Dow, John G. Data for Congressman. Remarks in the House. Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 6, p. 8211.

¹² Quoted in part in Congressional Quarterly, April 11, 1969. p. 525.

¹³ U.S. Congress. H.R. 10791. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to direct the Comptroller General to establish information and data processing systems, and for other purposes. (91st Cong., 1st sess., May 1, 1969). p. 1-2.

¹⁴ Statement of Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, before the Subcommittee on Government Activities, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, on H.R. 404, April 23, 1969. p. 6.

¹⁵ Saloma, John S. III. Systems politics: the presidency and the Congress in the future. In Technology review, v. 71, n. 2, December 1968. p. 25.

¹⁶ Michael, Donald N. Some long-range implications of computer technology for human behavior in organizations. In The American behavioral scientist, v. 9, n. 8, April 1966. p. 29-30.

¹⁷ Galloway, George B. Congressional reform: agenda and prospects. An address before the Tenth Southern Assembly, Biloxi, Mississippi, January 28-31, 1965. [See p. 25-27.]

¹⁸ Dechert, Charles R. Availability of Information for Congressional operations. In Congress: the first branch of government. Wash., D.C. The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966. p. 172-173.

¹⁹ Selective dissemination of information. IBM data processing application. White Plains, New York, International Business Machines Corporation, 1962. p. 7, fig. 2.

²⁰ Fenno, Richard F. The impact of PPBS on the congressional appropriations process. In Information support, program budgeting, and the Congress (Chartrand, Robert L., Kenneth Janda and Michael Hugo, ed.) New York, Spartan Books, 1968. p. 181.

²¹ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. Legislative reorganization act of 1969. (91st Cong., 1st sess., Report No. 91-202). Wash., D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1969. 59 p.

²² Congressional information service/index to publications of the United States Congress, 1739 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

²³ Janda, Kenneth. Information systems for Congress. In Congress: the first branch of government. Wash., D.C., The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966. p. 422.

²⁴ U.S. Congress. House. Air Force Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics). Seventeenth report by the Committee on Government Operations. (90th Cong., 2d sess., House Report No. 1133). Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1968. p. 15-16.

²⁵ Snow, C. P. Government, science, and public policy. In Science, v. 151, February 11, 1966. p. 653.

²⁶ U.S. Congress. Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Final report. (89th Cong., 2d sess., Senate Report No. 1414, 1966). p. 11.

²⁷ Wiesner, Jerome B. The society as a learning machine. The computer and society. In The New York Times, April 24, 1966. p. 15.

RAPID RAIL SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, speaking from the perspective of a Member whose first official involvement with Washington's proposed rapid rail transit was as a Maryland State senator drafting the legislative language of the interstate compact for the regional transit, I am personally grieved today that H.R. 11400, Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1969, lacks the basic transit funding. I have urged the Appropriations Committee to include these funds. I have worked with equal vigor for the construction of both subway and freeway systems here.

The Appropriations Committee should not obstruct these funds. But I want it to be crystal clear that the real cause for this impasse is with the failure of the local District government to execute its responsibilities to comply with the Highway Act of 1968. This act directed construction of certain freeway sections and links in our interstate highway system. The city government has shown no intention of complying with the law. It has taken a cavalier attitude toward its responsibilities as a part of a regional complex of jurisdictions. A study called for in the 1968 act has not ever begun.

This mess today, for a long time the responsibility of Federal agencies, is the product of the previous Department of Transportation leadership and the federally appointed National Capital Planning Commission.

While Secretary Volpe must be commended for his dedication to resolve this situation, even greater Federal direction will be required if we are to get our transit and freeway program going in the National Capital area. It is unfortunate that in order to straighten out the mess of the previous Department of Transportation the administration must intervene and give positive direction to the appointed officials, both local and national.

An obdurate, recalcitrant City Council has failed to recognize the real needs of the city for freeways and transit. The Council and city government have capitulated to extremists who have demonstrated absolutely no affirmative sup-

port or a healthy interest in our rapid rail system. Recognizing this, the President and the federally appointed officials can and must end the impasse and unlock these subway funds.

HOUSE CAFETERIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) in regard to the fair treatment of employees in the House cafeteria.

SECRETARY LAIRD COMMENDED FOR COMBAT ZONE SERVICE POLICY

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

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird for his decision to establish a mandatory policy of allowing surviving members of a family which suffered a death in a combat zone to be given a noncombat assignment and a permanent exemption from combat areas.

I am particularly pleased with this humanitarian directive because it implements a policy called for in legislation I authored and introduced last year.

My legislation was the result of a letter I received from a mother who lost a son in Vietnam, only to be faced with the prospect of another son, already in the service, being sent to Vietnam. I agreed with her that no family should be required to sustain two or more of these tragic losses. More than 50 Congressmen joined in the introduction of similar legislation.

At the time I introduced my legislation, I felt—and I still believe—that no American family that has lost a son in combat should be required to send another son into a combat zone. I was appalled when the Pentagon gave my bill a negative report last year on the grounds that it would create administrative difficulties. Certainly, Secretary Laird is to be commended for implementing this humanitarian policy despite apparent objections within the Department of Defense.

There is precedence for this directive in that there is a military regulation which allows a young man to apply for a 1-year deferment from duty in Vietnam when an immediate member of his family has died as a result of duty there. Also, there is a public law allowing military exemption for the sole surviving son of a family when another male member of a family has died as a result of hostile action. There is a further military regulation which prohibits a young man from being sent to a combat zone when a brother or father is already fighting in such an area. However, prior to Secretary Laird's new family assignment policy, when a young man had been killed in combat, there was nothing to prevent his brother from being shipped to a combat zone. In fact, the practice seemed to be fairly common.

Under this new policy, where a member of a family has been killed or dies from injuries or disease as a result of

serving in the Republic of Vietnam or other currently designated hostile fire zones, such as specified areas in the Republic of Korea, a surviving family member need only submit a request for a noncombat assignment, which will be honored. If the surviving member is serving in a hostile fire zone, he will, upon his request, be reassigned therefrom. These exemptions also apply where a member of the family is listed as missing in action or as a prisoner of war.

We are all prayerful that the present negotiations in Paris will lead to lasting peace in the very near future. But, so long as we do not enjoy the blessings of peace, we should do our utmost to see that our policies reflect human compassion to the highest possible degree. With this in mind, I find it particularly gratifying that Secretary Laird has promulgated this humanitarian directive.

HOUSE RESOLUTION ON MIRV TEST MORATORIUM

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman COHELAN and I are introducing, for appropriate reference, a resolution calling on the President to propose to the Soviet Union a mutual moratorium on the flight testing of multiple warhead missiles. We are being joined by 102 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. An identical resolution has been introduced in that other body by Senator BROOKE and is being cosponsored by 40 other Senators.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are sponsoring this resolution feel very strongly that we have reached a critical juncture in the arms race, one from which there will be no turning back. The deployment of MIRV by both the United States and the Soviet Union promises to set off a new escalation in the arms race, one which will be characterized by mutual suspicion and fear, instability, and the expenditure of vast sums.

Our sense of the House resolution is not an attempt to dictate to the President or to usurp his powers in this area; rather it is our intention to indicate to the President our vital concern over the MIRV issue and our support for a mutual moratorium until such time as a formal agreement can be arrived at in the upcoming strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviets. We hope to convey to the President the urgency of such an initiative. If MIRV is not halted in the test stages, it may be too late since the system does not lend itself to easy detection once it is deployed. With the possibility of MIRV deployment only a few months off, it is most vital that we act now to at least delay its deployment until the possibility of a formal agreement on MIRV has been thoroughly explored at the arms talks.

The object of American strategic policy is to deter nuclear war. The greatest current threat to the American deterrent force is the Soviet deployment of multiple warhead missiles capable of destroy-

ing our land-based ICBM force. We are therefore naturally interested in halting Soviet deployment of such a multiple warhead system. The Soviets are likewise concerned about American deployment of MIRV as a potential counterforce weapon. Both sides thus perceive MIRV as a threat to mutual deterrence and both should realize that a MIRV moratorium is mutually beneficial.

Some critics of this resolution have expressed both doubts and fears over Soviet good faith in abiding by such a moratorium, should they initially agree to it. In support of this argument, they point to the Soviet violation of the nuclear test ban moratorium of the late 1950's. I would agree that we cannot and should not accept the Soviets at their word on such a crucial strategic issue. However, after carefully studying this matter I have become convinced that it is not necessary to rely on blind faith and trust in the case of a MIRV flight test moratorium. Nor are the Soviets likely to accept us at our word. We are both capable of unilaterally policing a short-term MIRV moratorium since neither side would be able to conduct significant flight testing without exposing themselves to the others sophisticated surveillance systems. MIRV development is dependent upon a sequence of tests, each of which depends upon successful completion of the prior test for operational confidence. Although there is a possibility for a minor degree of deception through clandestine testing, only minimal advances in MIRV technology could be made before detection. These would not be significant enough to jeopardize our national security.

What we are concerned about is the apparent lack of means available to count warheads, short of detailed on-site inspections, once MIRV is deployed. Both sides will then be forced to assume that the other side has fully MIRVed each missile. As a consequence, both sides will have to drastically revise effective force level estimates upward and the arms race will make a quantum jump to a new plateau. This "Mad Momentum," as it has been called, can only detract from the margin of security which both sides now enjoy since the vulnerability of either side's retaliatory forces will always be a matter of speculation. This in turn increases the risks of a preemptive counterforce strike in a time of crisis. MIRV should thus be seen for what it is: A dangerous destabilizer in the strategic balance we have attempted to maintain.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons we have offered this resolution with a sense of mission and urgency which we hope will not be lost on this administration. At this point in the RECORD I include the bipartisan list of cosponsors and the resolution we are introducing:

LIST OF MIRV MUTUAL MORATORIUM COSPONSORS

| | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Addabbo, Joseph | Brasco, Frank |
| Anderson, John | Broomfield, William |
| Ashley, Thomas | Brown, George |
| Beall, Glenn | Burton, Phillip |
| Blester, Edward | Button, Dan |
| Blatnik, John | Cahill, William |
| Boland, Edward | Carey, Hugh |
| Bolling, Richard | Chisholm, Shirley |
| Brademas, John | Cohelan, Jeffery |

Collier, Harold
 Conte, Silvio
 Conyers, John
 Dellenback, John
 Dent, John
 Diggs, Charles
 Edwards, Don
 Erlenborn, John
 Esch, Marvin
 Eshleman, Ed
 Farbstein, Leonard
 Fraser, Donald
 Frelinghuysen, Peter
 Gilbert, Jacob
 Halpern, Seymour
 Hamilton, Lee
 Harvey, Jim
 Hastings, James
 Hathaway, William
 Hawkins, Augustus
 Hechler, Ken
 Helstoski, Henry
 Horton, Frank
 Jacobs, Andrew
 Joelson, Charles
 Karth, Joseph
 Kastenmeyer, Robert
 Keith, Hastings
 Koch, Edward
 Lloyd, Sherman
 Lowenstein, Allard
 McCarthy, Richard
 McCloskey, Paul
 McDade, Joe
 McDonald, Jack
 McEwen, Robert
 Macdonald, Torbert
 Matsunaga, Spark
 Meskill, Thomas
 Michel, Robert
 Mikva, Abner

Mink, Patsy
 Mize, Chester
 Moorhead, William
 Morse, Bradford
 Mosher, Charles
 Moss, John
 Obey, David
 Olsen, Arnold
 O'Neill, Thomas
 Ottinger, Richard
 Pike, Otis
 Podell, Bertram
 Powell, Adam
 Preyer, Richardson
 Railsback, Thomas
 Rees, Thomas
 Reid, Ogden
 Reuss, Henry
 Rodino, Peter
 Rosenthal, Benjamin
 Roybal, Edward
 Ruppe, Philip
 St Germain, Fernand
 Scheuer, James
 Schneebeli, Herman
 Schwengel, Fred
 Stanton, William
 Steiger, William
 Stokes, Louis
 Thompson, Frank
 Tiernan, Robert
 Tunney, John
 Udall, Morris
 Van Deerlin, Lionel
 Vanik, Charles
 Whalen, Charles
 Williams, Lawrence
 Wilson, Charles
 Yates, Sidney
 Yatron, John
 Zwach, Gus

in which to extend their remarks on the subject just discussed, namely this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN SEYMOUR HALPERN'S HEALTH INFORMATION PROPOSAL

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, certainly without good health the American people cannot make their full contribution to society. But as we all know, medical costs have skyrocketed 45 percent in the last decade and they continue to rise. Indeed, the cost of health services is prohibitive for many and very often medical care simply is not available in some communities.

