

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 28, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Frank Blackwelder, All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

*And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.—Joel 2: 28.*

Make us aware, Eternal God, of the pouring out of Thy spirit upon all flesh today, encouraging this Congress to legislate in Thy name. This is the first day of the rest of our lives. Grant that our actions, under Thy inspiration, may bring forth new times of hope, a new age of faith, and a new era of love, through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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 had passed a resolution, as follows:

## S. RES. 62

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Robert A. Everett, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now recess.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer, pursuant to Senate Resolution 62, appointed Mr. GORE and Mr. BAKER to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the Honorable Robert A. Everett, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

## VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House is highly honored today by a visit by the President of the United States. In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT INTO THE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. AL-

BERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair and the bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House meets again.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

*(At 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, escorted by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, entered the Chamber through the south door at the right of the Speaker's rostrum, and joined the Speaker in the Well of the House. The Minority Leader, the Majority Leader, the Speaker, and the President constituted the receiving line and Members formed in lines and filed into the Well to greet the President personally.*

*(At 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort and the Speaker, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.)*

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FASCELL) at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

## TO CLARIFY THE APPLICATION OF THE FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a constituent, I have introduced legislation today to correct an inequity prohibiting the payment of a family separation allowance to certain members of the uniformed services when movement of the member's dependents to a new permanent station is not authorized, and his dependents do not reside at or near his station.

A family separation allowance of \$30 a month is authorized for members of the uniformed services under 37 United States Code 427(b), when the movement of the member's dependents to his permanent station is not authorized at the expense of the United States, and the member's dependents do not reside at or near that station.

The Comptroller General of the United States has held that the family separation allowance is not payable during periods of involuntary separation of a member of the uniformed services from his family if his dependents are living in a residence not subject to the member's management and control, and for which he has no responsibility to maintain.

The bill I am introducing provides an amendment to the authorization, to provide that the family separation allowance will be paid without regard to whether the dependents are living in a

residence or household subject to management or control of the member.

There was considerable confusion in the military departments concerning the application of the provision of law and the Comptroller General's decision, and many payments have been made to dependents which the Comptroller General has held are not in accordance with the provision of law.

The Comptroller General has advised the Secretary of Defense by letter dated April 24, 1968—B-157586—that he will not insist on immediate discontinuance of payments in question, and that he will permit the military services to continue such payments until the matter is submitted to and considered by the Congress.

There was not sufficient time to consider this matter during the last session of the Congress, and while I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee, to which this legislation would be referred, I am introducing this bill today at the request of one of my constituents so that the Congress can correct this inequity at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the new administration will support this legislation as did the prior administration, and I am hopeful that the Armed Services Committee will schedule this bill for immediate consideration.

## ADDITIONAL GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18 POSITIONS

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will provide for additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the General Accounting Office, and the Library of Congress.

The bill further provides for the removal of the numerical limitation of the three top grades for the National Security Agency.

The FBI and GAO would receive 30 and 26 additional supergrades respectively, as reported in H.R. 15890 of the 90th Congress. The Library of Congress would be granted an increase of 32 positions, which was originally requested in H.R. 15890.

We, as legislators, have a responsibility to make sure these important agencies operate at a high rate of efficiency. The FBI and NSA involve the national security, while GAO and the Library of Congress are congressional agencies.

At the present time the FBI has 110 of the top three grades. An increase of 30 additional positions is justifiable. In recent years, the Bureau has expanded greatly in crime control and law enforcement.

Present crime trends indicate even greater responsibilities in the future. During the year 1967, the number of crimes known to the Bureau increased by 16 percent over 1966.

There is an urgent need for top professional personnel in the technological field of criminology. Scientific techniques

must be developed to prevent as well as to solve crimes.

The cost of meeting the challenge of crime is great. In fact, public expenditures for law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice were estimated at over \$4 billion per year by the President's Crime Commission.

In order to meet this challenge we must recruit the best people in the field. The only way that this can be done is to offer positions comparable to responsibility.

The National Security Agency must have a numerical limitations exemption on the number of positions for engineering and scientific purposes.

In 1962, Congress approved in Public Law 87-793 a provision of the Classification Act (5 U.S.C. 5108) which removes any numerical limitation on "engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine."

Thus, the numerical limitation applies to administrative, program, and policy positions in the Federal Government, but does not apply to scientific positions, most of which are in NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, and the Veterans' Administration. There are 2,930 such scientific positions in the Federal Government at the present time.

However, the Classification Act does not apply to the National Security Agency and therefore the scientific exemption contained in the Classification Act does not apply to NSA. NSA presently has 90 supergrade positions involving research and development functions in the agency, mainly cryptography.

The numerical limitation should be removed and the agency should enjoy the same scientific exemption from the numerical limitation which all other agencies of the Federal Government now enjoy. In order to qualify, the Secretary of Defense will need to approve the positions placed in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 by NSA and the qualifications of the proposed appointee.

At the present time there are 64 supergrade positions for the use of the General Accounting Office. Although these positions are allocated to the GAO independent of the general pool superintended by the Civil Service Commission, all appointments and position classifications are subject to the approval of the Commission.

Of the 26 new positions, 14 will be used for accounting, auditing, and investigative responsibilities on a Government-wide basis, and 12 will be assigned for legal, policy, technical, and administrative functions.

No money is better spent than that allocated to the General Accounting Office for its extremely effective work in auditing the books of the Government and in ascertaining that the policies and programs designed by the Congress are properly, fairly, and efficiently administered by the executive branch.

The GAO has been confronted with an increasing workload in major civilian agencies stemming from a growing economy and increasing requirements related

to space, research, atomic energy, education, postal services and operations, commerce, science, transportation, power and water resources, and other significant activities of Government-wide services.

The magnitude and complexity of the operations of the Department of Defense requires that GAO place extremely heavy responsibilities upon staff.

The Library of Congress is the national library of the United States and the research and development laboratory in library technology. It is of vital importance to the development of our intellectual community that this Library have the executive talent necessary to make it the finest Library in the world.

The use of automatic data processing equipment, inaugurated in 1963, is in a crucial period of development. Its successful development will make educational and library materials available on a nationwide basis so that in communities all over America research material and original manuscripts can be made available to scholars, scientists, students, and ordinary citizens immediately and inexpensively.

The Library of Congress cannot acquire an expert cataloger who is conversant in several foreign languages and a master of the librarian's art at a salary or grade below supergrade classifications.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide for the establishment of certain management, administrative, scientific, and research and development positions in the three highest Federal career service salary grades.

These are needed for the successful and efficient conduct of new and/or expanded programs and functions authorized by the Congress and other essential Government activities. I am hopeful that Congress will take favorable early action.

#### THE RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1969

(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 am pleased today to join my distinguished colleague, Representative LEE HAMILTON, and over 50 more of our colleagues in the House in introducing the Residency Voting Act of 1969, a bill designed to enable citizens who change their residences to vote in presidential elections.

Mr. Speaker, voting is a fundamental right in our democratic system of Government, and as a nation we have gone far toward securing this right for every American regardless of the color of his skin or his economic condition. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a milestone in the drive to extend the franchise to all of our citizens.

Yet Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Americans who are still deprived of their right to vote simply because they have moved their place of residence from one locality to another. These otherwise eligible voters are effectively disenfranchised because they are unable to satisfy the lengthy residence requirements which operate in many of our States and localities.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in June 1967, Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., noted that an estimated 5 to 8 million voters were disenfranchised by such residence requirements in the presidential election of 1960. For the 1964 election, he said that estimates of the number of these lost voters run as high as 15 million.

#### AMERICA A MOBILE SOCIETY

Contemporary America is a highly mobile society. Census data indicate that the mobility of our population has been steadily increasing with each decade of this century. Today more Americans than ever before move from one locality to another and from State to State in search of new job opportunities and a better life. It is estimated that one American in five changes his residence every year.

For such a mobile society, as President Johnson pointed out in a message to Congress on the "Political Process in America" in May 1967:

Election laws which impose unduly long residence requirements are obsolete. They serve only to create a new class of disenfranchised Americans.

Moreover, as the President further noted, to move freely about our country is a constitutionally protected right. The exercise of this right should not threaten the loss of another constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

A 1968 survey of State election laws by the Library of Congress indicates that 32 States and the District of Columbia impose State residence requirements of 1 year, 15 States require residence for 6 months, and three States require residence of 90 days. One State's election law requires a full 2 years of residence.

In recent years, it must be noted, certain States have enacted special election law provisions to facilitate voting in presidential elections by newly arrived citizens—and, in some instances, by former citizens. But in too many States archaic residence requirements continue to obstruct the right to vote for a great number of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Residency Voting Act of 1969 is designed to remedy this serious weakness in our electoral system by establishing uniform residence provisions with respect to presidential elections.

#### BILL APPLIES ONLY TO PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

I should make clear, Mr. Speaker, that the bill applies only to voting for President and Vice President and does not apply to elections for local and State offices or to elections for Senators or Representatives in Congress. The essential purpose of the legislation is to insure that every qualified American—no matter whether or when he has changed his residence—will at least have the opportunity to register and vote for the two national offices which are elected in common by the entire Nation—President and Vice President of the United States.

As Assistant Attorney General Vinson has pointed out:

Whatever the merits of residence requirements in elections for the Senate and House of Representatives, or in State or local elections, such requirements are hardly relevant in presidential elections, where the

issues are national and transcend local boundaries.

Clearly, the lines between States—or between political subdivisions—such as congressional districts, counties, or wards—within a State—bear no relation to the ability of a voter to inform himself about the principal issues and candidates involved in a presidential election.

#### MAIN FEATURES OF RESIDENCY VOTING ACT OF 1969

Let me explain the principal features of the Residency Voting Act of 1969.

Section 3(a) of the bill provides that a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of a State or political subdivision, may not be denied his vote for President and Vice President if he has been a resident of that State or political subdivision since September 1 preceding the presidential election. The citizen would, of course, have to comply with any voter registration requirements to the extent that they provide for registration after September 1.

The effect of this section, therefore, is to establish September 1 as the uniform qualifying date for presidential elections. State and local residence requirements would thereby be limited to a maximum of approximately 60 days.

The September 1 qualifying date, however, does not answer the problem of those citizens who move their residence after September 1 but before the date of a presidential election. To prevent the disenfranchisement of these citizens, section 3(a) contains an additional provision which states that if a citizen has begun residence in a State or political subdivision after September 1 preceding a presidential election, he shall be given the opportunity to register and vote in person or by absentee ballot in the State or political subdivision from which he most recently moved.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note here that while section 3(a) would require many States to alter their election laws with respect to the residency requirement, it would not in any way abrogate the legitimate interest of the States in maintaining orderly registration procedures, keeping their voting rolls up to date and preventing voting frauds.

Section 3(b) of the Residency Voting Act is addressed to the problem of arbitrary disenfranchisement among another group of American citizens—those temporarily residing abroad. All too often these citizens are denied the right to vote because of State registration requirements, particularly requirements for registration in person.

All but two of the States presently provide for voting by absentee ballot, but only 12 States permit absentee registration for citizens unconnected with the Armed Forces or Federal Government agencies. Thus many private citizens living overseas—such as businessmen, teachers, and students—are effectively disenfranchised because they are unable to register in person.

Section 3(b) would remedy this situation by requiring any State which permits absentee voting in presidential elections to provide an absentee registration

procedure as well. In doing so, section 3(b) would substantially reinforce a measure enacted by the 90th Congress—H.R. 8176, which I sponsored in the House and which amended the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 to recommend to the 50 States that they extend to their private citizens who are temporarily residing abroad and to their families the right to register and vote absentee.

#### A MATTER OF JUSTICE

Simple and convenient procedures for absentee registration and voting are now generally available to members of the Armed Forces, the merchant marines, and civilians employed overseas by the Federal Government and their families. It is a simple matter of justice that we should now take the necessary action to extend the same privileges to the many thousands of private American citizens who are temporarily residing overseas.

The League for Americans Residing Abroad has indicated that the best estimate of the total number of Americans overseas is near 1.5 million. And this number will certainly increase with the continued expansion of American business and cultural activities abroad. Whether or not these citizens should have the right to participate in all Federal, State, and local elections, they most definitely should be entitled to vote in the national elections for President and Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, the Residency Voting Act of 1969 proposes a long and dramatic step toward eliminating needless disenfranchisement among a great number of our fellow citizens. It seeks, first, to implement the conclusion of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation 6 years ago that:

No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements.

The proposed statute also seeks to guarantee the right to register and vote for Americans who happen to be living outside the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members will give close consideration to this important legislation and support its passage in the 91st Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the Residency Voting Act along with an editorial on the subject of this legislation from the New York Times of November 20, 1968:

#### H.R. 4794

A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That this Act may be cited as the "Residency Voting Act of 1969."*

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby declares that to enhance the right under the Fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of citizens who change their residences to enjoy equal access to the right to vote in the election for President and Vice President of the United States, it is necessary to prohibit the States

from conditioning the right to vote on the fulfillment of certain requirements of residence or registration.

Sec. 3. (a) No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote in any State or political subdivision in any election for President and Vice President of the United States shall be denied the right to vote in such election because of any requirement of residence or registration of such State or political subdivision if such citizen has resided in such State or political subdivision since the first day of September next preceding such election and has complied with the requirements of registration to the extent that such requirements provide for registration after such date. If such citizen has begun residence in a State or political subdivision after the first day of September next preceding an election referred to in the preceding sentence and does not satisfy the residence requirements of such State or political subdivision, then he shall be allowed to vote either in person or by absentee ballot in the State or political subdivision from which he most recently moved if, but for his nonresident status, he has satisfied, as of the date of such move, the requirements to vote in the State or political subdivision from which he most recently moved.

(b) No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote by absentee ballot in any State or political subdivision in any election for President and Vice President of the United States shall be denied the right to vote in such election because of any requirement of registration that does not include a provision for absentee registration.

Sec. 4. (a) In the exercise of the powers of the Congress under section 5 of the Fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to institute in the name of the United States actions, including actions against States or political subdivisions, for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief to restrain the enforcement or execution of any residence or registration requirements which, in his judgment, interfere with the provisions or purposes of this Act.

(b) Proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be heard and determined by a three-judge district court in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code, and any appeal shall lie directly to the Supreme Court. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

Sec. 5. (a) Whenever any person has engaged, or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage, in any act or practice in violation of the rights conferred by section 3, the Attorney General is authorized to institute in the name of the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them to (1) permit persons benefitted by this Act to vote and (2) count such votes.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether a person granted rights under the provisions of this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

Sec. 6. (a) Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in a State or political subdivision for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote under this Act, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging such individual's false registration or illegal voting under this Act shall be fined not more than

\$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever shall deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by this Act shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 20, 1968]

#### FIVE MILLION DEPRIVED VOTERS

Five years ago President Kennedy's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation declared: "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet state residence requirements." Since then a number of states including New York have taken steps to make it easier for new citizens—or, in some cases, for former citizens—to participate in Presidential balloting.

But the obstacles to voting remain formidable in many places for the one in five Americans who move each year. Mississippi maintains a two-year residence requirement. In 32 states and the District of Columbia, one year's residence is required. An estimated five to six million otherwise eligible voters were barred in this manner from participation in the recent Presidential choice, a choice that was decided by a scant margin.

In the interest of fair play and truly representative elections, citizens of every state that still obstructs the right to vote through antiquated residency restrictions should press their legislatures for prompt corrective action. But the question of qualifications for choosing national officials is more than just a local issue, as the Supreme Court has begun to recognize in recent decisions.

The most reliable way to insure that every qualified American will have a right to participate in the Presidential choice is through Congressional action setting reasonable and uniform standards for the entire nation. Such legislation was submitted by the Administration to the Congress during the last session in Senate Bill 1881. This measure, which never got beyond the hearings stage in the Senate, required that no citizen otherwise qualified be denied the right to vote for Presidential electors providing he had resided in a state since the first day of September preceding the election. This, or similar legislation, demands attention from the new Congress.

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONSUMERS COUNSEL ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Intergovernmental Consumers Counsel Act of 1969, a bill designed to modernize the regulation of the major electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph utilities.

The bill has four principal objectives: First, to require utilities to report to regulatory bodies information which is pertinent to utility regulation and to the understanding of utility rates and procedures. Second, to require the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Communications Commission to report this information to Congress and the public in a timely and convenient manner, using automatic data processing to the fullest extent possible. Third, to establish, at the Federal, State, and local levels, offices of Utility Consumers Council, to represent the interests of utility

consumers before regulatory commissions and courts. Fourth, to establish a grant program to finance study of regulatory matters.

For too long now we have allowed the utility companies to operate in nearly an autonomous fashion. Repeated power failures and high costs have been a part of the New England regions dealings with the utilities. In the Providence Journal of January 12, 1969, Irvin Becker, in an article, entitled "Can the State Change Its Outdated System of Regulating Utilities?" documents how utilities in Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, and Massachusetts are earning well over the "allowed" rate of return. He reports "it is difficult to find a major rate setting decision in the area since 1958"—11 years ago. He found the utility expert working for the utility companies, not for the public, and the university community—which used to furnish scholarship and leadership for the public in this field—unconcerned.

New England's electric rates are the highest in the Nation. The Federal Power Commission and most State utility commissions have agreed that a reasonable profit is slightly more than 6 percent. The FPC, when it computes the "overcharge" or "difference" earned by the power companies, uses a 6-percent figure to establish a fair rate of return. Becker noted that the power industries have ignored the rate ceilings and compiled record profits in the absence of State controls.

In the Providence area, Blackstone Valley Electric and Newport Electric are making returns of close to 8 percent. The Federal Power Commission calculated that if those two firms had been held to returns of 6 percent, their customers would have been saved an "overcharge" of about \$600,000 in 1966.

It has been pointed out that last year, in a review of corporate profits, the First National City Bank in New York estimated that all utilities have twice the return on their net worth than has the volatile transportation industry.

In State after State, the utilities have dominated the State commissions that are supposed to regulate them. Richard J. Connally, in an article in the Boston Globe on January 6, 1969, pointed out that—

Regulatory agencies at all levels of government often become so close to the organizations they were created to police that they become ineffective.

It is my hope that with the enactment of this bill we can help make the utility companies more responsive to a growing segment of the public that is becoming increasingly aware of the neglected responsibilities of these companies. The advent of nuclear power, the growing tendency toward regional compacts, and the inability of the separate States to control the wealthy power companies casts a grave doubt over the efficacy of several proposed reforms and reorganizations of utility regulations in several States.

The utility companies are not responsible to any electorate although they have several characteristics of government, including boundaries, as States and nations do, the right of eminent do-

main and the power to require public payments through rate adjustments just as States replenish their funds through the levying of taxes.

There is, however, no public control over their actions. Regulation is supposed to be a substitute for the absence of public control. This bill, the Utility Consumers Counsel Act of 1969, will help to make this regulation more meaningful.

In addition, I urge the private and public utilities, not only in New England but throughout the country, to plan and coordinate their future development in order that the public can be assured reliable and economical power. The public has a right to reliable and low-cost utilities and should not have to settle for less.

The article from the Boston Globe mentioned above and an article from the Providence Journal follow:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Jan. 6, 1969]

#### DPU OVERPOWERED BY COMPANIES, NEGLECTED BY STATE—UTILITIES HAVE TOO MUCH PULL, TOO MUCH CASH

(By Richard J. Connally)

Is the Massachusetts consumer adequately protected by his Public Utilities Department?

The question drew a smile from the career employee of the DPU. He had been around long enough to know the answer.

"The companies," he said, "have too many resources and too much influence with the commissioners."

"They all wear halos, although they are green around the edges at times," he said of the utilities.

The Massachusetts DPU, he explained, has neither the time nor resources to properly investigate the utilities, which prepare their cases with the consumers' dollars.

Few consumers have the time or confidence to appear before the DPU to oppose the utilities.

The magnitude of the electric industry alone and the extent of the power failures in the past week or so should show the inability of the DPU to keep close tabs on utility operations and delve into the cause of the blackouts without relying on the reports of the utilities.

The DPU's chief accountant, Harold F. Bertolucci, serves as a good example of the lack of sufficient personnel and the dedication of some DPU employees who are underpaid and overworked. He earns \$11,752 annually, figure he could double in private industry.

A DPU employee for 22 years, he is a registered public accountant, holds a Boston University degree in accounting, a master's in both economics and law and is a member of the bar.

Bertolucci supervises the examination and audit of accounting returns and schedules filed by companies under the DPU's jurisdiction.

Among them:

Sixteen railroads, 10 street railways, six phone companies, 26 gas firms, 14 electric companies, 2599 motor carriers of property, 816 security brokers and investment trusts, 63 water companies, 78 motor bus lines, 40 municipal light plants, 530 regular route common carriers, 7013 irregular route common carriers and 7422 interstate licensed carriers.

He specializes in the systems of accounts used by all of those firms. He must be familiar with administrative law and with the type of equipment used by the utilities as well as their financing methods.

Bertolucci's duties are important to the protection of the consumer. He prepares drafts of decisions and rulings issued by the DPU concerning fiscal and rate cases.

**TWO EMPLOYEES**

With all this responsibility and with a primary function in the establishment of utility rate schedules, Bertolucci has only two employees in his office—another accountant and a woman who handles clerical work.

When the other man is in the field and the woman is sick or on vacation, Bertolucci must eat his lunch at his desk. He cannot go out because nobody is available to answer the telephone.

John W. Coughlin, who has been with the DPU for nearly 20 years, is director of the division of telephone and telegraph utilities. His task is to direct the investigation of complaints about telephone and telegraph service and to examine equipment to make sure it meets DPU requirements.

His job requires a thorough knowledge of laws and regulations relating to telephone and telegraph services, of rate structures and of the mechanical operation of telephone and telegraph equipment.

**LACK OF YOUTH**

Coughlin has no clerical help. He must write the division's letters. He must keep one inspector in the office each day to answer the telephone, handle complaints and assist with the once duties.

DPU Chairman Helen P. Ross also lacks clerical help. She shares a confidential secretary with six other commissioners and two lawyers. On a recent night, Miss Ross wrote 22 letters at home.

Staff and sufficient funds are needed. But the biggest deficiency is in youth. Much of the personnel is a product of the depression years. They have talent but are aging. Of six engineers, the youngest is 53.

The salary structure is unattractive. Even if young talent could be recruited (there is no recruitment program) Civil Service procedures discourage applicants.