And yet, America spends more than any other nation for medical research; we boast of modern laboratories and we have more Nobel Peace Prize winners for medicine than any other nation.

What is happening to all this research, and the prolific outpouring of new scientific findings we hear so much about? The truth is that America is suffering from a health-information overload. We simply have failed to provide a mechanism for transmitting modern medical and health findings to the American people.

The surest, swiftest, and least expensive way of overcoming the grave shortage of doctors and nurses and rising hospital costs today is to prevent their need.

The public should be constantly given the latest, up-to-the-minute information on how to prevent diseases and protect themselves.

Indeed, without providing the average citizen with health information, America's wonder-drug discoveries, medical advances, and new remedies have only limited impact on the Nation's health. Unfortunately, the statistics bare this out:

In 1950, only five nations had a lower infant-mortality rate than the United States. By 1966, we had fallen to 15th place, surpassed by many so-called underdeveloped countries.

The United States ranks 13th in life expectancy among nations.

Half of all American men examined for military service are rejected because of poor health, very often because of medical disorders that could have been corrected if adequate health information was available.

And recently, some 2,000 children, aged 4 to 16 years, in Boston, were tested and between 35 and 70 percent of them had severe physical, emotional, hearing, visual, or dental disorders.

In addition, the poor suffer even more than most Americans because of their lack of health information and medical care. Since the poor have little access to information, their disease and mortality rates are almost twice that of more prosperous Americans.

What is needed then, for all Americans, is access to health information and the latest public health thinking to prevent needless suffering. For about 1 penny per citizen per year, we could become the most health-informed people in the world.

Unfortunately, there has been a studied indifference to the informational needs of the public in this time of health crisis. The Public Health Service, in effect, has abandoned the health indoctrination of the people to the private sector, which quite naturally sees more profit in remedies than in prevention.

I say, let us do something to make simple, basic, primer-like health information easily available to all.

There is most persuasive and inspiring evidence of what can be done if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Public Health Service effectively utilize broadcasting media to promote good health habits in this country. The Public Health Service now has more than 150 pamphlets on health topics that are made available through some 2,000 Government health offices, schools, doctors, and visiting nurses. There are also a number of antipoverty programs that try to instill suggestions on better-health habits to residents of ghetto communities.

All this is commendable, but it does not go far enough. It seems to me that we should be taking a page out of the advertising industry's book. The same technique that produces the awesome spectacle of hammers clanging away inside someone's head, or the rundown "blah" feeling of tired blood, can be just as effective in selling the idea of guarding one's health by heeding nature's early warning system.

Broadcasting—radio and television—especially, has become the major medium by which people learn to live and acquire their health habits today. Commercials increasingly induce response to their messages, often creating new behavior patterns among viewers and listeners.

Consumers buy pain killers, tranquilizers, and relief medicines not because physicians and health officials urge them to, but because they have been persuaded by commercials.

Another major untapped health information outlet is the corner drugstore. In 1964, the Public Health Service did a study on "The Pharmacy as a Health Education Center." The purpose was to gage the usefulness of a pilot project of free health literature available to everyone at their corner drugstore. The results were impressive: the public saw and took the leaflets, became concerned, and asked questions; and the doctors, pharmacists and health officials involved found themselves rendering more service to the community.

Since then the American Pharmaceutical Association has induced about 600 of its member druggists to continue this leaflet service—using literature contributed by voluntary health agencies, public health agencies and the Public Health Service. Unfortunately, this is only about 1 percent of the Nation's drugstores.

What is really required is a Government-sponsored leaflet program reaching

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

all of the Nation's 57,000 drugstores and pharmacies, and a broadcasting campaign to make people aware that their suffering can be stopped—and to send them to their drugstores to obtain more detailed information in leaflet form.

We already know that the average citizen visits a drugstore once a week on some health errand or other purpose. The task now is to provide health information for him there and alert him to the need for it and its availability—just as effectively as television alerts consumers to the need for, and availability of, a remedy for bad breath.

To this end, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make available to the Nation's 5,000 radio and TV stations, filmed and taped messages for frequent airing, designed to draw and hold the attention of the public to wholesome health habits, and to create a demand for health advice to be found in leaflets to be located in drugstores and pharmacies.

I estimate that about \$2 million—as I say, approximately a penny per citizen—would be sufficient to put this program on its feet, to cover the cost of producing the radio and TV spots and of printing and distributing enough literature to cover 10,000 pharmacies located in impoverished areas of the United States where there is a high priority need for this information. The printed material would be written by doctors and other health experts, and would cover everything from cancer, arthritis, multiple sclerosis and emphysema to rats, malnutrition, pesticides, and garbage.

For an additional \$2 million, making a total of 2 cents per citizen per year, we could probably provide every drugstore in the country with lifesaving and health-inducing leaflets. Is that too much to pay?

How much is the Nation's health worth?

I should point out that the immediate cost of this program will be paid back many times over in the future as it reduces the needless overload of our already overburdened medical and health facilities.

I earnestly urge that this measure be given prompt consideration by this House.

THE FACES OF AMERICA'S DEAD YOUTH

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members and the American people to the June 27 issue of Life magazine, in which the names and pictures of 242 young Americans who died in Vietnam the week of May 28 to June 3 appeared. The number of fatalities, 242, has no special significance, Life says. It is simply an "average for any 7-day period during this stage of the war."

How callous, how inured to this litany of death have we become? A great American magazine publishes the roll of death in this tragic war, and where is the pub-

lic outcry? Where is the reason why they fought and died?

For each of these faces staring out at us—page after page—represents America's youth: senselessly, needlessly, and purposelessly removed from their families, friends, and community.

But while our anguish returns the stare at the "gallery of young American eyes" peering forth from Life's pages—another incredulous horror seizes the mind. Just look at how young and innocent-looking these soldiers are.

Over half of them are 20 years of age or younger, and almost a third are teenagers—17, 18, and 19 years of age.

How many of them were cut down in the brilliance of their youth? How many of them would have been tomorrow's doctors, tomorrow's builders of our cities and the teachers of yet unborn generations of Americans?

"It is," the late John F. Kennedy once said at a war memorial, "against the law of nature for parents to bury their children—a son with all of his life before him."

In the past young Americans willingly fought and died for their Nation. Today, they fight and die, but are not doing so willingly.

They are "selected" by a system whose inequities are notorious. Indeed, the draft is a device difficult to justify under any circumstances, but when it operates to send American boys to die in a war in which many of them do not believe in and in which our official aim has never been clarified, then it becomes outrageous.

As I said, more than half of these young men were 20 years of age or younger. Too young to vote, too young to have a voice in public policymaking, they nevertheless lie dead now. And we wonder why youth questions the credibility of our Nation's policies and leadership today.

How do we tell our discontented youth that the society whose foundations they are questioning is good and just?

Is it any wonder that youth today is rebelling against the draft, against the war, against the society which produced both and sent them to fight without asking what they thought?

Mr. Speaker, I renew my call for the lowering of the voting age to 18 as a step toward restoring the confidence of the young in this Nation by giving them a voice in its affairs.

I renew my call for the abolition of the draft, and the substitution of an all-volunteer army.

And I renew my plea for the immediate ending of this unjustifiable war in Vietnam which is dividing the American people.

MORALE OF OUR FORCES IN VIETNAM

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Record two moving and distressing letters concerning the Vietnam war. One is a copy of

a letter which a very depressed young private sent to his parents from the jungles of Vietnam. Quite simply the boy cannot understand why he or any other American troops are engaged in that unfortunate conflict.

The other letter is from the boy's father; he asks that I try to raise his son's morale by explaining to him just exactly why he is fighting men he has no quarrel with, over issues he feels have been distorted, for goals that bear little relation to the realities of the war. This I cannot do.

The human suffering that daily defines the lives of thousands of Americans and Vietnamese alike can have no justification in political rhetoric. Children are rendered homeless, while men perish needlessly for the sake of obscure motives. Villagers are uprooted, housing and crops destroyed, the natural beauty of the countryside brutally scarred by the agents of modern warfare.

Over 13,000 American soldiers, not to mention countless native civilians, have been killed since the Paris peace talks began; the list of the wounded is equally as disheartening. The time is long overdue to marshal our resources not for further destruction and killing, but for a peaceful settlement to this regrettable entanglement.

Nonetheless, it remains my deep conviction that one does not contribute much in this society toward ending the war by refusing to be inducted, or by disappearing into Canada or Sweden, or by burning one's draft card or pouring blood on selective service files. Individual conscience may indeed require such action, but the reaction of the population at large is likely to assist in perpetuating the very objects of dissent. We will end the war and produce an equitable system for military service by working together to change policies—not by breaking the law.

Mr. Speaker, what has been minimized as a "small war in a small country in a distant land" threatens to unravel the inner fabric and paralyze the will of one of the most advanced societies in human history. The two letters which I offer today attest to the terrible damage which this war may do to the soul and the conscience of the American people. The mounting disillusionment within the American population about the objectives and the results of this war coupled with the serious erosion of U.S. programs for meeting human needs both at home and abroad must give us a renewed sense of urgency.

I fear for a nation that experiences such immense difficulty in reversing misguided courses of conduct. We must "get back from the shadows of war and search out the ways of peace," as John Kennedy so eloquently expressed our feelings in an appeal to the conscience of this Nation.

The letters follows:

MAY 27, 1969.

DEAR FOLKS: Today is Tuesday, I'm sure of that but I'm not sure of the date. I want to recount for you as best I can the events of last Saturday 24 May.

Our company was shuttled by choppers to a nearby mountain ridge (this is called a combat assault, C.A.). Running up and down the coast of Vietnam is the country's

only major road known as Highway No. 1 or the "Red Ball." We use the Red Ball extensively ourselves for moving truck convoys, and during the past couple of weeks numerous convoys have been getting ambushed along the highway. Anyway our company was lifted to a ridge to the west of Red Ball and were to sweep east attempting to flush out snipers. On the south side of the ridge and the west side were brush fires and they dropped us right in between them. Due to our position we had to move north down across a small valley and then uphill again to another ridgetop. And the fire was burning right on our heels. Everyone was covered with soot and cinders and the sun shone yellow through the smoke. The heat was intense and the fire made it noticeably hotter. We reached the second ridgetop and everyone hoped that we had some sanctuary from the fire. We already had taken a couple of heat casualties but nothing serious so far.

We had no more than dropped our gear when suddenly strong gusty winds whipped the fire up towards our position. The word went out to move down to the Red Ball which was directly below us but we were so high up that it looked 10 miles down. This time we moved due east down the side of this mountain through some jungle vegetation. Do you have any idea how thick semi-jungle vegetation is? It didn't matter much at the time because the fire had closed in so rapidly the company was near panic. I was up towards the front and we could hear those in the back yelling to move faster. But we were in high gear as it was. If the fire had gotten onto the east slope of that mountain, well, Alpha Company would be no more. It took two hours to work our way down to the Red Ball through the heavy foliage. When the whole company was finally down, all kinds of gear and ammo were missing; we had something around a dozen heat casualties, and the worst part was that we didn't have any water as it had been almost 24 hours since our last resupply. Somebody found a nearby stagnant pond and everybody starting drinking water, stagnant water. As far as I know, no one has gotten sick from that water but we were just lucky, that's all. By this time, it was about mid-afternoon. There is no effective way to describe the total and complete exhaustion that we all experienced. Not only from the physical exertion but the tense fear of being caught in that fire.