"It may take a whole year to fill a job," one division head noted.

"If you try to fill the job temporarily, you're liable to get a politician who is worthless. If you get someone who can do a good job, he can get bumped by a veteran or a disabled veteran," he said.

"This department, like others in the state, is in real trouble," he continued. "Talented young men and women are not coming into state service because they can make more money in private industry."

Numbers are not the only answer. Because of the complexity of its task and the need to regulate highly technical industries, the DPU must have knowledgeable personnel.

The Massachusetts DPU, like other state regulatory agencies, has failed to use data processing methods, unlike the utility firms it is empowered to regulate.

Rate bases, income and rates of return are checked. But, in the opinion of one DPU official, the analysis of statistical data and comparisons are the exception. Not enough attention is paid to the cost of a utility's operation.

U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf of Montana, long a critic of investor-owned utilities, which he refers to as the "I.O.U.'s," says that state regulatory commissions are one of the most important—yet most neglected—parts of government.

Metcalf has reminded state commissions that they must keep the public informed of utility operations and must protect the consumer who cannot purchase power, water or telephone service in the open market.

**EXTRAVAGANCE?**

"Commissions should probe into the financial figures of the utilities to find where the money goes, whether there is extravagance, whether the public is overcharged, whether the consumer's dollar is used for political purposes or endeavors which the consumer does not favor."

Sen. Metcalf has said of some regulatory commissions:

"Responsible for the protection of the public interest in many and diverse fields, but lacking the staff and funds with which to exercise their responsibility, some commissions are able to do little more than accept and approve what is put before them by the hundreds of companies under their jurisdiction."

"Thus most rate changes are initiated by the utilities and simply approved by the commissions, which are not equipped to inquire into the reasonableness of the rates. . . . Consumers are paying dearly for the regulation that protects and benefits the investor-owned utilities at the expense of their regulated customers."

In the opinion of Sen. Metcalf, the electric consumer, for example, is caught in a vicious circle.

"He cannot obtain adequate rate reductions because many regulatory commissions do not have the staff nor inclination to reduce rates, due to the political and propaganda activities of the utilities, which are designed to prevent adequate rate reductions," Metcalf said.

Past and present DPU commissioners in Massachusetts have not been especially active on Beacon Hill in efforts to obtain more money, power, and staff to do a better job.

Even if they were, they would encounter opposition, not openly, of course, from the most powerful lobby on The Hill—that of the private utilities.

By neglecting the DPU, by not giving it enough tax dollars to do an adequate job, by not demanding tip-top efficiency, the public has cheated itself as a taxpayer and consumer.

**CAN THE STATE CHANGE ITS OUTDATED SYSTEM OF REGULATING UTILITIES?**

(By Irwin Becker)

The election of Frank Litch as governor presents the state with a rare opportunity to overhaul its outdated utilities regulation system.

Mr. Litch made the subject of utilities one of his major campaign issues as he urged a three-member, non-partisan commission to replace the current administrator.

Despite the move toward reform, the central question remains: Can a regulatory agency on the state level cope with a problem that is regional and national in scope?

The local division of public utilities has said that it is understaffed, poorly paid and encumbered with reviewing the activities of more than 60 firms ranging in size from small taxi companies to large electric power complexes.

In the hedge-podge of hearings and decisions that crowd the agency's schedule, it is not unusual for more time to be spent on deciding whether to restore telephone service after bookie raids than in reviewing the accounts of the multi-million-dollar telephone company operations.

The system is further weakened by the advantage enjoyed by the large utilities which, with customer money, can afford the best talent to argue persuasively for higher rates that the public will have to pay.

**COMPANIES STRONG**

Many feel that the utilities division, as in many other states, is so poorly equipped that the utilities companies are able, in effect, to dictate the manner and the terms under which they are supposedly regulated.

"In many states, it is regulation of the customer, not of the utility," Sen. Lee Metcalf of Montana, a strong critic of the electric power industry, has argued in numerous speeches.

The status of the electric companies is central to any discussion of controlling the utilities and this is especially so in New England, where electric rates are the nation's highest.

Utility regulation consists basically of de-

termining a reasonable profit for the risk-free, government protected industry. The exact amount differs in each case, but the Federal Power Commission and most state commissions have agreed that slightly more than a six per cent return is reasonable enough.

The FPC, when it computes the "overcharge" or "difference" earned by the power companies, uses the six per cent figure to establish a fair rate of return.

**NOT ENFORCED**

In 1957, the average rate of return set by the states was 6.14 per cent, which is a percentage based on a utility's plant investment and other economic factors.

But significantly, the states have not enforced their own profit limits and the major investor-owned electric companies earned an actual profit last year that averaged 7.44 per cent.

Some firms, operating in southern and western states, achieved a return on their investment of more than 15 per cent, which is higher than most competitive and risk corporations earn.

The difference between the established and actual returns or profits is only 1.30 per cent but the loss to customers runs into billions of dollars.

For example, a company that has a one-billion-dollar investment would get 10-million dollars less in revenues if its profit ratio dropped one per cent.

The Consumer Federation of America estimated that if the average cost for a kilowatt hour fell one-tenth of a cent this year, residential users would have saved 1.3-billion-dollars.

**CEILING IGNORED**

In New England, the regulatory gap is not as severe as in Texas, which has no utilities agency, but it is still a serious problem. Hardly any of the states in this region have initiated rate cases. The important issues of control of atomic energy and reliability of electric power are decided out of view and control of the states.

It is difficult to find a major rate-setting decision in the area since 1958. For some reason, there were rate hearings throughout the region in the 1957-58 period. The last utility rate cases in Rhode Island, concerning New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Narragansett Electric, were in 1957.

During this lapse of state control, the power industry ignored the rate ceilings and compiled record profits.

In Massachusetts, the rate of return for Boston Edison was set at 5.7 per cent in 1958. According to the FPC, the Boston firm earned 7.75 per cent in 1966.

In Maine, the profit margin of the Central Maine Power Co. was established at 5.75 per cent. Its current income return is 6.56 per cent.

In Connecticut, the three power companies—Connecticut Light and Power, Hartford Electric Light and United Illuminating—earned an average return of nearly 7.40 percent.

**EIGHT PERCENT**

In the Providence area, Blackstone Valley Electric and Newport Electric are making returns of close to eight per cent. The FPC calculated that if those two firms had been held to returns of six per cent their customers would have been saved an "overcharge" of about \$600,000 in 1966.

Last year, in a review of corporate profits, the First National City Bank in New York estimated that all utilities have twice the return on their net worth than has the volatile transportation industry.

The electric companies offer several arguments in their defense. They claim the cost of money is constantly increasing, that they face competition from gas and oil interests, that they need high profits to attract investors and, that unlike municipal companies or federal projects, they pay a large amount of income taxes.

Further, the companies contend that the cost of electricity is decreasing all the time and they are making heavy investments in modern nuclear equipment so that the cost will go down even faster.

But industry critics maintain that the electric industry's contentions are phantom objections when they are viewed closely.

The cost of money argument is one instance. The industry contends that the cost of borrowing for investment is over six per cent and that this should be used to decide a fair rate of return.

The critics note that while the prime rate is now about six and a half per cent, what complaint did the industry have when the interest rates were half that 10 years ago. Would the utilities have reduced their profit margins to three per cent? They ask.

In addition, the cost of money is misleading, the critics observe. The real cost of money to a utility is the long-term interest it must pay on its bonded debt which comprises more than half its capitalization.

The latest annual FPC report states: "The average interest rate on the companies long-term debt reached a record high of four per cent in 1967." The report continues:

#### TAX MONEY CITED

"Much of the present debt capital of the stronger electric utilities was obtained in the 1946-56 decade when borrowing rates considerably below four per cent were prevalent."

On the question of competition, observers believe that the electric companies, the nation's largest industry in terms of value, have advantages over its rivals.

Because of excess profits, the critics assert, the electric firms can cut their prices, provide customer bonuses and absorb the loss without materially affecting their profits.

One of the electric companies' most potent arguments in terms of public relations has been their insistence that they are taxpayers like everyone else and that their tax money is vital to the operation of municipal governments.

The misunderstanding on electric company taxes is based on the confusion of who is paying the money—the utility or the customer.

Several favorable tax amendments in recent years have reduced the percentage of revenues the electric industry pays in federal taxes from 14.7 per cent in 1965 to 11.6 per cent in 1967. In many cases, the savings have not been passed on to customers.

Utilities include taxes in their operating expenses and these expenses are met by collecting the levy from customers. As Senator Metcalf has charged:

"Utilities are not taxpayers. They are tax collectors. When utility taxes are decreased, as they have been frequently, many utilities do not automatically reduce rates. They thus become tax keepers."

Dr. Horace M. Gray, emeritus professor of economics at the University of Illinois, quoted in the Congressional Record, maintains that the electric industry will profit from the recently imposed 10 per cent surtax.

#### PROFITS SEEN

He argues that the industry will have to pay \$400,000 on the new charge but will probably collect twice that amount and pocket the difference.

Income and tax figures since the surtax went into effect are not available to affirm or contest the professor's remarks.

The cost of electricity to consumers has indeed gone down since World War I. The cost per kilowatt in 1967 dropped three cents to \$2.31 but the average annual bill increased \$5 to \$120. That hike is attributed to the increased usage by each family.

The challenge of cheap federal power and the government's 2-million dollar research investment in nuclear power has revolutionized power production. The electric industry is planning a huge outlay in the next 10

years to construct about 66 nuclear plants with a capacity of 51.5 million kilowatts.

Again, rush of the companies' into nuclear generation has riled the critics. They contend that the public paid for the development of the new power, but that the control over nuclear energy is being "handed over" to private industry.

Moreover, the critics charge that the cooperatives and the municipally owned companies, which provide 14 percent of the power needs in New England, are being excluded from sharing equitably in the distribution and profits of the new energy source.

#### PROBLEMS LISTED

Thus, the advent of nuclear power, the growing tendency toward regional mergers and the inability of the separate states to control the wealthy power companies cast a grave doubt over the efficacy of the proposed reorganization of utilities regulation in Rhode Island.

Dennis J. Roberts II, nephew of the former governor who is working on a utilities report for Governor Licht, admits there are difficulties to overcome if a revamped system is to be effective.

He said the initial plan on reforming the utilities division included a three-member panel with overlapping terms filled with "apolitical" appointees.

The commission should be "judicial" in nature and have the use of experts, Mr. Roberts said. He said that there is sufficient legislation now for a utilities commission to carry on its work.

He added that "some thought has been given to regionalizing or setting up a compact." Mr. Roberts said there does not seem to be any liaison among the utility divisions in New England, many of which are dealing with different offshoots of the same companies.

The new commission, he asserted, "should be aggressive in its regulatory mission. You can do quite a bit under the present law," he remarked, but very little had been done with the current setup.

"I don't think there has been a hearing of the (state's) own volition in 10 years. This is not a way to regulate utilities," he said.

He conceded, however, that a new regulatory system will run into the "very real problem" of money. "Good solid people would have to take a substantial cut in pay," he explained.

Another handicap is that utility experts are all working for the utility companies, and the universities do not have specialists who are concerned about the power monopolies.

Essentially, Mr. Roberts said, the state must settle the "question of priorities" and determine if it is "willing to spend the money" that would have to be taken from other programs.