Now comes the killer, we received orders from battalion to move back up and secure that same ridgetop overlooking the Red Ball. The company at that point reflected the epitome of demoralization. We moved out latter part of the afternoon and step by agonizing step worked our way back up the same slopes that had earlier chased us off by fire. I want to tell you, that night when we finally reached the top of that hill I was just about at the end of the line. Not from just fatigue but morale-wise, too. I didn't give a damn about anything, and most others felt the same as me.

Three days later we are still sitting on the same mountain top with the purpose of observing truck convoys passing below us. They brought up an 81mm. mortar with the hope of zeroing in quickly on any snipers that may start shooting at convoys. Our company is providing security for the mountain. But Charlie is no idiot, like most of our military people, he knows exactly what we are up here for, so yesterday the V.C. moved their ambush site to the north of our range and attacked three convoys. But we go on about our work of securing this hill; clearing brush, laying barbed wire and digging gun positions. Probably within a week or so we'll move off the hill and all our work will be for nothing. "Mine is not to question why, mine is to do or die."

In your last letter you made some statement about dropping an atomic bomb on N. Vietnam. It has become my opinion that

our best course of action would be just the opposite. Pack up and get the hell out of this God-forsaken place. I do not know one GI over here who would trade even as much as a single teaspoon of U.S. soil for this entire country. I sincerely feel that just the mere presence of U.S. military forces are doing more to perpetuate this war than any other single factor. I am not a conscientious objector because I cannot say that all wars are futile, but this is futile. If I should die over here there is no way that I could justify or anyone could justify the loss of my life. I have not seen nor even heard of any military objective over here that warrants the loss of an American life. The propaganda argument that we are fighting for our country in Vietnam is the biggest bunch of — I've ever heard. If you were over here and could see the way the people respond to us and the way we respond to them you'd fully understand. I also fail to see how "aggressive Communism" in a backwards, very primitive country like Vietnam, on the other side of the world poses a threat to the security of the United States.

I guess I've racked Vietnam over the coals long enough. The manner in which the army conducts operations in Vietnam and just the fact that we are in Vietnam, it is quite easy for me to understand why there is so much dissent and rebellion among the youth of our country today. The resentment is deep and it's going to get worse before it gets better. Frankly I'm resentful against my commanding officers for some of their decisions and orders. I place too much value on my life to allow the U.S. Army to sacrifice it for some obscure and totally meaningless objective in Vietnam. I think this is perhaps at least part of the root of the rebellion against the 'military-industrial' complex of today. Gotta go now, write later.

Love,

CHUCK.

P.S. Please send me one dozen packages of un-sweetened Kool-Aid. All flavors except Lime.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

June 11, 1969.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have received from my son in Vietnam.

After a year of training and specializing in personnel work, he is now an infantryman. He has been there since the last of March and as you can see by the letter, I don't believe he knows just why he is there. He has asked questions in his letter which I am unable to answer. I don't believe the army has educated the boys as to why we are fighting there because if they had I think they would have at least some understanding of the situation.

Some in civilian life understand as to our original purpose over there but the boys can't understand why they are sent out in squad strength to be sitting ducks for the V.C. ambush.

I am sure the morale of my son would be greatly increased if he were to receive some communication from you giving him some answers to his questions or the possibility of transfer to his specialty.

I ask this in spite of the fact that I know how busy you are with Congressional duties.

Sincerely yours,

A.C.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have finished the business for this week.

The business for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are no suspensions.

For Tuesday we have scheduled for consideration H.R. 11249, to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 6508, California Disaster Relief Act of 1969, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week the following are scheduled:

H.R. 11400, Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1969, conference report. We are not exactly sure what day that conference report will be ready.

House Joint Resolution 247, relating to the administration of the national park system, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 471, to hold in trust certain lands for the Pueblo de Taos Indians in New Mexico, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 11702, Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1969, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 4284, authorizing appropriations for the Standard Reference Data Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader two questions.

Did I correctly understand it is not certain and positive that the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill will come on Wednesday; it could come on any one of the days, Wednesday or the remainder of the week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. My understanding is that the conference committee will meet on Tuesday. Of course, until it does meet we are not sure what the disposition of this matter will be.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Second, in looking at the agenda on the whip notice, is it likely or is it problematical that we will have a session on Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. I should not like to be bound by any statement in that regard. I do not anticipate it at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE SURTAX VOTE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the 210 to 205 vote by which the House of Representatives extended the 10-percent surtax for 1 year, some interesting questions arise. A number of debates continue. There are many important issues involved here—tax reform, probably Senate action, the sweeteners contained in the bill. The argument continues as to whether this is really a check on inflation. I would still argue that taking \$10 billion away from the people who might spend it and giving it to the Federal Government which will absolutely spend it is no check on inflation. However, there is one really crucial issue which has received very little attention. Has the Republican Party here and now abdicated its historic role as the party of economy in Government, fiscal responsibility and straight dealing with the American people? I have enough concern about this fundamental issue that I must raise some questions.

No amount of semantics can gloss over the central issue here. I listened to my party leaders talk about this as a "unity vote" for Republicans and the "responsible" position. As for unity, this is great and needed but when the unity is for purposes which are questionable this is little more than a call to abdicate principle. If all you are interested in is unity, you might as well emulate the Mafia. They have cohesion, unity of purpose and discipline. The principles must come first unity then follows on these principles.

I heard the word "responsible" used over and over. Was it responsible to vote for the surtax extension? I think not. It was a *carte blanche*, a full-steam-ahead signal to the spenders to proceed with their plans for bigger programs which will ultimately be heaped on the backs of the American taxpayer. It was sad indeed to listen to Republican speaker after Republican speaker call this extension a responsible action but then pay only scant attention to the biggest need of all, the responsibility of the Republican Party to cut unnecessary spending, to dampen the fires of inflation by restraining Federal extravagance. As I have said so many times, our problem is not that we are undertaxed as a people it is that the Government has overspent, overpromised, overprogramed and followed pie-in-the-sky panaceas created by the liberal pied pipers. To take the position that it was responsible to overtax to cut inflationary pressures rather than to support—indeed, force if necessary—cuts in the many Federal programs on the books seems to me to present a strategic juncture in the history of our Grand Old Party.

I would remind many of our Republican leaders, including the President, that the history of the Republican Party did not commence on January 20, 1969. The solid legacy and record of the Republican Party is one of the central reasons we elected a Republican President in 1968.

It is that record that most of us have run on in the past and have been elected on. That legacy was given to us by responsible leaders like Senator Robert A. Taft, Senator Bill Knowland, Representative James Reed, Representative Dick Simpson, Representative Carrol Reece, and scores of others who fought for economy in Government, limited Government, checks and balances, increased responsibility by the States and solid conservative programs. To indicate that it was a breach of Republican solidarity to oppose the surtax extension and a vote against the President would have been humorous had it not been so ironic.

I think it is fair to say that the great majority of Republicans and independents who supported President Nixon last year did so for the reason that they were fed up with Democrat-style super spending and because he held out to them the promise of a change. I sincerely supported him on this basis. I believed him when he said he would clean out the State Department, reduce Government spending, phase out the Job Corps, change the direction of the politically dominated Poverty program, knock out the surtax, and so forth. I supported him and cheered when he indicated he would not tolerate a coalition government in Vietnam.

Thus far we have increased Federal salaries, increased the national debt, increased the IDA authorization and, just last Monday, we voted to extend the surtax. The Job Corps will apparently continue despite its record and there is already an effort to extend the poverty program as is—just for starters. A coalition government in Vietnam may be just around the corner in one form or another. All of these supposedly will become Republican positions if that is what the White House wants. If this is so, count me out.

Are we Republicans talking about cutting the bloated Federal payrolls which found several hundred thousand new employees added during the Johnson administration alone? No. I read in the newspaper yesterday that there is a general feeling of relief in bureaucratic circles now that the hiring freeze has expired and they can start building their empires once more. What was happened to our Republican principles?

Admittedly, the Republican administration took over at a time when many of the Democrat chickens were coming home to roost. The spectre of overspending, inflation, high taxes, and general unrest throughout the Nation were not of our making. However, we knew the situation and we made promises as to what we would do. We simply have not given any honest indication that we are willing to do what we told the people we would do. No meaningful effort has been made to cut spending. This is why I think a vote to extend the surtax was irresponsible—it merely assured the

spenders that the money would be there to continue business as usual.

A few months after a hard-fought and close national election, it appears that some Republican leaders would make you believe that it is a question of "not supporting" the President or the party when you vote against him when he fails to carry out his campaign promises. I will support him steadfastly in his efforts to bring about the changes he promised the American people. I will just as vigorously oppose him if he endeavors to go in the opposite direction. I am not one of those Republicans—and they are apparently in the majority—who could view with alarm under Johnson last year and point with pride to the same thing under President Nixon this year. There are always changing factors to consider but some things are clearly central and basic to our Republican philosophy. If as a part of our basic philosophy we opposed something last year, it should still be wrong this year. If it was right last year, it should be right this year.

It is this matter of basic philosophy which worries me. Are we abdicating the traditional role of the Republican Party? I have heard precious little during these past 6 months about making necessary and substantial cuts in the Democrat spending programs. In fact, every indication seems to point in the opposite direction. For example, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Bob Finch has given us very little change over the Cohen brand of spending. In fact he is asking for hundreds of millions more in some areas and seems bent on trying to implement some sort of guaranteed annual income program and a national welfare floor which would negate the rights of the 50 States to set their own standards. Will our Republican leaders call these non-Republican programs a matter of "responsible party loyalty" at some time in the not too distant future?

U.S. News & World Report, in its June 23 issue, made the following statement on page 34:

Unless Mr. Nixon rejects the counsel of most of his advisers on domestic affairs, he will soon be sending to Congress the most liberal welfare program ever proposed by a President of either major party.

If this is true, and I have no reason to doubt, does anybody honestly think this is what people voted for last November?

What had happened to the basic philosophic thrust of the Republican Party? Is there any doubt in anyone's mind that if we had told the American people last fall that we would promote more spending programs, a renewal of the surtax, increases in the national debt, and a guaranteed annual income program that they would have stuck to the party that has demonstrated real expertise in these matters, the Democratic Party? It is clear to me that the people wanted the Republican Party to take them in a different direction, in the direction of our historic mandate. They voted for a change. What will we tell them if we do not give it to them? I have a pretty good idea what they will tell us and I suppose that is what really bothers me the most. Not so much that we might lose but that we will have missed a rare historic oppor-

tunity to move the Government in the very direction which we have through the years advocated. We can and should restore some balance and sanity to the Federal Government but will we?

There is frustration everywhere about politicians and Government. This is a central factor in the unrest which permeates the cities and the campuses. Are we Republicans going to add to this frustration? I believe we will if we follow the course of action which we seem locked into. There is always the argument that you can ride the waves, that people get upset for a while but soon forget. I would caution our Republican leaders not to bank on this hope. The people do remember and will remember us. Our not-too-sterling performance at the special elections thus far should be some sort of a reminder that the people may be trying to tell us something. They spoke in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New York this year. They spoke last year. There is already one liberal party, we do not need another one.

In my opinion, most people have had a belly full of politicians. Not Democrat politicians, just politicians. We Republicans can just as easily fit into that mould as those big government advocates who have worn out their welcome with their constituencies. It may not be popular to point this out but I am certain that it is a fact of life for us in 1970 and 1972.