#### COUNSEL URGED

Another attempt at reform is just getting started in Massachusetts, where the Consumers' Council has assailed the electric companies with overcharging Bay State residents a total of \$1 million dollars last year.

The charge was made by Dr. Edward R. Willett, council chairman, who said the council would sponsor legislation assessing gas and electric companies for funds to study rate systems and make competitive bidding mandatory in certain contracts.

A council spokesman suggested that provisions of the FPC law allow an investigation of a region's utility problems if the state agencies in the area request a probe.

Another change the council favors is the appointment of a utilities counsel, who would work with the regulatory commission and represent the public in rate cases.

Maryland is the only state with a utilities counsel and efforts at the federal level to provide funds for the position have been defeated in Congress.

The Utility Consumer Counsel Bill, intro-

duced by Senator Metcalf, required the reporting of additional financial information by the utilities, including stock ownership and stock option plans.

The bill would have made federal funds available for up to 75 per cent of the cost of establishing utility counsels in cities with more than 100,000 population and at state and national levels.

The legislation contained a provision to start a grant program for a continuing study of regulatory issues, the money for the new programs would have come from the utilities, which were to be taxed at the rate of one-tenth of one per cent of their operating revenues.

Senator Metcalf maintained it was fair for the utilities to pay for their own regulation since the government paid four-billion of the industry's annual \$4 billion dollars in revenues.

#### SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

**THE SPEAKER.** The Chair understands that one Member-elect is present who has not as yet had the oath of office administered. Will the Member-elect appear in the well for the purpose of having the oath administered to him.

Mr. HANNA appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

#### THE DISPLAY OF BESTIALITY IN IRAQ YESTERDAY

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

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, eight Jews and six others were hanged in Iraq yesterday in a public display of bestiality reminiscent of the days of the Nazis.

When several airplanes were destroyed in Lebanon we heard cries of anguish throughout the world. Is this same world less concerned about the destruction of human lives than of property? If we are more concerned about humans than of property, then we dare not stand mute in the face of this return to the age of barbarity. If we remain silent, there is a likelihood that our silence may encourage further such acts against others imprisoned for alleged espionage which, it is charged was committed by Jews who were under house arrest since 1967.

Private pleas to stop this mass murder have been proved to no avail.

I trust that the civilized world and our Government will raise objection more vocal than has been done to date to avoid further such savagery.

Only a roar of condemnation that will descend about the heads of the rulers of the Iraqi Government will, in my opinion, prevent similar acts of mass murder and further destruction of innocent human souls for similar false reasons.

#### URGENT NEED FOR EARLY ACTION ON COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY LEGISLATION

(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, at 6:55 a.m., at the break of dawn today, a portion of the roof fell in No. 7 Christopher Coal Co. mine near

Mount Morris, Pa., on the Pennsylvania-West Virginia border, triggering an electrical fire which trapped a number of men.

Within the last 15 minutes, fortunately, it has been officially announced that the last of the men have successfully and safely emerged from the burning mine.

The fiery near disaster underscores the urgent need for early passage of coal mine health and safety legislation. I make a plea to the chairman of the appropriate committees of both this body and the other body to start hearings on the proposed coal mine health and safety legislation at the earliest possible date. Each day that passes subjects the coal miners to new dangers of being crushed, burned, buried or gassed, as well as being exposed to the ravages of the deadly pneumoconiosis—black lung.

The Congress can no longer afford to delay. We cannot afford to fiddle while coal miners burn. In the name of humanity, this Congress must act to pass effective legislation on coal mine health and safety.

#### PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: DR. PHILIP HANDLER

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Philip Handler, James B. Duke professor and chairman, Department of Biochemistry, Duke University, has been declared president-elect of the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Handler, who is 51, will begin a 6-year term as the 18th president of the Academy on July 1. He succeeds Frederick Seitz, who has served in that position since 1962. Dr. Seitz was named president of the Rockefeller University in 1968 and will be serving in both capacities until Dr. Handler takes office.

The announcement was made January 17 by Dr. Detlev W. Bronk at a luncheon in the State Department Building honoring the winners of the National Medal of Science. Dr. Bronk, who was one of the medalists, was president of the Academy from 1950 to 1962.

Dr. Handler has not only had a distinguished career in enzyme research but has also played an energetic role in national scientific affairs in recent years. He has been a member of the National Science Board since 1962 and chairman since 1966. From 1964 to 1967 he was a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

The National Academy of Sciences is a private organization, established in 1863 by an act of Congress to elect to membership the outstanding scientists and engineers in the Nation and to serve as an independent adviser to the Federal Government on questions of science and technology. Its present membership is over 800, but its advisory activities involve more than 5,000 scientists and engineers, as well as a staff of more than 750. Its annual budget, including that of the National Research Council which

serves as its principal operating agency, is over \$25,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring out at this point that Dr. Handler has been both an effective and distinguished friend and adviser not only to the Congress in general but to the committee in particular.

Because he is chairman of the National Science Board, we have had reason to be in close liaison with Dr. Handler and we have benefited very considerably from our collaborations with him—formal and informal.

It is with genuine pleasure that I and, I am sure, all the other members of the Science Committee take cognizance of Dr. Handler's election to the Academy presidency. We confidently hope to continue our working relationship with Dr. Handler in his new capacity. We are indeed fortunate to be able to do so.

#### IRAQ WEARS THE MARK OF CAIN

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Hitler's hand has reached from Gehenna and sprung the trap from under those innocent victims Iraq has just put to death. Clear and visible upon the brow of Babylon is the mark of Cain. There is no defense for what they have done.

It is one thing to make war. It is another to come in stealth across a nation's borders at night to murder, destroy, and burn. It is again another to threaten that nation's very existence, up to and including genocide. All this and more have the Arabs done or threatened to do to Israel.

But what the Iraqis have perpetrated here is solely an act of murder against a group of Iraqi citizens because they happened to be Jews. This is an act straight out of the Gotterdammerung of the Wagnerian twilight of Nazi Germany.

Mark well the methods utilized by Iraq. Public execution, a method long ago dispensed with by civilized nations, who extend even to the condemned the right to die privately. But the Iraqis tore a page from the book of the Middle Ages.

Not content with this barbarism, they draped a sign around the neck of each of the condemned, noting his religion—Mr. Speaker, his religion. If this is not damning proof of the reason for their execution, then there can be none. So much for the Arab argument that they make war only upon Zionism, rather than upon the religious faith of Judaism.

The next act of this brutal and gory scenario involves the public display of the hanged men. I am certain their families have had this marked indelibly upon their memories. I can only recall the hostages suspended from lampposts after their execution by the S.S. in a dozen different European countries during World War II. It calls to mind the horrors of Lidice, Malmedy, Babi Yar and Belsen.

But the final act was the most revolting. Iraq was not content with going back to the Middle Ages or even the Dark Ages. She was not even content with Hitler's methods. She instead reached back to the

mists of man's tribal history as she removed the bodies and hanged them from a gate overlooking the capital city of Babylon. How horrible. How degrading to the human spirit. How demeaning for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, where is the action of the U.N.? Where are the howls of indignation to match those we heard when the Israelis destroyed planes at Beirut? Everywhere throughout the Arab world the Jewish remnant languishes in prisons or lives in fear of a repetition of this atrocity. Where are those who condemned Israel for fighting to stay alive? Where are the bleeding hearts of yesterday? Where indeed.

They are in the same place they were in when the Jews were massacred for the 2,000 years of the Diaspora. They are gone. They are where they were when Jews were butchered by the Crusaders and the Turks—by the Inquisition and the Moors—by the Czars and the Soviets—by the Nazis at Auschwitz and the synagogue burners in New York City.

Where is the conscience of the world? Where is the guilt of mankind? Where is the idealism the bible and organized religion speaks of? Where is the humanity of the holy Koran? Where are the honorable and compassionate men?

Mr. Speaker, a nation and a people have a right to live, including defending that right by violence and bloodshed. This applies to Israel and the Jewish people as well as to all others on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Attorney General to open our gates to the agonized remnants of the Jewish communities of the Arab States. In this emergency I call upon the United Nations to negotiate the release of those Jews in these lands who wish to depart from their bed of agony and torment. This is a simple humanitarian gesture that is practical and easily arranged. Further, it is a perfect outlet for the Arab States. They accuse many of their Jewish citizens of being Israel spies. This is their opportunity to easily, cheaply, and quickly be rid of any more potential Israeli spies and Jewish martyrs. Because Israel was founded as a refuge for the persecuted, these Jews are automatically Israeli citizens if they choose to go to Israel. Further, the immigration quotas for these Arab States to our own country are, I am sure, not filled; they would easily accommodate these pitiful refugees, if they were allowed to go. The choice is simple and the chance to act is now.

#### WILLIAM M. McMILLAN

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

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, on December 30, 1968, the postal service and this Nation lost, through retirement, a truly outstanding and dedicated public servant—William M. McMillan, Assistant Postmaster General for Operations.

I suppose it was destined that a man who was born in a town named for the first Postmaster General—Ben Franklin, Tex.—and who chose to make the postal

service his career, should become one of the most respected and knowledgeable officials ever to serve the U.S. postal service.

Mr. McMillan started his career as a substitute clerk in the post office in Albany, Tex., on July 1, 1927, and over a span of 41½ years rose successfully through the ranks to be a postal inspector, inspector-in-charge of the Fort Worth inspection service, regional director of the Wichita and Dallas postal regions, and finally in February of 1964 was nominated by President Johnson and confirmed by the Senate to be the Assistant Postmaster General for Operations. During his 5 years in this position, he was responsible for the collection, handling, and delivery of nearly 400 billion pieces of mail, employing over 700,000 people in over 34,000 post offices throughout the United States.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Treasury, Post Office, and the Executive Office of the President, I have personally observed Mr. McMillan's dedication to our great postal service and the many contributions he has made to it. I can attest to his leadership, his wise counsel and advice, his unfailing integrity, and the deep concern he has always demonstrated for adequate and responsible public service. Over the past 5 years he has appeared before our committee many times to explain and justify the Department's request for the appropriation of billions of dollars and I always found him well prepared, extremely knowledgeable and highly practical in his solutions to problems of the Government. He was always vitally concerned with the kind and level of postal service provided this Nation, but equally cognizant of his responsibility to taxpayers of this country whose moneys were entrusted to him to pay for the service they expected.

Over the years he demonstrated a rare talent for understanding the postal service needs of this country while at the same time not losing sight of his fiscal responsibility as a steward of public funds. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very desirable and much needed trait in these days when too often the expedient rather than the hard but responsible approach to problems seems to be the order of the day.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, as well as for the members of my committee, I want to say that the void left by the retirement of Mr. McMillan will not be easily filled. This Government has lost a good and faithful public servant. His devotion to public service, his ability to handle the tremendous burdens placed on his shoulders, his concern for people—postal workers as well as the public he served—and his own high standard of personal integrity will stand as a benchmark for those who follow him.

I wish him every happiness and contentment in his well earned and richly deserved retirement.

#### THE CRIME SITUATION IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the crime situation in Washington, D.C., has reached the point of—I do not know how to express it. It is intolerable.

I do not see any help in the future for the citizens of this Nation's Capital.

The President was quoted in the paper last night as having said that he could not even walk around the White House for fear of bodily harm.

I am today offering a resolution providing for the deployment of two companies of U.S. Marines on the streets of Washington, D.C. I hope this resolution will be considered seriously. As I see it, it is the only hope for the law-abiding citizens of the District.

Our police department has done the best it could. They have been hamstrung by guidelines from the Mayor and the Commissioners and court decisions.

If Members will stop and think, it will be just a few months, perhaps a few weeks, before the high school students will be coming to visit the Nation's Capital. I hope that none will come from my district. I have warned all school principals not to send any up here for fear that they might be injured. But now is the time to take action. I say to you, in my opinion, if the U.S. Marines cannot protect the Nation's Capital, then there is no hope for law-abiding citizens in Washington, D.C.

#### JOSE MARTI—CUBAN PATRIOT

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the birth, in 1853, of Jose Marti, the Great Cuban statesman, teacher, philosopher, and poet who inspired and led his people in their struggle for independence.

Born in Cuba of Spanish parents, Marti devoted most of his life to fighting against the country of his forefathers. He was banished time and again from his homeland for his political and revolutionary activities, and spent much time in Spain, Guatemala, and in the United States.

He arrived in New York in 1881 where he set about uniting the Cuban exiles, renewing and reviving the revolutionary spirit of his compatriots, and drafting a democratic constitution for his nation.

In 1894, Marti attempted to lead a company of armed Cuban revolutionaries from the United States to Cuba but was intercepted. The following year, however, he succeeded in reaching Cuba and joined the forces of General Gomez Baez. He fell in battle on May 19, 1895, near the little town of Dos Rios, giving his life for Cuba's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Jose Marti will always remain enshrined in the hearts of the Cuban people, not only as a great political leader and a revolutionary, but also as one of the most gifted poets and writers of the Western Hemisphere. It was his writing, more than anything else, that has endured to nurture the flame of freedom in the hearts of his countrymen.

As the inscription on his monument in New York City says—he was the "Apostle of Cuban Independence—Leader of the peoples of America and defender of human dignity."

Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of Jose Marti's birth brings to mind the tragic plight of the Cuban people and their continuing struggle for liberation from the tyranny of Castro's brand of communism.

This struggle is of great import and concern to all Americans—from Hudson Bay to the Strait of Magellan. For if freedom is allowed to be permanently suppressed in Cuba, the consequences of that state of affairs will, in time, be tragic for all of us.

As John Donne once wrote, "No man is an island entire of itself." Neither is a country. And the loss of freedom in Cuba diminishes freedom for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, a new administration has taken the reigns of our Government. According to President Nixon's preelection statements, this administration is not only dedicated to, but also prepared to work for, a change in the status quo of Cuba.

We applaud that resolve and give it our wholehearted support. And we look with anticipation to the results which it will produce.

As a Representative in Congress of the city of Miami which today is home to many thousand Cuban exiles, I have worked to the best of my ability to promote the realization of Jose Marti's hopes and dreams for his nation. I will certainly continue to do so in this Congress.

I could mention at this point that, with the new Congress taking office, I have been urged to resign as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements and to seek the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs on which I have served as the ranking Democrat.

There is certainly no part of the globe which is of greater importance to the future security and economic progress of the United States than this, our own hemisphere. For that reason alone, the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs carries with it responsibilities and opportunities not provided by some of our other subcommittees.

I am fully conscious of this. I also want to reiterate that the future course of developments in Cuba, and the prayers of Latin America as a whole, are of deep concern to the people of Miami—perhaps more so, because of our geographical position, than to the people of other American communities.

These considerations will play a large role in my plans and activities during the 91st Congress, and I will have more to say on this subject in the next few days.

#### DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for appropriate committee reference, a joint resolution proposing an

amendment to the Constitution to provide for direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

In introducing this legislation, I have been joined by 38 Members of the House of Representatives representing both political parties.

The proposed joint resolution is exactly like Senate Joint Resolution 1 introduced earlier in the Senate by the junior Senator from Indiana Senator BAYH, on behalf of himself and 40 other Senators, again representing both political parties.

Mr. Speaker, there are two popular myths concerning the election of the President.

Many Americans believe that when they mark an X beside a presidential candidate's name, they are voting for that candidate.

They also believe that in the democratic tradition, the man who gets the most popular votes will always win.

Of course both these statements are false.

This proposed constitutional amendment will make them fact.

Under our present electoral college system, voters do not vote directly for the candidates, but for slates of presidential electors.

And because of the electoral vote allocation, it is entirely possible for a candidate to win the popular vote, but to lose the Presidency to the second-place, or even third-place candidate.

If this situation did not already contain sufficient potential for electoral chaos, we must also recognize that at present there may not be any enforceable constitutional requirement that the electors actually vote for the candidate to whom they are pledged.

An elector, at his personal whim, might cast his vote for whomever he chooses. This happened in our last presidential election.

Earlier this month, when the House and Senate met in joint session to certify the vote of the electoral college, the Senator from Maine Senator Muskie and I joined in a historic, though unsuccessful challenge of the vote of a "faithless elector" from North Carolina.

While we had hoped to establish a precedent that might have deterred future faithless electors, the purpose of that challenge was in part educational—to once again remind the public and the Congress of the power of the presidential electors, and the danger inherent in that power.

You will remember that this elector was one of 13 elected by the voters of North Carolina when they marked their ballots for the Republican nominee, Richard Nixon. Yet this elector chose to disregard the mandate of the voters of his State, and instead of voting for Mr. Nixon when the electors met, he cast his ballot for third-party nominee George Wallace.

While that single errant vote is of little immediate consequence, one can recognize that a substantial block of such faithless electors could swing the election to a candidate who failed to lead in the popular vote.

Thus the danger remains that electors,

by either capriciously abandoning the candidate to whom they are pledged, or by casting their vote at the candidate's direction in a political power play, could thwart the public's will.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would absolutely insure that the man with the most votes will win the election. It simply abolishes all the trappings of electoral votes, and says that the popular vote—the vote of the people—will determine who shall be President.

I recognize that other Members have proposed legislation that would correct the most flagrant flaws in the present system. Specifically, they would abolish the electoral college as now constituted, and they would eliminate the present winner-take-all formula for allocating electoral votes.

While disposing of the body called the electoral college, these other proposals would retain the electoral vote, either allocating it proportionately within a State according to popular vote, or by congressional districts.

While these proposals are attractive to some, each one fails democracy's test—that the popular vote winner will in fact be elected President.

In each case, as long as the electoral vote is retained, with clusters of electoral votes rigidly held within a State framework, the possibility remains that a man who did not win the most popular votes could be elected President.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments last week, an opponent of the Bayh amendment, who has endorsed both the district and proportional plans, admitted that under either of these formulas John F. Kennedy would have lost the Presidency in 1960 while winning the popular vote.

The only way to completely eliminate this possibility is to elect the President by popular vote, as provided for in this amendment.

Imagine, if you will, that it is late election night 4 or 8 years hence, and that Chet Huntley and Walter Cronkite flash the news to the Nation: "Candidate A has a clear lead—probably insurmountable—in the popular vote, but, because of some electoral vote formula, candidate B has won the election."

Can you imagine the outcry across the land?

President Nixon has said that he doubts that a President so elected could lead the Nation. I agree.

Since the Harrison-Cleveland election of 1886, we have managed to avoid such a situation.

Few Americans would want this to remain a possibility.

But the potential exists now, and it will still exist, if we retain the structure of electoral votes, whether distributed by congressional district or on a proportional basis.

Now the eminent Members of this House and the Senate who support these other plans realize that there are grave dangers in the present system. They also agree that the present winner-take-all system of allocating electoral votes is undemocratic, since it effectively disenfranchises millions of voters.

They say that their plans would correct this defect in the present system, that, in effect, their proposals are more democratic than the present system.

And they are correct—they are more democratic—but they do not go the full way. They stop short of that final step that assures that the will of the people, in every case, shall prevail.

And the election of the President by popular vote is the only way to give each voter—no matter where he lives or for whom he votes—precisely the same voice in the election of our Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the President should be the choice of a substantial number of voters. In order to assure this, in case there should be three or more candidates, this constitutional amendment requires that the winning candidate receive a plurality of at least 40 percent of the popular vote.

If no candidate received the minimum 40-percent plurality, there would be a runoff election. If past history holds true, this would rarely occur. President Lincoln, in 1860, was the last President to receive a plurality of less than 40 percent, and he was very, very close to that mark.

The proposed amendment provides that the Congress will set the date for such runoff. The Nation should not endure prolonged uncertainty over the identity of its next President. And the President-elect should have as much time as possible before inauguration to organize his administration.

It is my intention that the election be held as promptly as possible after the general election.

Mr. Speaker, events of last year brought us to the threshold of electoral stalemate and chaos.

Most of us here recognize the need for reform. Yet the proliferation of proposals for reform are now threatening the opportunity for change at a time when its prospects are brightest.

This past Sunday the *Washington Post* declared in an editorial:

The overriding fact about our national electoral system is that, from the viewpoint of the twentieth century, it is one of the worst that could be devised. Almost everyone wants it changed. The arguments against using it again in its present form are so overwhelming that Congress should move promptly to supplant it with the best substitute that can be worked out.

The Post suggested that the "best substitute" may be the Bayh amendment.

This is the amendment I introduced here today with the announced support of 37 Representatives.

I support this amendment because I think it the best of all proposals submitted thus far, and because I think it is what the people want.

With the weight or reason, and the momentum generated by the junior Senator from Indiana, Senator BAYH, I believe we can enact this joint resolution.

And I believe that logic—and the people—will persuade the State legislatures to ratify it—irrespective of supposed narrow State interests.

Mr. Speaker, some editorial cartoonists across the Nation have depicted the electoral college as a rickety footbridge, ropes frayed, planking missing, spanning a

bottomless chasm. Others have pictured it as a wheezing, rusty mechanism, ready to collapse.

Fortunately, there was no collapse in 1968.

We may not be so lucky next time.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial, "Road to Reform," from the January 26 edition of the Washington Post, the names of the sponsors, and text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD: [From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1969]

#### ROAD TO ELECTORAL REFORM

It was long ago established that there is no perfect system for election of the President and Vice President in this Federal Republic. Every proposal that has been devised to date leaves something to be desired. This fact is once more getting emphasis from the hearings conducted by Senator Bayh's Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

But the same can be said of virtually every reform that is sought in government or elsewhere. It means only that there is very little perfection in human affairs. The process of legislation, in Congress or elsewhere, is not one of discovering and enacting perfect remedies for the ills of our time. It is, rather, a process of accommodation from which emerges the most acceptable compromise to meet the problem at hand.

We hope that Senator Bayh's subcommittee and the Senate itself and the House, too, are embarking on such a process in regard to electoral reform. For the overriding fact about our national electoral system is that, from the viewpoint of the twentieth century, it is one of the worst that could be devised. Almost everyone wants it changed. The arguments against using it again in its present form are so overwhelming that Congress should move promptly to supplant it with the best substitute that can be worked out.

What are these defects? The first is, of course, that the President is chosen by electors who may be "appointed" in any manner that the state legislature may approve. The idea of entrusting the choice of the President to third parties who may not even be chosen by the voters or who may disregard the voters' wishes if they are, is so deeply repugnant to present-day democratic principles that it should no longer be tolerated at the base of our electoral system.