We have always held ourselves out to the public as a responsible, conservative party. We did this in the last election as we have done it throughout the years when it appeared public opinion might be going the other way. We lost many elections but we held our principles. Last year we won a great victory. People everywhere have begun to see the fallacy of the liberal panaceas and we had a true conservative mandate.

If our Republican leaders have decided that we do not want to be the type of party we have been—and most of us in Congress ran on Republican principles and Republican records—let us at least be honest enough to tell the people this in direct and clear language. At least that much of our proud historic heritage could be respected.

REASSESSING OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES—CAN WE AFFORD PEACE?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a week ago a bipartisan group of Congressmen and Senators convened an extraordinary conference of distinguished scholars, diplomats and experts to start a national dialog on how America can redirect its wealth and resources. I was privileged to be one of the four House sponsors of the conference, my colleagues being the distinguished gentlemen from New York (Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. OTTINGER) and the able gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN). In the other body, the sponsors were the distinguished Senators Cook

of Kentucky, SAXBE of Ohio, CRANSTON of California and HUGHES of Iowa.

In my keynote address before the panel discussion on domestic policy, I stressed that if we are going to rebuild urban America, creating a decent life for rich and poor, black and white, alike, then Congress should re-evaluate how it allocates the Nation's resources.

The Priorities Conference, held in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, had no legislative standing as a functioning body of Congress. But what it did have was the legitimacy of U.S. Congressmen and Senators banding together to use their moral persuasion and prestige to sponsor a forum where the public could express its views on how its tax dollar is spent. Because although almost 50 percent of public spending today is financed from the earnings of working Americans, the Nation actually spends less than 8 percent of its wealth on social benefits for the population.

Of course, one could not expect a carefully structured syllabus specifying how we should redirect the Nation's wealth from a senselessly escalating military machine and an indefensible war in Vietnam to socially beneficial outputs that emphasize human needs to emerge from a 2-day conference. Obviously, such an undertaking will require the full expertise and commitment of Congress and its standing committees. But what we participated in last week symbolized to the American people that the democratic process does work—that citizens' petitions and students' protests are not anguished cries of despair.

In effect then, the Priorities Conference was a reaffirmation of our democratic values—relaying to the public that their representatives in Government are sensitive to their needs and desires.

For as taxes bite deeper and deeper into the buying power of the average American, and he realizes less and less for his tax dollar—he is justifiably seized by frustration and wonders what Government is doing for him. Indeed, it seems a certain malaise has crept into the hearts of Americans, reflected by the disruption, fear, and violence of today's headlines.

For there is an uneasy feeling adrift in the Nation today that suggests people have no control over their own lives. In the ghetto disorders, the student rebellions and in the protests against the ABM and the Vietnam war, people are saying that events have become too enormous to control.

Indeed, the current upheaval reflects the Nation's frustration over its inability to cope with a rapidly changing urban society. Nobody ever questioned the availability of fiscal resources for financing the Vietnam war and the Nation's military machine. Yet curiously, we operate with different accounting methods when it comes to meeting domestic social needs.

In such an atmosphere, hope and confidence in society slowly erode when human needs are subordinated to military spending. The question we should be asking then, is: Can we afford not to rebuild our cities and reaffirm our traditional

American values of decency and compassion?

But even though our first priority in reassessing our resources must be to make democracy work at home, I believe the Nation's security still must be given top priority. The problem though, is that the old ways have been tried and retried without success. Neither cold war diplomacy or military aggressiveness have guaranteed international tranquility or achieved peace.

For peace and tranquility among mankind cannot be willed and it cannot be imposed by force. It can only be achieved by hard work, by performance, and by understanding. Yet who is really working toward attaining peace today? Indeed, peace seems to be everyone's concern, yet no one's job.

The Pentagon has over 300 legislative liaisons—that is, lobbyists—spending \$4 million annually to secure defense contracts for the military.

But who is lobbying for peace?

And I understand, it was recently disclosed that some 2,000 retired military officers were working for 100 major aerospace and defense-oriented industrial firms that had over 67 percent of the Nation's prime military contracts last year.

But how many retired military officers are working for peace?

The Nation expended \$49.6 billion in 1965 on national defense, and it is estimated that defense spending will skyrocket to \$81.5 billion in the coming fiscal year.

And what have we got for our money, in addition to following the generals into blunder after blunder—an Asian folly that has become a human disaster; building multi-million-dollar bombers that cannot fly; exhausting human resources on rockets that are now obsolete, and wasting an estimated \$10 billion of this year's Pentagon budget for useless military hardware?

The answer is: Very little. As the world is increasingly learning, you can do just so much with bombs and military might.

Military force can quell outbreaks; it can crush and ravage foreign lands. But it cannot bring tranquility or peace or make friends for America. The walls of isolation separating American resources from world poverty and despair cannot be buttressed by merely allocating 1 percent of our Federal budget for foreign aid.

What is needed to foster a climate of peace are more substantive on-going programs of development and cultural understanding that are beneficial to people, and not tied to any current, expedient foreign-policy design. The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency reports that between America, the Soviet Union, and other global powers, we are spending 40 percent more for armaments than we are for education, and over three times as much as world spending for public health.

Is it any wonder then, that the attainment of peace still eludes us?

In all, America is spending less than one and two-tenths of a percent of the Federal budget on peace activities. The \$2.9 billion the Pentagon spends an-

nually merely purchasing ammunition is more than the entire Federal budget for functioning peacekeeping programs that are oriented toward achieving world stability.

For instance, we spent only 6 cents out of every \$100 of Federal funds this year on the Peace Corps.

We spent only \$1.9 billion for the Agency for International Development this year.

And while no one questioned whether we could afford space research—it soared from \$100 million a decade ago to almost \$6 billion in fiscal 1966—when it came to disarmament the funds vanished. Incredibly, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been hobbling along these years spending something like one-half cent out of every \$100 of Federal money expended.

Clearly, the time has come to re-evaluate our national priorities and assign part of the defense dollar for activities in the name of peace.

What we need is a policy of peace. Our foreign policy and military policy must be overhauled, but its time we adopted a fresh perspective on peace. I would like to see a fulltime top-level, Cabinet-rank branch of Government devoted exclusively to the cause of peace.

Toward that end, along with Senator HARTKE, I have proposed creating a new Department of Peace within the Federal executive—bringing together those operating agencies that are now functioning in an atmosphere not conducive to promoting their peaceful objectives.

So far, some 80 Congressmen and Senators from both parties have cosponsored our proposal. Of course, the idea for a Department of Peace is as old as the founding of the Nation. But as Victor Hugo said:

There is nothing more powerful than an idea whose time has come.

The Founding Fathers never intended that a vast, institutionalized military and diplomatic establishment should develop practically independent of congressional control. In matters of war, Congress was to initiate armed force. Otherwise, foreign affairs were intended to promote the attainment of peaceful relations among nations.

We must recapture control of that distant vision now, if we are to regain the confidence of the public and stem the frustration I spoke of earlier.

I believe that only in a national atmosphere that provides for a fresh initiative on peace—free of monetary, diplomatic and political strife—can on-going programs of international development prosper and lend themselves to the pursuit of peace. Indeed, it is imperative that we distinguish between foreign policymaking and peacekeeping programs of world development and cultural understanding in any reordering of national priorities.

SOME CRITICS ARE OUT OF TUNE WITH "MUSIC"

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the current attacks upon the "military-industrial complex" require more study, exposure, and understanding. I will be the first to demand the same scrutiny of the budget of the Department of Defense that I demand of the budget of every other agency of the Government—but malicious malignment is quite another thing. Unless some sense of perspective is interposed in the current clamor, this careless political demagoguery could reduce our Nation to a second-rate world power.

Those segments of our society involved in military procurement and our national security are not just the military and the industrialists. Equally involved are the universities, the unions, and the scientists. If there be any such complex, it should be described as MUSIC—"military, university-union, science, industrial complex." Others may deserve inclusion, but certainly MIC—military-industrial complex—is clearly too narrow and misleading.

Military, university-union, science, industrial complex (MUSIC), should be subject to the strictest surveillance. Waste in the Department of Defense is not excusable; we ought to do better. Civilian control of the military is essential.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some indicative facts and history. During a recent war, one of our then less distinguished presidents was able to fire one of our then most distinguished generals and make it stick. "Civilian control" is quite secure, then and now.

During the last 8 years the Department of Defense has made some procurement mistakes and some excessive overruns, but remember all of the serious mistakes and overruns were due to the procurement judgments and practices of civilian Secretary McNamara often overriding his Pentagon advisers. For these errors, mistakes, and overruns, we must fault the civilian secretary and his "whiz kids"—not the military or any "complex." Certainly we cannot, and should not, condemn Secretary Laird or President Nixon for the mistakes of Secretary McNamara and Clifford or of President Kennedy and Johnson.

Many antiwar, ban-the-bomb zealots strike out vituperatively at the Pentagon and will make any wild allegation. But any reasonable person must recognize that the military would be the last to recommend a war in which they will be the first to die, in which they will sustain the gravest casualties and their families endure the greatest suffering.

There are solons and columnists who, with some tortuous logic, malign the military for somehow causing Vietnam; yet our foreign policymakers, the State Department, the CIA, the Foreign Relations Committee, the World Federalists, the internationalists, and many others are far more responsible than the military for our early and present presence in Vietnam. Indubitably, the military would have the most self-interest in leaving Vietnam immediately. What could delight the combat GI, the marine, or the airman in Vietnam more than for the State Department and the civilian

leadership and the negotiators to say, "come on home."

No reasonable person could "buy" the nonsense that the military was responsible for Vietnam, Korea, World War II, or World War I. But each time when the military was called, they performed magnificently. No knowledgeable critic faults the performance, the dedication or the desire for peace of our military personnel—from Chief of Staff to newest enlistee.

Not only is much of the current criticism plain demagoguery—it is cheap demagoguery. It is somewhat comparable to a false claim of rape—easy to allege; highly inflammatory and likely to degrade the accused; difficult to disprove; impossible for the accused, no matter how innocent, to recoup his reputation; and no penalty or embarrassment is imposed upon the wrongful accuser. In the case of the military being accused by a Member of the Congress—with immunity—or by the news columnist—with the "last word" and extensive circulation—the false or careless allegation is doubly reprehensible. The military is shackled in several ways. They cannot "talk back." It would be unseemly, and unmilitary, for the generals to argue publicly with their civilian or congressional superiors. Their oath of office deters them. Their concept of "duty" deters them. "Their's is but to do and die; their's is not to answer why."

The military covered by regulations is effectively removed from the political area except as easy prey from the protected critics who can "hit and hide."

Military, university-union, science, industrial complex (MUSIC), is responsible for our lunar landing program—and this is no less a spectacular success than our military, naval, and air accomplishments of World War II or the writing of our Constitution. The moon landing may be our Nation's most successful technological and scientific achievement—yet it was done by that same "military, university-union, science, industrial complex." If for some psychological reason we must malign, we ought to also give credit where credit is due.

There have been overruns in the NASA programs—enormous overruns, 100 percent overruns. Whenever you are dealing with new, sophisticated, complex ideas and instruments, overruns seem to have been the rule rather than the exception.

There have been mistakes and overruns in every agency of the Federal Government. The overruns in the social security program, medicare and war on poverty would put the overruns of the Defense Department to shame comparatively.

I personally do not like the war or the way it has been conducted, but when our Government—civilian controlled—asks a man to fight and risk death by service in the military—whether drafted or not—I believe we should give him every weapon, every vehicle and all the material and facilities he needs—when he needs it—to protect himself and to carry out his mission. Furthermore, I believe the weapons, materials, and facilities should be the very best we can possibly devise, produce, and provide. If we are not willing to spend the money—even if it requires consider-

able monetary sacrifice—then we should bring the men home immediately. We insist that NASA build in every practicable safety factor—redundancy after redundancy—to protect the small flight crews in our space exploration program. I believe the same safety factor, the same redundancy, the same attitude toward human life and the expenditure of money should be applied whenever we ask or demand that military personnel risk their lives for our future freedom and security.