In a close contest, this strange system may give us a President with an electoral majority but without even a popular plurality. In a three-way contest, it may leave the door open for the second and third candidates in the popular and electoral votes to snatch the Presidency away from the No. 1 candidate. In the case of no electoral majority, the choice is thrown into the House with a crude and undemocratic requirement of voting by states.

The problem of the reformers is to eliminate these perils in the system by the most effective means possible. Senator Dominick seemed to be making a strong case for the distribution of each state's electoral votes on the basis of its congressional districts or the division of each state's electoral votes among the candidates in proportion to the popular vote cast. But he admitted that either alternative would have elected Richard Nixon in 1960, although John F. Kennedy led in the popular vote. It is too late to offer the country a new system that would increase the possibility of installing in the White House a candidate who has lost the popular vote.

Fortunately, the subcommittee does have before it a plan for direct popular election of the President, with 41 Senators sponsoring it. This is the Bayh resolution. Unless the hearings turn up some more promising approach to the problem, it would be better to use this as a base for the proposed constitutional amendment with such changes as

may be necessary to win a two-thirds vote in the Senate. The risk of chaos under the present system is too great to make a stalemate tolerable.

#### H.J. RES. 317

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"SECTION 1. The people of the several States and the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall be the electors of the President and Vice President. In such elections, each elector shall cast a single vote for two persons who shall have consent to the joining of their names on the ballot for the offices of President and Vice President. No persons shall consent to their name being joined with that of more than one other person.

"Sec. 2. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of Members of the Congress from that State, except that any State may adopt less restrictive residence requirements for voting for President and Vice President than for Members of Congress and Congress may adopt uniform residence and age requirements for voting in such elections. The Congress shall prescribe the qualifications for electors from the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 3. The persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President, having the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected President and Vice President, if such number be at least 40 per centum of the total number of votes certified. If none of the persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President shall have at least 40 per centum of the total number of votes certified, a runoff election shall be held between the two pairs of persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President who received the highest number of votes certified.

"Sec. 4. The days for such elections shall be determined by Congress and shall be the same throughout the United States. The times, places, and manner of holding such elections and entitlement to inclusion on the ballot shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The times, places, and manner of holding such elections and entitlement to inclusion on the ballot shall be prescribed by the Congress for such elections in the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 5. The Congress shall prescribe by law the time, place, and manner in which the results of such elections shall be ascertained and declared.

"Sec. 6. If, at the time fixed for declaring the results of such elections, the presidential candidate who would have been entitled to election as President shall have died, the vice-presidential candidate entitled to election as Vice President shall be declared elected President.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death or withdrawal of any candidate or candidates for President and Vice President and for the case of the death of both the President-elect and Vice President-elect and, further, the Congress may by law provide for the case of a tie.

"Sec. 7. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 8. This article shall take effect on the 1st day of May following its ratification."

(COSPONSORS OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 317:  
MESSRS. ADDABBO, ANNUNZIO, BOLAND, BOLING, BYRNE OF PENNSYLVANIA, DICKINSON, DONOHUE, EILBERG, WILLIAM D. FORD, MRS. HANSEN OF WASHINGTON, MESSRS. HARVEY, HATHAWAY, JACOBS, KYROS, LONG OF MARYLAND, MIKVA, MOLLOHAN, MOORHEAD, and NEDZEL.)

#### MINE DISASTER AT MOUNT MORRIS, PA.

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, shortly before I first came to the floor today, we received word of another mine disaster. This morning a fire swept a coal mine in Mount Morris, Pa.

All the workers were able to escape the mine, thus averting what could have been another major mine disaster like the bitter tragedy at Farmington, W. Va.

But the happy thought that at Mount Morris, only property, and not human lives, were destroyed, cannot lull us into a false sense of security about mine safety. The near tragedy at Mount Morris is as compelling a reason as was the mass slaughter at Farmington to double our efforts to get effective coal mine safety and health legislation on the books—and to make effective enforcement of that legislation a fact of life in the coal fields.

It is tragic indeed that it takes disaster after disaster and death after death to arouse the Nation's indignation to the point where something can be done about coal mine safety—and, for that matter, about all the unsafe and unhealthful working conditions throughout American industry which annually take a grievous toll of life and limb and health and money from the working people of this country.

It is too late, Mr. Speaker, to indulge in arguments over who is at fault in these disasters. It is too late for anyone to worry about his reputation as a supporter of mine safety. It is too late for further recrimination. It is time now—not tomorrow, not next week, but now—to begin immediate steps to secure the passage of pending legislation to stop this slaughter of our fellow Americans.

Back in the bloody days of the unionization of the mining industry, there was a song called "Which Side Are You On?" which began:

They say in Harlan County  
There are no neutrals there.

I say that today, in Harlan County, Ky., in Marion County, W. Va., in Greene County, Pa., and, Mr. Speaker, in the District of Columbia and throughout this Nation, there are no neutrals in the fight for mine safety legislation.

The only question each of us must answer is "Which Side Are You On?"

#### CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 23, I introduced three bills which would provide for additional judges for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, additional assistant U.S. attorneys for the District of Columbia, and additional manpower for the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

I introduced this legislation because I believe that increased manpower is the best attack we can mount against the crisis of crime that exists in this city.

Mr. Speaker, it is a crisis, and the Congress, as the legislative body for this city, ought to realize it.

Since January 1, there have been 575 armed robberies in the District of Columbia. An average of 22 per day. In 1968, the average was 12.7 per day. This represents an increase of 78 percent over the daily rate for 1968.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that these figures do not include purse snatching, and fear of robbery, which would more than likely push these statistics considerably higher.

Since January 1, there have been 19 homicides in the District of Columbia. In 1968, there were a total of 209 homicides. If the current rate of 1 homicide every 1.4 days continues, there will be 260 homicides during 1969, or an increase of 25 percent over 1968.

This shocking increase in the rate of crime is taxing our judicial machinery.

Over 5,000 defense motions are heard by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia each year.

This is the Capital of our Nation, and it should be a showcase for all the freedom-loving people of the world; but tragically, that is not the image in which this city is seen.

Henry Brandon, Washington correspondent of London's Sunday Times, gives the following description of Washington:

You carry only sufficient money to keep the hold-up man satisfied. You acquire a burglar alarm or a watchdog. You don't stay out late. You avoid walking in unfrequented streets. You leave the lights on when you leave your house. You acquire your own gun.

Brandon further adds:

In a curious way many Washingtonians have become accustomed to living with crime almost in the way that Londoners learned to live with the World War II blitz.

Mr. Speaker, what we need here in Washington is a blitz on the crime crisis.

While Washington has reported 575 armed robberies for the first 26 days of January, the city of London reported a total of 165 "confirmed" robberies in all of 1967, and this was a decrease of 21 over 1966.

Certainly we can make Washington a safer city.

#### DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris

as Chaplain of the Senate, an outstanding spiritual leader leaves Capitol Hill.

In addition to his service in Congress, Dr. Harris has given courageous and outspoken moral guidance through his newspaper columns and other writings. One of his more memorable contributions appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 21, 1964, as he recalled the Allied invasion of France two decades earlier. Following are the concluding paragraphs of that column:

And new in the perspective of history in this Year of Our Lord 1964, America faces a foe as heinous and ruthless—and even more so—than did those who responded to the Eisenhower command. In this hour of destiny it is vitally necessary for Americans to keep before them the true dimensions of the Communist ideology and the extent of its thrust. To ignore it in the comfortable and self-satisfying enjoyment of our own prosperity and freedom is to court disaster. It is to turn into defeat the victory won by our boys but twenty years ago. It is to betray the cause for which they died. Well has it been said by a close student of world affairs, "The very nature of communism, itself, makes it impossible for its leaders to compromise, to negotiate in any realistic sense, or to consider anything short of total domination of the world."

While some are talking glibly of accommodation and coexistence, America needs to listen to those who have seen communism at first hand and have suffered under its terror. A Lutheran pastor and theological professor in Estonia until the Communists took over is now teaching on the faculty of a Theological Seminary in Chicago. Listen to him—"The Soviet rule extirpates every human value, obliterates the voice of conscience, violates the sense of morality, uproots human virtues, and erases freedom of thought. The aim of this ruthless process is the death of the individual. The result of this dehumanization is that man is thrust down to the level of an animal."

There can be no peace with such a system. To be true to those who have been sleeping for 20 years where poppies bloom, this is the time to mobilize America's might, moral as well as material, against such a foe! And, in the spirit of that fateful "O.K. we'll go," to vow in the memory of Normandy that whatever the cost, "government of the people shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. Speaker, now, too, America must keep this counsel. If there is any tendency to assume that the Russian leaders are becoming more human, we need only to remember the help that they have provided Hanoi and the bestial way in which they have been treating the people of Czechoslovakia for the past year.

Dr. Harris' admonition is a reminder that, regardless of how soon the Vietnam war is resolved, America must continue to strengthen its defense structure as long as communism has strength enough to trespass.

In looking forward to a cessation of hostilities in Indochina, the administration must plan ahead for assurance that every veteran will be able to continue schooling or find employment without delay. Yet these preparations should in no way be interpreted as an expectation of a cutback in mobilization requirements. On the contrary, there can be no deemphasizing the Red threat and the need for greater defense efforts in this country.

Just as Dr. Harris warned that to ignore the true dimensions of the Commu-

nist ideology and the extent of its thrust would be to betray the cause for which our boys died in World War II, so, too, would any move to relax America's guard at this time, constitute a cruel hoax on the principles for which our servicemen were sent to Vietnam.

Congress has benefited by its association with Dr. Harris. His views from the pulpit and in writing will continue invaluable to the Nation and to the world.

#### ONLY MAN DESTROYS HIS OWN ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Star there appeared an editorial entitled "Only Man Destroys His Own Environment."

The statements in this editorial are prophetic and I draw it to the attention of my fellow colleagues of the urgency needed to conserve and restore our own resources. The editorial follows:

#### ONLY MAN DESTROYS HIS OWN ENVIRONMENT

It was doubtless embarrassing to the new administration and it is very rare in the Senate's long history of advising and consenting to presidential appointments, but the hold-up last week of the Senate's consent to Secretary Hickel's appointment was a very good sign for the cause of conservation.

The Secretary is ex officio the nation's chief conservationist. The delay in confirmation indicated senatorial doubts as to the appointee's fitness in that respect. It also indicated a real concern for the importance of conservation.

As Governor of Alaska and, earlier, as a successful Alaska businessman, Secretary Hickel operated on the last large-scale frontier this country has. On the frontier, whether it be, as it was once, 50 miles inland from the Atlantic, or over the great ranges of the West, or now in Alaska, the natural concern of man is to tame the country and to wrest a living from it.

But this country is no longer on a frontier, regardless of the Alaskan experience. Our desperate need is not mastery of the land but its salvation from ourselves. Our true situation may be seen in two contrasting images of nature:

The water sparkles sweetly over stones worn smooth and round, picks up speed over a deep spot, tugging along the vagrant grasses of the bank, splashes and whitens over gray rocks, plunges into a fall, smoothes across the surface of a dark pool and resumes its varied progress from spring-source to sea, by way of forest and field, town and city, stream and great river. All along the way the water refreshes what it moves beside, the grasses, the fish, the fisherman, the town air, the city streets, the secret corners of the human heart.