I believe that when we are at war and one man is required to risk his life in our behalf or cause, we should all make some sacrifice. One of the immoral aspects of this war is that only a few have sacrificed while most of us have remained secure, cozy, and better off. The military and their families have really been the principal sufferers. Some who have suffered or sacrificed the least are now condemning the sufferers the loudest.

To be sure some contractors, colleges, scientists, and industrialists have received large lucrative contracts. To be sure many businesses have made money; all should have made a reasonable profit. My complaint would be based not upon the dollar amount of their contracts, but upon their excess profits, if any. We have a Renegotiation Board, charged with the responsibility of reviewing defense contracts, to make certain that no defense contractor has made any excess profit.

I am certain that huge numbers of craftsmen in almost every building and construction trade have enjoyed extraordinarily high employment at the highest wages. Neither the unions nor the union leadership is going to complain about the high level of work and wages permitted under the defense contracts—but I am convinced they would much prefer to see the hostilities terminated.

I am certain that numerous university professors, graduate students, and scientists have discovered lucrative sources of income and new fascinations in the use of exotic equipment and improved facilities via defense-related research and development grants, fellowships, and studies. I am aware that many of their projects have resulted in fabulous discoveries and developments which will inure to the benefit of all mankind. For instance, I am advised that certain surgical techniques developed during the war will require medical schools and the medical profession to completely revise certain surgical procedures. For every near-miracle which will benefit mankind, hundreds of university research projects were useless sink holes of the taxpayers' money. These, too, were "overruns." Many "researchers" dawdled while the grants lasted. The university researchers and the scientists know this but seldom complain or reject a "research grant." But I am confident that they, too, would prefer that their talents, laboratories, and facilities be used for peaceful pursuits.

I am confident that the university covets no more ambition to form a "complex" with the Government or the military than industry or business desires to become involved in any sort of a "complex" with the military or the Govern-

ment. An overwhelming portion of each group cherishes its freedom and independence more than it nurtures any avarice for power or control of society.

I am certain that many company executives and officials may have enjoyed some of the highest challenges, salaries, and fringe benefits in the history of their life's work because of their defense-related contracts, but I also believe these men, and their families, would prefer that their energies and talents be directed to more peaceful and domestic achievements.

Many of these industrial craftsmen, executives, and officials have worked hard and long and are entitled to be paid fairly for their services. The shirkers and wrongdoers of every ilk ought to be penalized although probably they will not. But when heavy and urgent demands are made upon designers, planners, builders, managers, scientists, auditors, craftsmen, inspectors; when crash programs are required; when new projects are introduced; when experiment is indicated; when innovations, even inventions, are demanded; when the state of the art is stretched to the bursting point, overruns and some useless experimentation will ensue.

Try to avoid overruns, yes; punish wrongdoing, yes; correct mistakes as quickly as possible, yes; utilize new systems, new materials, new ideas, yes; criticize and complain, yes; but be fair and honest. If you can do better, make your proposal. It is your country; your tax dollar; your MUSIC; your sons and husbands who are dying; your sons, husbands, and fathers who are working in the military, university-union, science, industrial part of this "complex" also.

As imperfect as MUSIC may have been, the latter-day conscience-stricken crusaders ought to remember—if they now decline to rejoice or be grateful—that this beleaguered "complex" permitted our Nation and the free world to flourish since 1945 and saved it from oblivion in World Wars I and II. Not only were our own citizens once most grateful and proud but so were many other nations and peoples of this planet.

When the overruns were in the welfare programs, the basic research programs, Federal aid to education, the colleges, medicare, NASA, the construction of a post office or a bank building or a housing project, where was the outcry? Only a few Members of the Congress worried about overruns in general. Now some Members of Congress, the public and the news media are complaining about the most difficult of all procurement—procurement of military supplies, weapons, and vehicles which must be obtained most rapidly under the most difficult conditions and in the largest amounts.

The Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts here in Washington will overrun the cost estimate and exceed—percentage-wise—the largest overrun of any military procurement. But will the Pentagon maligners say a word in a protest against such an overrun? Nary a word. In fact, they will probably be back urging the Congress to make up the growing and scandalous deficit. Compare the difficulties, compare the logistics, compare

the rush, compare the state of the art and compare the need. There is no comparison whatsoever; yet the same group that condones the Kennedy Center overrun will condemn the Defense Department overruns. Actually, I can understand both overruns and I would not assess wrongdoing or conspiracy or greed as the cause of either. Both should have been avoided. To criticize and demagog on one and ignore or condone the other is hypocrisy which ought to be exposed and understood by the public.

Just to make certain that another view of this rather crucial matter is better known, I include the column of James J. Kilpatrick carried in the Washington Star on June 1, 1969:

DEFENSE COSTS NOT EXCESSIVE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The tidal wave rolls on as May goes into June: It is impossible to pick up a newspaper without reading fresh blasts against the pentagon—against the generals, the admirals, the top brass—against the whole "military-industrial complex" that is said to be dominating our society and exhausting its wealth.

Everyone is jumping aboard this juggernaut—peacenik students, conscience-stricken colleges, whole covens of U.S. Senators. A House subcommittee publishes a damning report on Pentagon procurement procedures. Such gifted cartoonists as Herblock and Oilphunt treat us daily to caricatures of bloated generals playing billion-dollar games. The military budget, we are told, is no longer sacrosanct: Defense spending will be cut to the bone.

In the midst of this orchestrated howling, it is not easy to raise a small voice of reason. Yet the voice has to be raised: This nation is not spending too much on defense. We probably are spending too little.

Sure enough, vast sums have been spent badly, on tanks that won't run, and planes that won't perform, and missiles that go awry. Defense Secretary Laird has a prodigious task ahead of him, in cracking down on defense contractors who have been taking advantage of the government. Laird is a tough hombre, and will do what has to be done.

But the demand that the U.S. spend less for national security is a demand that makes no sense—not at a time when the Soviet Union is upgrading its navy and expanding its missile program. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, our general purpose forces must be kept at high levels. To permit their erosion, in effect, is to abandon commitments; eventually, such a course involves the piecemeal yielding of most of the world to advancing Soviet power.

Sad to say, that is the course the false economizers are pursuing. The consequences of this folly already are appearing.

For a case in point, consider the critical situation that has developed in the field of naval aviation. The Navy maintains an inventory of roughly 8,250 planes. Six years ago, the average age of a Navy plane was about three years. Today the average age is more than seven.

Upwards of 2,400 naval aircraft already have outlived their service life; another 2,000 will reach that point of obsolescence within three years. Naval Reserve wings have been stripped of planes and parts. Nothing remains in mothballs. The Navy's inventory of fighters has dropped from 1,700 to 1,100 in eight years. Vice Admiral Thomas F. Connolly, head of naval aviation, has a blunt phrase that sums it up: We are engaged, he says, in "unilateral fiscal disarmament."

It will be five years before the Navy's proud new multipurpose plane, the swept-wing F-14, begins to arrive in significant numbers.

Grumman Aircraft is building this beauty; and in view of the outcry over Lockheed's runaway costs on the C5A, it may be in order to note some of the hard-nosed provisions of Grumman's contract on the F-14.

The Navy wrote into that contract certain specific requirements on design and performance—weight, range, acceleration, landing speed, and the like. Penalty clauses are attached. If Grumman goes over the maximum weight by as much as a hundred pounds, a \$440,000 penalty will be imposed. Grumman will have to pay \$1 million for every 10 miles of range by which it misses. The penalty for missing the maximum approach speed is \$1 million a knot. The company is confident that it will meet these requirements, on time, within the target price.

The Navy ought to be ordering, 1,000 planes a year at a cost of \$4.8 billion. The economists threaten to whack this replenishment schedule almost in half—and the Navy is not alone in its appropriation troubles. All our basic defense forces are in the same fix. This way lies disaster; that's where we're headed now.

He calls our attention to a prospective major disaster. He mentions only a small portion of the problems and deficiencies of the Department of the Navy. The Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and merchant marines are in similar serious straits.

Some critics of course will claim I am being too sympathetic with the problems and deficiencies of the Department of Defense. Most people know better. I have been and will continue to be hardnosed with respect to any agency that spends the taxpayers' dollars. The dollars are too hard to earn and even more difficult to save. We have a very special fiduciary responsibility when we spend somebody else's money. I intend to be just as hardnosed and careful about spending dollars for defense as I am in spending any other Federal revenues. No department is sacrosanct. The same criteria should apply to all Federal spending.

In an attempt to assure that this criteria is applied, I have introduced a bill—H.R. 4857—which will require a certified "price tag" on each new legislative proposal requiring more than \$1,000,000 in total expenditure, whether in the Department of Defense or elsewhere.

Under my proposal a proforma profit and loss statement or balance sheet certified by the General Accounting Office as being a true and total cost would be required before any new legislative proposal can be reported out of committee for floor consideration.

Some of the MUSIC critics fail to remember that more than \$6 billion was cut from President Johnson's fiscal year 1969 budget request for the DOD, even at a time when our casualties were increasing. If all agencies and departments had been curtailed as much, we would have a better handle on inflation right now.

Nevertheless, it should be remembered that national security is not cheap and freedom is not free. So long as we have international marauders, we must maintain a sufficient defense. When we ask men to risk death, we owe them the best weapons and equipment we can provide.

Some of the critics of MUSIC would have us believe that we can simply go to a shop and order the newest, most so-

phisticated aircraft ever dreamed of—which will perform perfectly many functions which have never been performed before—and expect delivery the next month—yet pay the "shelf price." If they were the contractor, if they were the scientist, if they were the industrial manager, how would they perform? Dozens of contracting procedures and techniques have been used. Perhaps we have not yet devised the perfect contracting mechanism or instrument to guarantee fairness and efficiency for all parties, but no one can honestly say that all parties have not tried.

Some of the carping about "MIC" and the "exposure" of military procurement overruns and worthless experiments is somewhat akin to publicity seeking Monday morning quarterbacks who do not know a hotdog from a "red dog."

Many vituperative critics of MUSIC have alluded to a conspiracy. None will say it directly because the law is clear and effective to cope with any such conspiracy or collusion. This suggestion always disintegrates when it comes to the evidential stage because then the integrity of the accused usually exceeds the integrity of the accuser. Of course the critics never permit their suggestions of collusion, wrongdoing or criminality to proceed to the evidential or proof stage because then their opportunity for demagoguery evaporates.

Some of the "military maligners" may be mystified by the myths that "if we do not do anything to the enemy, he will not do anything to us" or that "if we ignore communism, the Communists will ignore us." These myths are just as deluding as the belief that "if we want peace, we can have it—simply by doing nothing."

Those who bolster their demagogic attacks upon the "military-industrial complex" with quotations from General Eisenhower, usually quote the general out of context and only partially as follows:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

As I read President Eisenhower's farewell address in full, he was equally concerned about the potential evil of the university-Government axis.

In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become captive of a scientific-technological elite.

This admonition should be remembered in the context of the current clamor. The relationship, even dependency, between the Government and the university is much closer than any alleged clique between the military and the industrial.

Today the university, almost every university, could not function without the subsidy—in numerous forms—of the Federal Government. Many universities which claim to be private or parochial or independent are none of these—they are dependent upon, and subservient to, the Federal Government for funds, for scholars, for fellowships, for facilities, for research grants, and much more. If you do not believe this, I will show you my files of letters from universities and colleges from throughout our land saying that, if this or that Federal program is not "fully funded" their collapse is imminent.