It's a pretty picture but there's another: The water moves sluggishly over God knows what unseeable rubbish on the bottom, taking its murky colors and its acrid smells from the industrial and human wastes poured into it as it goes. The vegetation on the shore is nonexistent: To touch the water, for a plant, is to die. If a child, ignoring the counsels of its elders, ventures on a swim, he comes out with green hair or worse. The ruined water attracts more ruins: People dump their dumpings and old autos, old tires, old wreckage of all kinds may be seen as little islands here and there or as new promontories on the shore, each contributing its share of noisome ugliness. When the wind is off the rivers, the city suffers just a little

more than normally. There are no fish, no fishermen, and the human spirit can look elsewhere for sustenance.

There was a time when most of America's streams corresponded to the first picture. They rapidly approaches a time when most will correspond to the second.

There are other pairs of pictures, most of them rather depressing. There is the air itself as it comes refreshed from water, sun and trees, and the air we know in our throats, eyes and lungs smudged by factory smoke, poisoned by the carbon monoxide of a million internal combustion engines, polluted a little, even, by the burning tobacco we carry about with us.

There are the trees. Only God can make them, but man is endlessly inventive of the ways to unmake them. Pollution in general and at large will do the job, but it takes time. We have usually preferred the direct attack with ax and saw, and no planning for the future. Americans in Vienna at the end of World War II noted that the Viennese, with considerable reluctance, set out to gain their winter's firewood from the famed Wienerwald, the enchanting forest outside town. But the Viennese did so only under the close guidance of the foresters who carefully planned what might be cut and what must be spared. On the record, a similar restraint among Americans faced with the same winter would be unthinkable. All the trees would go.

We are, after all, the people who "took the top off Minnesota, sent it down the river." From Plymouth and Williamsburg we set a course of destruction of trees and followed it, axes ringing, clear to California, where even now there are citizens who can't wait to sink their steel into the last of the giant redwoods.

The historical reasons for the destruction are well-known and no excuse. There was just so much abundance of everything in nature that traditional European caution and prudence were abandoned. The homesteader cut down trees to build his house and to clear his fields. The mills were built beside streams because water power rather than wind power was the tradition. When water was replaced as a power source, the mills stayed there and began fouling the streams with their wastes. They still do. The fabled "city of dreadful night," first in London, then in the new world, became the very type and symbol of the new industrialization of the 19th century. No one did anything about it and it really didn't occur to anyone that anything could be done. The people who profited from air pollution used their profits to move away from the pollution. The victims stayed on and became further victimized, whether in the inner city or in the hills and hollows of West Virginia, ravished by strip miners.

The Indians, who were here first and who have a pretty good record of victimization themselves, could never understand the white man's uses of nature. The Indians killed animals for food and killed only what they needed. The white man—as with the buffalo and the passenger pigeon—made an industry out of slaughter. The more the merrier until there were no more at all. The Indians used trees for poles and for canoes and left the rest standing. The white man seemed to chop down trees simply because they were there. The pollution of air and water, of course, was unthinkable to the Indian. He didn't know how to do it. We do.

Conservation is the name of the movement against all these assaults upon nature by man. But in sober truth, the situation today almost seems to call for restoration rather than for conservation. There is so little left to conserve, so much to be restored if nature's balm is ever again to be known from its sources.

The initial impulse toward conservation came from the honorable human shock at the sheer mindless destruction being visited

upon nature by man. This remains the root philosophical reason for working for conservation. It is, really, the same instinctive response as that of the Indians. The destruction is simply wrong. It must be stopped. We are the less human for the senseless slaughter we perform or permit upon all nature.

This is still a basic and compelling argument.

But we have created for ourselves a more urgent one. The truth is that nature does maintain a balance, disrupt it as we will. For the kind of reckless abandon of the American attitude toward natural resources, there is always a bill sent in eventually. Payment may be deferred, but payment is exacted. Our bill is beginning to come in. The sooner we pay it in conservation and restoration, the less it will amount to in the very real deprivations of water and air and in the less real spiritual results of such shortages.

We live in cities, but we live with nerves, eyes, brains, reflexes, hands and feet fashioned for other environments, those of nature. Like the salmon going back up the Columbia River, we need, we physically and spiritually need, the solace of nature, of woods and water, of sand and sea, of sweet air and freshening breeze. We destroy these gifts at our peril. And we have largely destroyed them.

#### PRAYER AND BIBLE READING

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the isolated protest of the astronaut reading from the Book of Genesis during the moon flight might appear to be unworthy of notice, yet it should remind the Nation that the Supreme Court sided with atheism in banning prayer and Bible reading from the public schools. Another mischief against the Divine Being was the Court's rejection of the teachers' loyalty oath to keep Communists off school faculties.

To protect the Nation against similar disastrous decisions, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 82 to authorize Congress, by two-thirds vote of both Houses, to override decisions of the Supreme Court. I ask that it be acted upon as quickly as possible. Its urgency becomes more recognizable with each passing day.

As Government extends its responsibilities in child education, it is all the more important for teachers to be free to emphasize man's dependence upon God. Having established that many parents are incapable, for whatever reason, of giving youngsters a proper start in life, the Federal Government is involved in numerous projects aimed at helping children of preschool age to make up for the vacuum in the home. Without the assurance that there is no legal objection to his beginning at the beginning—with the Creator—an instructor would find it difficult, if not impossible, to establish values and to provide the proper philosophy upon which children may grow in wisdom and in age.

Without a safeguard such as offered in House Joint Resolution 82, there is danger that any employee of Federal, State, or local government will hesitate to utter the name of God in the execution of his duties. Lord help us all if such

reluctance seizes those who are placed in charge of neglected children.

Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons why responsible citizens want some assurance that the Supreme Court will not be able to impose upon the intent of the Founding Fathers and the will of our people. There is a new fear that there will be attempts to remove chaplains from the armed services, remove God's name from the Pledge of Allegiance, and remove God's name from other areas of American life.

Millions of Americans were thrilled to hear of the lunar astronauts' reference to prayer and the Bible. We were filled with emotion when those three courageous pioneers in space stood before the stands in the Super Bowl in Miami and led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance with its dedication to God.

We will tolerate no debilitation of this spirit and this reverence. Your support of House Joint Resolution 82 is of vital importance to this Nation and its people.

#### SCHERLE CALLS FOR BIPARTISAN PROBE OF "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution designed to create a special Joint House and Senate Bipartisan Committee to consider the events leading up to the capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. This special joint committee would be comprised of 16 members, one-half from Members selected by the Speaker of the House, and one-half appointed by the President of the Senate.

News reports of the Naval Board of Inquiry into the *Pueblo* incident have raised questions as to the ultimate responsibility for this sordid affair. Testimony released to date indicates that the responsibility for the capture and subsequent imprisonment of 82 Americans was the result of indecision and inaction in the highest echelons of the administrative branch of our Government.

Two weeks ago I visited personally with Commander Bucher and many members of the crew of the *Pueblo*. I was asked repeatedly by them, "Why wasn't our call for help answered? We held out as long as we could, but help never came."

That question has haunted me and brought a sense of guilt regarding the conduct of many of our Nation's top officials. The information made public so far shows that the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Department were caught short of policy, short of plans, and short of guts. In defending the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, responsible military personnel passed the buck because no one knew what to do or would accept the responsibility for doing it; the usual timidity exercised by the State Department handicapped immediate and effective action; and the White House was thrown into chaotic fear, precluding the exercise of judgement, which allowed a defenseless U.S. naval vessel to fall into Communist hands. Despite the fact that the ship made numerous calls for help, none ever came—why?

The proceedings of the Naval Board of Inquiry to date are producing many unanswered questions. Press reports state that the Air Force will not be called to testify as to its role in this matter. Why not?

A full-scale congressional inquiry is demanded by the American people and they deserve nothing less.

#### PORNOGRAPHY—THE RISING TIDE OF SMUT

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1968, Public Law 90-206 went into effect, a law designed to help Americans stem the flood tide of obscenity engulfing the mailboxes and minds of our youth.

I called attention to Public Law 90-206 in March of 1968, hoping to alert the parents of my district to this weapon for fighting smut with the following statement, made public at that time:

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 20, 1968.—Representative Henry C. Schadeberg (R-Wisc.), said today that beginning on April 15, First District parents will be able to "at least partially slam the door on smut mail now flowing like a sewer into the hands of our children and homes."

The Wisconsin Congressman said that on April 15 Public Law 90-206 goes into effect, which allows householders to "fight back against obscene material sent to their homes by advertisers of obscene mail both in District Courts where it is received or where it originates. We can police our own mail boxes now," he said.

Congressman Schadeberg outlined the following three steps that can be taken on April 15 and thereafter and he urged "civic groups, church groups, the PTA and other community organizations to assist parents, who wish to protest the mailings and slam the door on future ones."

1. If you receive an advertisement which you judge to be obscene, write a letter to the Postmaster General in Washington, D.C., or to your local Postal Inspector. Demand that he send an order to the mailer directing him to remove your name and address immediately from all of his mailing lists. You may also request that the Postmaster General's order include the names of any minor children and other family members at your address.

2. If you continue to receive questionable mail in violation of the order, you may then request the Attorney General to seek a court order against the smut mail advertiser.

3. If you then get a court order and still receive the smut mail, the sender will be subject to contempt of court citations and a possible jail sentence.

He said that by the April 15th deadline his District, as well as his Washington Office would have forms available which will be sent to the parents on request, which "will be handy for parents who wish to protest the mailings."

Congressman Schadeberg said that he is also investigating the possibility of amending Public Law 90-206 or introducing new legislation which would make it illegal for advertisers to sell or otherwise obtain the names of citizens for advertising mail solicitations without the permission of the individual.

"It is my feeling that something can and should be done in this area, not only as a step forward in terminating obscene mailings but to help take the burden off the

backs of our postmen and our mail service, and alleviate some of the perpetual annoyance from junk mail deliveries." The Congressman said that "a man's name is one of his most valued possessions, yet it is bandied about, sold, re-sold, stolen and otherwise covertly obtained without his consent."

He said the legislation he will seek would exempt mailings by political organizations, Veteran's groups, community schools, church and service organizations and would be "aimed squarely at where the problem lies, in the back rooms of smut peddlers and others who invade our privacy via the U.S. Mails."

He noted that, J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, regards smut as a serious problem, one that is conducive to creation of crime. Hoover declares: "It is impossible to estimate the amount of harm to impressionable teenagers and to assess the volume of sex crimes attributable to pornography, but its influence is extensive." He points out that police throughout the Nation "unequivocally state that lewd and obscene material plays a motivating role in sexual violence. In case after case, the sex criminal has on his person or in his possession pornographic literature or pictures."

"The new legislation provides the American householder with an effective, enforceable, tough law against invasion of moral privacy by smut peddlers using the mails. It allows the recipient to decide what kind of mail is to be delivered in the family mail. It is a solid step toward guaranteeing individual rights," Congressman Schadeberg said. He said his office will have a form letter available without cost for parents to send to local postmasters, plus one requesting the Attorney General of the United States to take legal action if smut peddlers persist in their obscene mailings.

"Parents will not have to put up a cent in costs, other than the price of a postage stamp in putting a stop to the unwanted mail," he said.