General Eisenhower was reminding us of something which is very dear to us. We Americans want no segment, or no alliance of segments, of our society to dominate our society. I, for one, do not want the Government, or any combination of governments, to dominate our society. I do not want an "intellectual-scientific" clique to dominate our society. I do not want the news media, or any coalition of the news media, to dominate our society. General Eisenhower's warning should be heeded. But to use a limited portion of his wise admonition as a clarion call to malign, degrade, and demagog is a great and grave distortion of his meaning and can be a serious detriment to our national security.

General Eisenhower also said something that was more significant, more topical now and which he considered to be more crucial to our survival as a nation of free men and women; namely:

We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration.

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement; and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

A vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

We can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense.

Thus General Eisenhower said in clear language that to insure our freedom we must remain strong; weakness invites aggression or bullying; current conditions and weapons will no longer allow us time—as in the past—to gear up from cozy complacency to emergency situations; reliance upon hasty improvisations

in matters of national defense is ineffective, perhaps fatal, and terribly costly in lives and resources. MUSIC needs perfecting, not wrecking.

There must be effective cooperation and coordination between the military-research-industrial segments of our society. There must be more complete integration of the civilian and military components of our society. This cooperative objective ought to be encouraged, not maligned. Certainly the cooperation ought to be in the public, rather than the private, interest. But we should keep our eye on the real target—wrongdoing for private aggrandizement at public expense, not the cooperative association of the various segments of our society in our collective interest of national security.

As we tenaciously reserve our right and responsibility to scrutinize and criticize the spending of tax dollars by every Federal agency, especially by the Department of Defense, I believe we have a concomitant responsibility to use facts and draw reasonable conclusions without bias and without seeking personal attention of self aggrandizement at the expense of other innocent or defenseless persons or groups.

There are several other general areas of inquiry which could be pursued by those desirous of obtaining better comparisons and truer perspectives:

First, what is the percentage of our gross national product that we are committing to national security today, 10, 25, or 50 years ago? How does our percentage compare with the percentage of other world powers with comparable security responsibilities?

Second, what is the condition or state of "maintenance and repair" of our defense system today? Compared to 10, 25 or 50 years ago? Compared with other world powers?

Third, visit any military base—notice its condition and state of repair. Compare its condition and state of repair to other Federal agency buildings and facilities, or with State, county, or city governmental facilities.

Fourth, what are the central governments of other countries spending for housing, medical care, education, crime prevention, welfare? What percentage of their GNP are other countries spending for these needs of their citizens? How does the quality of these and other citizen comfort items compare with ours?

Do not accept everything you hear from the critics. They usually are given extraordinary space and time in the mass media. They usually are more vocal. But we should insist that they prove their allegations. Then, if they can prove their allegations, join them, support them until the deficiency or wrongdoing is corrected.

Our military strength has preserved our freedom and liberty for almost two centuries. The construction of our representative system of government and our free enterprise system of business and industry has permitted us to achieve a position of superiority, security and affluence unequaled in the world. The industrial segment of our Nation has always responded with competence and alacrity to every war or other national

emergency. We should not be ashamed or worried about MUSIC, we should encourage this cooperative venture in our continued quest for peace with freedom and justice. We should never tolerate any wrongdoing; we should vigilantly oppose all waste and extravagance; we should work assiduously to improve the system and to quickly correct deficiencies.

We should expose, isolate, and refuse to aid and abet the carping critics who make no constructive contributions. We should know and understand why some critics emerge now rather than during the last 8 years. There is no opportune time for partisan political carping when American lives and our national security is at stake.

The critics seem to be suffering a psychological complex about complexes. These critics offer no practical alternative. One suggestion is complete socialization of the Department of Defense. This would eliminate any "complex", of course, but simply convert our defense system to the Russian-style totalitarian system—the most expensive, least effective method for obtaining sufficient weaponry and facilities to respond to any crisis.

Another system sometimes suggested is to employ numerous inspectors general. This could be much more expensive and redundant with less benefit. With the constant probers of the Congress, the intrepid news media, the reports of disappointed contractors and vigilant employees, the publicity-seeking politicians, the proficient GAO, and the persistent Renegotiation Board, the true story and the facts will out.

Additionally, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has wisely proposed the formation of a blue-ribbon investigation committee to be chaired by Mr. Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, chairman of the board, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. Mr. Fitzhugh appears eminently qualified to undertake this critical task. He appears to be assuming the responsibility with an unbiased and open mind and an earnestness which will redound to the credit of the committee, the benefit of our national security, the improvement of our procurement practices and the excellence of our research and development programs.

I would hope that someday there will be no international marauders and that no Department of Defense would be necessary, but that wondrous day has not yet dawned. Until that day dawns, MUSIC may save our Nation, our way of life, from being buried.

We must save it from being vilified, dismantled, or disbanded.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation directed toward increasing the security of the retiring Federal employee. This bill is designed to strengthen the civil service employees' retirement system.

Through the improvements which this bill will make in the civil service retirement and disability fund will come assurances that sufficient funds will always be available to pay in full and on time the annuities of the Government's retirees and survivor annuitants. This bill is designed to rehabilitate the sad condition of the retirement system—a program which is a vital part of the Federal employment system, and one of paramount importance to the Government's millions of retired, active, and future employees and their families.

This measure recognizes the problems resulting from past and present funding practices, resolves doubts of the system's financial integrity, and develops a definite plan of action to insure its ability to fulfill its obligations.

The problems of which I speak did not develop overnight. The system's inability to meet future commitments is attributable to funding practices that have been grossly inadequate since the program's very inception in 1920. Employees have always paid their full share of retirement costs as set by law. Government has appropriated substantial sums to the civil service retirement and disability fund from time to time; but it has not contributed, regularly and systematically, in amounts sufficient to meet that portion of accruing costs not covered by employee contributions.

None of the several methods of financing proposed from 1920 through 1957 provided for an automatic reflection of the Government's share of retirement costs in annual appropriation. Because employee contributions annually exceeded benefit payments, the expansion of Federal employment during the 1930's and 1940's further obscured the potential impact of an ever-increasing unfunded liability. However, the stabilization of employment during the early fifties, combined with inadequate and sporadic employer contributions, made it apparent that as the system matured, annual trust fund revenues would soon be less than benefit payments.

Projections show that the deficiency will increase and that the fund will ultimately be depleted unless action is taken. By increasing the Government's contributions my bill will generate sufficient revenue to properly support the benefit and retirement program.

Comptroller General of the United States, Elmer B. Staats, speaking for the General Accounting Office, has stated:

We believe that, in furtherance of the objective of prudent management of the Government's financial affairs, a consistent method of financing the system should be established that will recognize and provide for all costs of maintaining the system from year to year as the costs are incurred.

He further states:

It is our view that, regardless of the approach the Congress may choose to follow, it is important that a definite plan be adopted to improve the financing of the system at an early date.

This bill proposes such a "definite plan."

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this bill improves the benefit structure of the civil service retirement system. The improve-

ments include reducing the number of years considered in deciding an employee's "average pay" from 5 to 3. Similar adjustments in the actual computation of annuities will likewise favor the Government employee.

The civil service retirement system is a most important responsibility. It is an essential part of a modern employment system designed to attract and retain employees of the caliber required to conduct the complex business of Government. It contributes importantly toward financial security of millions of people. There should never exist the slightest doubt of the system's ability to meet its commitments to these people. That doubt now exists.

The Government's financial obligation is clear. The Government's recognition of, and action to meet, that obligation is imperative. The situation has been studied intensively during the past few years. It is time now, that Government face the problem realistically and adopt some definite program to meet it. Passage of this measure will be adoption of such a program.

"GHETTO KIDS" PROPAGATE A TRADITION OF REGARD FOR TEACHERS

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

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Attorney Aaron Fishman in New York City, believes that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has served a wonderful purpose in disseminating matters of a cultural interest to the Nation and he writes to report on the continuity and development of matters that were reported here before. The interest of alumni in the children of an elementary school is rare since we find alumni interest directed to schools of higher learning. But it is well directed when we consider the importance to young children of an awareness of affiliation with a tradition and with alumni of importance. In these perilous days of our educational system the efforts of alumni "to give a damn" as they say in New York City, about the disadvantaged have impressed the board of education which had our last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD report distributed to the almost 1,000 schools so that they could follow good example. Items like the following may serve as guidelines of commendable conduct that the Nation should know about as being in the national interest. It is about what is probably the best known elementary school alumni group in the country. The item follows:

Alumnus Charles H. Silver a former member of the Board of Education of New York City and now an assistant to the mayor of New York City is the president of the Beth Israel Medical Center which has just celebrated its 80th anniversary by tendering a testimonial dinner to Dr. Albert Sabin of antipolio vaccine fame.

At the medical center is inscribed a credo which will be a permanent statement of the philosophy of Charles H. Silver—"I know of no phase of human endeavor which is nobler in purpose than the healing of the sick and the alleviation of suffering. I know of no institution that serves a community with

such utter unselfishness and such great effectiveness as a modern hospital. I know of no personal relationship that is more genuine and tender than that which exists between the patients in a hospital and the men and women in white who function within its walls. This, our credo for more than half a century, will endure long after those who now serve Beth Israel Hospital have passed on."

For the past 20 years Mr. Silver has also served as chairman of the annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner. The dinner raises funds to provide for the poor, the sick, and the underprivileged regardless of race, creed, or color, contributing millions of dollars to hospitals, especially St. Vincent's and Beth Israel and to Catholic Relief Services and other charitable organizations.

In the past Francis Cardinal Spellman headed the Foundation as president and Mr. Silver was the vice president. At the last dinner Archbishop Terrence J. Cooke, now a cardinal, succeeded as the president. The occasion was an historic one which Charles H. Silver presided over. In an unrehearsed, brilliant display of wit, good taste, and good will appeared the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, and Richard Nixon. Assembled on a six-tier dais were among others Mayor John V. Lindsay, Governor Rockefeller, Governor Hughes of New Jersey, Senators Javits and Goodell, ex-Governor of New York Thomas E. Dewey. The guest of honor was James A. Farley.

Referring to these guests in his remarks Dinner Chairman Silver said: They are leaders in the human parish that fuses men of all faiths in search for a way of life to ease the tensions of today and to meet the trials of tomorrow. They are leaders and followers, too, of those who minister to the human spirit—those men of God who will give us the strength to carry on despite seemingly overwhelming odds—despite the rage and riot in our streets and the bitterness and bloodshed between men and nations . . . Today's frustrations and anger—today's injustice and insecurity—should remind us that American is what we make it—for ourselves—and for our children."

When Archbishop Cooke travelled to Rome to receive from Pope Paul VI the pallium, the symbol of the fullness of episcopal office included in the party that travelled to Rome was his good friend, Charles H. Silver.

Alumnus Israel Cummings who is the president of the Shamokin Woolen Mills refers to his schoolmates as "Those ghetto kids." He is very proud of them since in addition to Charles H. Silver, their names include Senator JAVITS, Ben Javits, George and Ira Gershwin, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Irving Jacobson, Irvin Caesar, Harry Golden, Surrogate Silverman, Judge Simon Silver and Judge Samuel J. Leibowitz. "A half century ago we referred to the ghetto children as 'underprivileged.' Today we speak of the 'disadvantaged.' But semantics aside, an editorial entitled "A Clue to Decency" that appeared in the New York Journal-American said: They grew up in a neighborhood of immigrant parents huddled in tenements, and they rose above their environment. Perhaps the reason was summed up best by Charles H. Silver, former president of the board of education, and alumnus, when he said: 'Maybe we do not know all the answers to the problems of delinquency . . . but we know that the regard we had for our teachers and the love we had for our parents made a great difference in our lives. We believe that a new generation can find inspiration in these words.'"

A big event in New York was the occasion of Cummings 80th birthday when Mayor Lindsay, Borough President Percy Sutton, Attorney General Lefkowitz, Congressman Leonard Farberstein, Samuel Silverman, president of the Federation of Jewish Phil-

anthropies and Frank Weil, president of the Education Alliance joined representatives of community organizations in honoring him. Part of this event was the gift of a building to the Education Alliance of a Recreational Center containing a new gymnasium, 15 recreational rooms and a roof playground by Israel and Leah Cummings. An honor paid to Mrs. Cummings on this occasion was the renaming of one of the summer camps which they founded to be known as Camp Leah.

Because his beneficence remembered the place he came from he has been stamped as The Man Who Did Not Forget. He has discovered a great personal satisfaction in establishing Israel Cummings Day at the Circus. He recently sent down 8 buses to the East Side and picked up over 500 children from the Anna Silver School, the Education Alliance, the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School, the University Settlement and the Henrietta Szold School and a police squad car led them up to the new Madison Square Garden. Ice cream was as always part of the visit.

Because to help support his family he had to drop out of elementary school, aiding dropouts became a specialty of his. For his generosity to the U.S. Navy League he was presented with an admiral's sword. Many groups have honored him but he had an overwhelming desire for that elementary school diploma which he had left behind. After 65 years the Board of Education decided that he had probably earned one and it was presented to him by schoolmate U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits at an alumni reunion dinner. He says, "I have made it my business throughout my whole life to help others to help themselves and I have felt that the satisfaction of giving has paid me back manyfold." Good habits and his selflessness are probably the reasons for his longevity.

We pay a last tribute to some of the "Ghetto Kids" who have just left our midst; Charles Guttman, president of the Paddington Corporation whose philanthropy included gifts of a building for the Henry Settlement and the Beth Israel Medical Center; Dr. William F. Rosenblum, community and religious leader; Irving Alpert who worked for better housing legislation; Human A. Meltzer who spent a lifetime in the Immigration Service and George Levy, the oldest alumnus, Spanish-American war veteran and famous ball park announcer.

An illustration of the enterprise and imaginative behavior of East Side teenagers who were part of the "disadvantaged" living of that early era is that of the Forton Club. Made up largely of boys of P.S. 20 who lived in the school area of Forsyth and Rivington Streets—a group which had Irving Mandell (later a chancellor commander of the Grand Lodge of the Knights of Pythias of the State of New York), Murray Fishman, William Alpert and Jack Kamlet as the leaders of this social club in 1910. The name Forton stemmed from the two streets, and they first met at the corner of "the streets where they lived", at times in the University Settlement at the other corner, and most of the time in each other's homes. With their small dues they later hired a clubroom for their dances and socials, away from dance halls. The group stuck together and when family relationships came into their lives, they formed a lodge, bought cemetery land and became pretty well established when under the leadership of Judge Max Meltzer, Harry Perlis, Lou Seltz, Sam Stackell, William Alpert, Irving Alpert, William Steirman, Moe Hellman, Irving Mandel and Allan Bienstock they incorporated their lodge.

They were a community minded group and community welfare was their program. They shared in the relief of disasters that occurred on the East Side. The Forton Ladies Auxiliary have taken on the project of distributing Passover baskets to the needy. The lodge has created a scholarship fund for the deserving of the community and has concerned itself with the committee working for better hous-

ing. After some sixty years the lodge now has 320 members, among them Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz and Supreme Court Judge Samuel Spiegel. Harry Perlis a recent 20 alumni association president has been slated as the Forton Man of the Year for 1969. They maintain their club house at 301 East 14th St. in New York City.

Alumnus Irving Jacobson has developed an international reputation by his portrayal of Sancho Panza in *Man of La Mancha*. He has within a period of four years of the play's run, used up eleven Don Quixotes. Jacobson, despite a lifetime of comedy background chose not to present Sancho Panza as a funny man but as Miguel de Cervantes intended him, a simple peasant whose love and loyalty to his master Don Quixote moved many viewers to tears, watching them set out on their glorious quest to right wrongs, dreaming impossible dreams and reaching for unreachable stars.

When Lynda Johnson and her mother visited with Jacobson backstage Lynda remarked that her father could use a Sancho Panza in Washington, he answered with the now famous remark, "Well, I'm off on Mondays". Ethel and Robert Kennedy were both very much moved by Sancho and the senator was very much interested in Jacobson memorabilia which revealed him as a schoolmate of the senior senator Jacob Javits. When Ethel urged Sancho to persuade Robert to take a much needed haircut, Jacobson said, "Don't you do it Senator, you may yet have to play Sancho!" When Congressman Celler visited with him he revealed an in depth acquaintance with Cervantes.

Sensing the importance to the children of meeting and mixing with professional actors, Jacobson brought down to his school the principals of his *Men of La Mancha* company, Don Quixote (David Atkinson) and Dulcinea (Bernice Massey) to watch the children's glee club put on a miniature performance of the play and to mix with them, join in their singing and talk "theater". He also traveled to the St. Albans Hospital with members of the company to entertain service men returned from Vietnam.

Ben Bloom, alumnus and music publisher is proud of the photo of George Gershwin an old time student which reads "To Ben Bloom who gave me my first job in the music business". Ben Bloom delights in organizing with the help of the Brandt Pictures offices, parties to the movies for groups of children.

Out in Las Vegas alumnus Charles Kandel is one of the Sands Hotel executives. At the request of the Hon. Walter S. Baring M.C. one of the flags which had flown over the U.S. Capitol was presented to Kandel "in recognition of your outstanding service to your former comrades in arms and your patriotic service to your country". Kandel sent it to his old public school in New York City where it is exhibited for the children to see.

Kandel has made a special project of veteran welfare, rehabilitation and hospital assistance, and scholarships for youngsters of all faiths. He is national deputy rehabilitation officer of the Jewish War Veterans and a national aide de camp of Veterans of World War I. His interests have also included the American Cancer Society and the Shrine Club. He is a brother of the well known writer Aben Kandel.

Ralph D. Cole who heads the Consolidated Lithographing Corporation has made a special project of a multiple purposes certificate of commendation which carries on the very important recognition program which the alumni have fostered among faculty and alumni to intensify interest in the aims of their tradition. The principal uses them to encourage excellence in every direction by presenting them in public to the deserving.

The last reunion of the alumni held at the Statler-Hilton in New York City featured a tribute in honor of the birthday of the orga-

nization's founder, attorney and old time teacher, Nathaniel Phillips. The evening also paid tribute to its illustrious alumnus, Irving Caesar, world famous lyricist of "Swanee" and "Tea For Two". Participating in the tribute were Congressmen Leonard Farbstein and Emanuel Celler, and Harry Hershfield and Harry (Only in America) Golden and representatives of ASCAP.

The Pledge to the Flag used the music which Caesar had written and presented to the Congress in behalf of ASCAP. It was recalled that when the new song for the Pledge was introduced to the country at a joint session of Congress the Marine and Air Force Bands and the Singing Marine Sargeants participated. The entire Congress assembled faced towards the gallery and applauded a little East Side boy now grown to full manhood, Irving Caesar, the author of the nation's new song.

Principal Benjamin Falon continued the tradition of reissuing the diplomas to the 50th anniversary graduating class. The alumni are teacher minded and rose in recognition of the 90th birthday of their old principal. Dr. I. Edwin Goldwasser and the 80th birthday of their physical ed instructor Herman Brown. Peter J. Massaro, happy about the reunion offered this tribute to his home town New York City:

"She's mine—no matter where I roam. My well being is secure in knowing that she will be there when I return. Despite the hustle and bustle which annoy strangers, to me her sounds are the beat I need."

He is the proud possessor of a letter of appreciation from His Holiness Pope Paul VI for the Christmas prayer that he composed and sent titled "Carrillons on High Ring in His Praise." The reunion dinner was chaired by Jack Kamlet and m'cd by Judge Simon Silver, president of the organization.

You will recall the fact that Carl Sandburg, the poet laureate, was made part of the tradition of a New York East Side school. In impressive ceremonies a tablet was erected at the Anna Silver P.S. 20. The statement was obtained by alumnus Harry Golden, Sandburg's neighbor and biographer. It reads, "The restless and venturing human spirit of youth may perform tomorrow with exploits today called visionary and impossible. What the young people want and dream across the next hundred years will shape history and more than any other motivation to be named. The walls of this school might be saying, 'youth when lighted and alive and given a sporting chance is strong for struggle and not afraid of any toils or punishments or dangers or death.'" That statement prepared in 1961 reveals a timely admonition of the importance of our maintaining confidence in youth. To perpetuate the memory and ideals of the great poet laureate the Alumni will yearly vie for the honor of being the donors of the Carl Sandburg Memorial Prize to the student selected by the teachers as one who characterizes the teachings of the great poet laureate.

Margaret Sandburg, a daughter, writes from Connemara Farms in Flatrock, North Carolina that the resolution of North Carolina's Senator Ervin to make a national historic site of the Sandburg homestead passed both Houses by voice vote and obtained the President's signature. The Secretary of the Interior was authorized to acquire it. From Cleveland Helga Sandburg, the wife of Dr. Crile, has come a letter containing a poem "Addressed To A Father". It is a beautiful poem in tribute to Carl Sandburg and it is comforting to know that he has left us a heritage in a daughter who inherits his own great talent. She has sent it to the children of the school where a permanent Sandburg exhibit is being set-up. Part of the display in addition to the Sandburg plaque are the color photo sent by President Johnson of himself with Carl Sandburg. Through the

kindness of Kate Rodina Steichen there has been added a copy of the famous Sandburg Profiles which her father Edward Steichen took of his brother-in-law Sandburg. This is the poem "Addressed To A Father".

"I remember you in various ways;
The picture I have of you of those days
Differs perhaps from what you'd think it is.
Living is an unprobed game that children play
Since everyone else is doing it too.

"You sat on the house'stop above three stairways,
Your skin caging the sun with brassed felicity,
And spoke to me father's counsel
To which I gave little mind,
Though admiring your glad attitude, and being
Sure that the world was firm, since you held
Its reins so exceeding well. The smoke
Had gone from your cold clenched cigar;
The wood
Of the orange crate was hot to touch; in back
Of you the iron grill was flooded by a trumpet vine;
The tropical blooms hid clustering from
The sun which was stamped with your name,
Which belonged I knew to you.

"That was one thing, the sun; another was
Your voice humming as you descended uncounted stairs
To where the rest of us were at table.
Two mad beautiful Irish setters howling joy
Prefaced your arrival. A song started lusty
When you reached the second staircase; it might be,
'Everybody works at our house! But my old man!
The faces in the room went wheeling to your voice. Then

"Your affection for night, your walking through it,
Into its blackness where occasionally glowed
One evening star like a tiny sun
Or the beginning moon like a cobweb looped
Or an old sated one in a blue baze.

"For these thanks: the globe and bugle blooms, the red dogs
And song; the night that I hold on temporary loan."

A visit to the school would show that its corridor referred to as the P.S. 20 Alumni Hall contains a museum of the tradition that the alumni are so proud of and which they believe should serve as a shrine and a source of inspiration to the generations of children who will follow and will be guided by the standards which have been set.

The Hall of Fame tablet contains the 100 best names in the history of the school, honoring those who have succeeded in their vocations and who have served the community, and it is intended to acquaint future generations with the alumni with whom they share the school's tradition.

Exhibit cases show the works and the story of achievement of many of the alumni. The internationally famous muralist Lumen Martin Winter who designed the murals for the Air Force Chapel in Colorado Springs and the AFL-CIO Building in Washington created the mosaic glass Immigration mural which tells the story of the background of the students who came to the school. It contains the famous lines of Emma Lazarus—"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." John F. Kennedy's statement "America is a nation of immigrants, descendants of immigrants" emphasizes the ideology behind the school's

tradition. The most valued statement is probably the one that gave rise to the school's anthem "Ecce Quam Bonum, Quamque Jucundum Habitare Frates In Unum" which are the Latin words for that ideal that we all strive for—"Behold, How Good and How Pleasant It Is For Brethren To Dwell Together In Unity." Lumen Martin Winter recently donated a sketch of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy with the inscription that he was so proud of "Some men see things as they are and say why. I dream things that never were and say why not."

Noteworthy are the legends in brass on the marble walls by Emerson, Lincoln, John F. Kennedy and Silver. Uncannily the legends of presidents Lincoln and Kennedy were set together on the same wall, long before the tragic Kennedy incident—two men whose presidential lives contained many parallels. Worthy are the Lincoln statement "Let Us Have Faith That Right Makes Might And In That Faith Let Us To The End Date To Do Our Duty As We Understand It," and the Kennedy statement "And So My Fellow Americans, Ask Not What Your Country Can Do For you—Ask What You Can Do For Your Country."

The statement of Charles H. Silver who served for many years as president of the Board of Education contains a rich message—"Human Aspiration Reaches One Of The Highest Expressions In The Sacred And Noble Act Of Building A School. Because The Children Of Today Are The Parents Of Tomorrow There Are No Limits Of Time Or Distance To The Enrichment Of All Mankind Everywhere That Begins In A Single Classroom."

"Reaching the unreachable star" has become part of an inspiring vernacular. The inspiration of such an idea was already present in the school's slogan engraved on every graduation pin—Per Aspera Ad Astra.

Over 50 years ago the school had instituted the Davis School State. It honored a superintendent and its purpose was to give the children an opportunity to learn live civics by having them select judges and mayors for the upper grades and a governor, secretary of state and prosecuting attorneys. In a sense it catered to the desires of the immigrant population that was so anxious to do things the American way. As alumnus Harry (Only in America) Golden said in his New York Daily Column, "P.S. 20 is more than the repository for the names of successful sons sprung from the lower East Side. It represents one of the most visionary experiments in the history of human relationships, the making of an immigrant population into a citizen body politic. The teachers in public school 20 not only taught American History but shared it."

Note should be taken of the program of recognition and awards which were effective as an incentive to building alumni interest. The creation of the "Our Teacher Award" called attention to the service which retired men and women had given in a lifetime of teaching of children. At the instance of Senator Javits a joint resolution was introduced in the senate establishing National Teachers Recognition Day on the 4th Wednesday in April.

Alumni who had achieved notability and had served the community were awarded a "Certificate of Appreciation." The nostalgic sentiment of the alumni was captured by the idea of "Time for Another Diploma" when the members of the 50th Anniversary Class each were presented with a duplicate of their elementary school diploma very few of which were still extant among the alumni.

At the school restored as the Anna Silver P.S. 20 the faculty is tendered a luncheon annually by Mr. Silver and there is presented a community award by the faculty. Most recently Mrs. Rose Shapiro formerly the president of the Board of Education was presented with the award for her great in-

terest in the children of the New York City school system.

The Sandburg statement which the poet laureate had prepared for the school inspired other friends of the school to do some writing for presentation. Theodore Reade Nathan, the aide of Charles H. Silver, and Director of the Lincoln Square Academy which is interested in children talented in writing, composing, music, art and the performing arts, has created the poem "East Side Mother" in keeping with the concept of the school which was dedicated to Anna Silver the symbol of all East Side mothers.

"I'd gladly give up gold or fame
To seek again that poor place
Where when the hour of bedtime came,
I gazed up at my mother's face.

"The hours have gone, the days have fled
The years have washed away like sand . . .
I stand upon the shore of dread
And cannot find my mother's hand.

"What wisdom—oh, what wealth is there
To change that rumpled little fool—
Who pushed her fingers from his hair
Before he hurried off to school.

"She watched him on his way to class
Admonishing from up above:
'Be sure to let the horse-car pass'—
And so we heard the voice of love.

"The East Side Mother long ago
Gave us her strength, her faith, her youth—
Gave us the will to learn and grow
And so we know the voice of truth.

"Look down once more from where you are
To watch the children of our day,
And be again their guiding star—
Mother, help us find our way."

Smith and Dale, the internationally famous comedians and founders of the Avon Comedy Four, with its Dr. Kronkite and Mr. Dubious, met at the site of the original P.S. 20 when they ran into each other while riding on bicycles. They never graduated from their elementary school but they had many friends at the old school. In recent years they were made honorary members of the Alumni Association. In 1963 on the occasion of the dedication ceremonies of the new school building, after some sixty years, the Board of Education decided that their accomplishments had fulfilled the requirement for an elementary school diploma and Supt. Dr. Donovan presented them with a special diploma.

One of the honored guests participating in the dedication program was His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. In his remarks he congratulated Joe Smith and Charles Dale and referring to the elementary school diplomas which they had just received said, with a twinkle in his eye, "I hope that someday I will merit one of those."

Joe Smith who is an artist with a brush and with the poetic line was inspired by the Sandburg effort to add his contribution to the poetry of the day with his poem "Mothers of The East Side". "Go children, hurry! Don't be late for school. Be a steady scholar—learn the golden rule. Listen to your teachers—they are your safety shields. Helping to mold your youth, leading on to higher fields. We mothers of the East Side wholeheartedly attest to the integrity of your teachers to do their level best. We have faith in their system for better education. We have faith in their wisdom and allegiance to our Nation. So go children, hurry! Don't be late for school. Be a steady scholar and learn the golden rule."

So that we may joyfully sing "America, The Beautiful" and as has been our practice in the past, we pass on some words of value to our school successors. The full meaning maybe a bit advanced, yet deserving of enlightenment and explanation by their teachers.

"If each of us can be helped by science to live a hundred years, what will it profit us if our hates and fears, our loneliness and remorse will not permit us to enjoy them?"—David Neilsenwanger (Menninger Foundation)

"In approaching your fellow men hold these principles as your foremost guides—Sincerity, Kindness, Graciousness."

When Robert F. Kennedy was asked what he thought leadership was, he said it was the ability to inspire people to develop their best talents.

"Be mindful of the thoughtful courtesies of a gracious heart. It is strongly understanding of the feeling of others, never too busy to protect and enlarge the self-respect of the others person and build his ego."—Elizabeth Byrd.

"We want a better America, an America that will give its citizens, first of all, a higher and higher standard of living so that no child will cry for food in the midst of plenty. We want to have an America where the inventions of science will be at the disposal of every American family, not merely for the few who can afford them; an America that will have no sense of insecurity and which will make it possible for all groups, regardless of race, creed or color to live in friendship, to be real neighbors; an America that will carry its great mission of helping other countries to help themselves"—Sidney Hillman

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame, and Chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights speaks of the need of a vision. "Part of that vision must certainly include law and order. But, curiously enough one cannot really have law and order without another part of the vision: greater achievement of justice in our times, more compassion for all, real love between generations."

AIR SERVICE TO HAWAII

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the State of Hawaii has again been dealt a serious setback by still another delay, the fifth in as many months, in the advent of much-needed additional air service between the mainland and Hawaii. Other States have similarly suffered, the Congress and the American people deserve to know the cause of the delay, and to receive the administration's assurance that this delay will not continue indefinitely.

New mainland-Hawaii service can be implemented immediately as soon as the President decides the last remaining part of the international phase of the Trans-Pacific route case. The Civil Aeronautics Board made its recommendation weeks ago, but the administration's failure to act has resulted in repeated postponement of new additional service.

The administration, in one of its first official acts, decided to intervene in the Trans-Pacific route case on January 24, 1969—over 5 months ago. It asked the CAB for a further recommendation on April 11. After receiving that recommendation, it still has not acted.

To put this matter in perspective, it is ironic that it is taking the Nixon administration longer to decide the Trans-Pacific route case than to establish its position on the ABM.

There are literally thousands of people on the mainland United States who

would like to visit Hawaii, but who are unable to do so because of a lack of adequate airline capacity. Hotel occupancy in Hawaii is falling, and the economy of the State is being injured—needlessly. The airlines are prepared to provide the service which the Civil Aeronautics Board has determined is required in the public interest. Summer is usually the height of Hawaii's tourist season. Millions of dollars have been invested in tourist plant facilities. The employment of thousands of people are dependent upon an expansion of Hawaii's lifeline; namely, air service. An important segment of our Nation's travel economy is seriously threatened because of continued indecision by the administration.

In the meantime, none of the newly designated carriers has been able to fly a single mile. In anticipation of the starting date, airlines have kept offices open and staffs operating in Hawaii. However, the inauguration of the new carrier routes appears to be as uncertain and elusive today as it was in the days when Dwight D. Eisenhower was President and the original Pacific route case was canceled after being handed down.

A recent editorial in one of the Honolulu dailies sums up the entire situation very aptly in these words: "We deserve better from our Government."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure thousands of Americans share my sincere hope that the President will act promptly so that the Civil Aeronautics Board can proceed without further delay to authorize new mainland-Hawaii air service.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEICKER), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TALCOTT, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TUNNEY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEICKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. TAFT in four instances.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. WHALEN in three instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. CRAMER in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RIVERS in six instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. FALLON in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. WAGGONNER in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

Mr. BOLAND in three instances.

Mr. DULSKI in four instances.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. CONYERS in five instances.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. MIKVA in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. KOCH.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aili Kallio; and

S. 1011. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLAY. 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 296, 91st Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 7, 1969.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 296, the House adjourned until Monday, July 7, 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:

908. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program in Becker, Hubbard, and Mahanomen Counties, Minn., under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1954, as amended, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

909. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the second annual report of the Rochester Institute of Technology concerning the establishment and operation of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b)(3) of Public Law 89-36; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

910. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on Army and Air Force controls over inventories in Europe; to the Committee on Government Operations.

911. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, transmitting notification that the Council, operating for the Task Force on Uranium Enrichment, has commissioned a study on market aspects of possible future disposition of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission uranium enrichment facilities, pursuant to the provisions of 41 U.S.C. 252(c)(11); to the Committee on Government Operations.

912. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

913. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

914. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

915. A letter from the executive director, Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting notification that the association's annual audit for 1968 will be delayed beyond the specified filing date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

916. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 213(c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 12571. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY (by request):

H.R. 12572. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 12573. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 12574. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 12575. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reduction presently required on account of governmental pensions in the special monthly benefits payable thereunder to uninsured individuals at age 72 shall be made only to the extent that such pensions exceed specified amounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12576. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make health information available to the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 12577. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 12578. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12579. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for more effective protection of fish and wildlife resources from the effects of projects licensed by Federal agencies, and projects undertaken with Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12580. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DENT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MORGAN, and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 12581. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H.R. 12582. A bill to protect the privacy of depositors at insured banks and other institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 12583. A bill to amend section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to income tax collected at the source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 12584. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12585. A bill to secure bulk power supplies adequate to satisfy the mounting demands of the people of the United States, consistent with environmental protection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 12586. 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. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 12587. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12588. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with regard to the use of dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 12589. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to States in which Indian trust lands are located; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12590. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 12591. A bill to establish the Fossil Butte National Monument in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12592. A bill to require certification of operators of certain vessels on navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 804. 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. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 805. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H. Con. Res. 298. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the President should direct an immediate unconditional withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H. Res. 465. Resolution seeking agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights

of reentry vehicles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Res. 466. Resolution seeking agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights of reentry vehicles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. POWELL):

H. Res. 467. Resolution seeking agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights of reentry vehicles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ERLÉN-BORN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEITH, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MC EWEN, and Mr. MESKILL):

H. Res. 468. Resolution seeking agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights of reentry vehicles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MIZE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RUPE, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCWENGEL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ZWACH):

H. Res. 469. Resolution seeking agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights of reentry vehicles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12593. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Llobet Noguerai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 12594. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Gregory Levin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 12595. A bill for the relief of Maria Alicia Melindez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12596. A bill for the relief of Rosa Emilia Morales Molina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.