Congressman Schadeberg said he is distributing the form letters to newspapers and urging them as a public service, to print them so parents can clip them out and use them for immediate communication with the proper officials.

Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful at the time I made the above statement that the muck-peddlers would find it more difficult to peddle their filthy wares. Such has not been the case, I am sorry to report.

I believe the fault with Public Law 90-206 was not in its intent but in the nature of the enforcing arm on which the Congress leaned in order to help clean up the mails. The Post Office Department is a service organization or agency, designed and charged with the single purpose of delivering the mails. It is not an enforcement agency. It is neither equipped nor has the time to pursue this new obligation, according to the information I have in respect to the problem of policing pornography.

I am now convinced that Congress must do more in this area. With this conviction in mind I am today submitting new legislation to attack the problem of smut mailing from another starting point—the producers of this filth and the mailing list brokers who supply them with the names for their filthy mailings.

A person's name is as sacred as his privacy and his reputation. It is the private property of each American and it should be illegal for anyone, for any purpose, to bandy our names about for any

purpose whatsoever, without the express consent of each one of us.

Daily I receive letters from my constituents expressing their amazement and disgust over receiving filthy materials through the mail. In several instances the smut material is addressed by hand and sent from some hotel in a foreign country. Recently I came into possession of a particularly vicious smut mailing. It was sent to a young college girl, whose name, I am certain, was secured from her high school annual, which, according to custom, is placed in the public library in her community and is thereby available for any caller to copy from at will.

There are thousands of others just like this young miss, hundreds in fact from the high school from which she graduated. I can only assume that each year each graduating class is to have the names of its young female graduates punched into the smut mill forcing them to become the prey of every diseased pornography peddler in the publishing business.

I believe this should not only be stopped but made illegal. And I believe it can be if Congress will approve the legislation I am submitting, making a Federal offense to use the name of any individual without the clear consent of that individual, whatever his or her age and status in life. I believe that stiff penalties should be provided for name brokers who violate the restrictions in my bill when it becomes law. The bill is as follows:

#### H.R. 4850

A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4061. Registration of mailing list brokers; furnishing of information with respect to mailing lists

"(a) Each broker engaged in the sale or exchange of mailing lists shall file with the Postmaster General a registration statement, in such form and detail as the Postmaster General shall determine, which shall cover, among other matters prescribed by the Postmaster General, (1) the name under which he is doing business, (2) the scope and general character of the business, (3) the location of his principal business office, and (4) the names and addresses of the directors and the chief executive officers if the broker is a corporation, association, partnership, or other business association.

"(b) Each individual and each corporation, partnership, or other business organization or association using, buying, selling, renting, exchanging, or otherwise making available to others any mailing list shall, on request, furnish to the Postmaster General, in such form and detail, and at such times, as he shall determine, information respecting (1) the name of the individual, corporation, partnership, or other business association or organization, and (2) the identity of individuals having a financial interest in any such organization or association, including the responsible officers and employees thereof. Postal officials, upon request, shall

be permitted to examine records and particulars of transactions or mailings pertaining to any such mailing list.

(c) As used in this section, 'broker' means any person who engages either for all or part of his time, directly or indirectly, as agent, dealer, or principal, in the business of offering, buying, selling, or otherwise dealing or trading in mailing lists owned, rented, or used by another person.

(d) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section. Such regulations shall provide that a broker shall obtain the written consent of each person to be included on such list before placing the name of such person on such list and that a broker or user of such list shall remove the name of such person from such list on the request of such person."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"4061. Registration of mailing list brokers; furnishing of information by suppliers, buyers, and users of mailing lists."

Immediately below

"4060. Foreign publications free from customs duty."

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, relating to offenses against the postal service, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1735. Mailing list brokers, suppliers, buyers, and users

"Whoever, being required by section 4061 of title 39, United States Code, to furnish information to the Postmaster General, fails or refuses to furnish such information as the Postmaster General shall request under such section, or violates any regulation of the Postmaster General under such section, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not to exceed one year, or both."

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 83 is amended by inserting

"1735. Mailing list brokers, suppliers, buyers, and users."

Immediately below

"1734. Editorials and other matter as 'advertisements'."

Sec. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, certain exceptions must be made—for the Red Cross, veterans organizations, city and State governments, and other legitimate organizations who use such information for legitimate purposes. I would expect that an appropriate committee of Congress will conduct hearings on my measure, eliciting information from decent publishers and organizations, all of whom, I feel certain, are equally anxious to clean out the smut mailers, who not only poison the minds of our young with their filth but add immensely to the taxpayer's burden of paying for our postal services.

The legislation I propose would require name brokers to register with the Postmaster General of the United States, who shall be provided with additional funds and help for the purpose of collating information concerning all mailing brokers, legitimate or otherwise. Once collected, on an annual basis, such information shall be turned over to the Department of Justice, which holds the enforcement power to punish lawbreakers and which has the know-how and the personnel to handle such matters. I would further amend Public Law 90-206, turning over to the Department of Justice the assign-

ment of recipient for complaints concerning smut from the people and for corrective action where warnings are ignored or violations occur.

One other aspect of the pornography flood engulfing our young minds that needs reexamination concerns the establishment in 1967 of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

There are several things wrong with this effort and organization. The Commission has been supplied with \$643,000 for operating expenses and salaries. No interim reports are required as to how these funds are being used or what progress is being made. The Commission does not have to give an accounting until July 31, 1970. I mention these factors, not in criticism of its distinguished members, but lay the blame at our own doorstep for not writing tighter legislation so that the American people might have an opportunity to take part or determine how well the fight against smut peddlers is going. I believe the 91st Congress might well amend H.R. 16489 to require an interim report. I believe further that Congress should signify its intent for the Commission to report to an appropriate committee of the Congress from time to time. I hesitate to suggest which committee of Congress this might be, prior to consulting with the leadership, but the urgency of the need for action is so imperative that I offer the suggestion that either the new House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or the Government Operations Committee may well be appropriate bodies for riding herd on the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

I will also, at the proper time, submit to Congress legislation designed to make permanent an investigative subcommittee of the House, staffed and instructed to pursue the problem of smut mailing and filth peddling on a permanent basis, with appropriate reports to Congress on a regular basis.

The present setup and composition of the Commission follows:

**COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY AUTHORITY**

Public Law 90-100, October 3, 1967.

**RESPONSIBILITY**

To study the nature and volume of traffic in obscene and pornographic materials. To study effects of obscenity and pornography on minors. To recommend legislative, administrative, and other appropriate action that the Commission may feel necessary to regulate the flow of such traffic without interfering with constitutional rights. To evaluate existing laws pertaining to obscenity and pornography and to evaluate and recommend definitions therefor.

**MEMBERSHIP**

Eighteen members appointed by the President, composed of persons having expert knowledge in fields of obscenity and anti-social behavior; and with special competence with respect to obscenity laws and their effect on juveniles.

William B. Lockhart (Chairman), Dean, University of Minnesota School of Law.

Edward D. Elson, President, Atlanta News Agency, Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. Edward D. Greenwood, Psychiatrist, Menninger Clinic, Topeka, Kans.

Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., Executive Secretary, Operation Yorkville, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Dr. C. William Jones, Assistant Professor of Broadcast Film Art, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.

Honorable Kenneth B. Keating, Associate Judge, New York Court of Appeals, Albany, N.Y.

Dr. Joseph T. Klapper, Director, Social Research, Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Otto N. Larsen, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Rabbi Irving Lehman, Temple Emanu-El, Miami Beach, Fla.

Freeman Lewis, Executive Vice President, Pocket Books, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Winifred C. Link, Executive Director, Four-Fold Challenge Campaign, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Morris A. Lipton, Professor of Psychiatry and Director of Research Development, Hon. Thomas C. Lynch, Attorney General, State of California.

Barbara Scott, Associate Counsel, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Cathryn A. Spelts, Instructor, South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Dr. Frederick H. Wagman, Director, University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Dr. Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director, Center for Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania.

**STAFF**

An office for the Commission staff was set up in Washington in August, and is located at Suite 500, 1016-16th Street, N.W. Their telephone number is 382-8655. The staff director of the Commission is Dr. W. Cody Wilson.

**REPORT**

The Commission is required by statute to file a report of its findings with the President no later than January 31, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission has a purpose, and I am not criticizing that. I merely feel an urgency concerning the matter which Congress, in its wisdom, apparently did not in passing the law. I urge a speedup in the Commission's work and the eventual transfer of its duties to a more permanent body, such as the House of Representatives.

Congress as an investigative body has focused its spotlight of exposures on the issue of Communist infiltration, influence peddling and graft in our Government, with salutary results in most instances. I believe the subject of pornography should be so investigated. It is equally serious and far more lasting in the harm it is doing to our young than many of the subjects of congressional hearings. I urge this Congress to consider an immediate investigation, using the legislation I have proposed as the vehicle, along with any additional legislative steps proposed by other Members. I welcome them all as I know the parents of America will welcome immediate congressional attention to this disgraceful situation.

**GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT**

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate objective of a free public education in a democratic society is to provide an equal opportunity for each youth to develop his potential abilities to the fullest.

In recent years, we have seen a widening of the gap between the obvious need and current supply of creative and talented people who are properly educated. This has happened because the development of talent often has been hindered by economic and cultural factors. Thus, the time has come for systematic efforts to be made at the State and national levels to identify and nurture the demonstrated and potential talents of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I have today, together with my colleagues, Messrs. **AYRES**, **QUIE**, **REIN** of New York, **SCHERLE**, **ESCH**, and **ESHLEMAN**, introduced the "Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act." Today, we ask our Nation to adopt as policy the fact that the education of these exceptional children is a national concern.

This bill provides no money; nor does it earmark any funds. Experience has shown us that funds alone are not the answer to the problems facing us. Instead, we must attack the attitudes that bind us to the status quo.

The bill will do the following:

First. Define gifted and talented children as those having outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent, the development of which requires programs or services beyond the level of those ordinarily provided in regular school programs.

Second. Amend title V "Grants To Strengthen State Departments of Education," Elementary and Secondary Education Act, section 503(11) by adding after "handicapped," "the gifted and talented."

This amendment will enable State education agencies to develop appropriate plans for providing for gifted and talented children within their State and to acquire necessary personnel to implement such plans. At present, only 13 of the 50 State departments of education assign one or more full-time staff members to programs for the gifted and talented, while 21 States have no one responsible on a full- or part-time basis for such programs. Nine out of the 10 gifted and talented children now receiving services come from States employing full-time personnel.

Third. Amend the Education Professions Development Act, title V "Teacher Programs," part C "Fellowships for Teachers," Higher Education Act, section 521 "Statement of Purpose," by adding in the last sentence after "handicapped," "gifted and talented."

There is a lack of trained personnel to administer and provide education for gifted and talented children. This amendment will make the preparation of such personnel a priority to which the Education Professions Development Act should focus its attention. At present there are only 26 colleges and universities in the Nation offering programs to prepare teachers and other personnel to work with gifted and talented children. If programs for these children are to be increased to any substantial degree, there will need to be a substantial increase in the number of personnel training programs as well as the number of personnel prepared.

Fourth. Amend title III "Supplementary Educational Centers and Services," ESEA, section 303 "Use of Federal Funds" (a) (3), by renumbering "(I)" as "(J)" and adding a new "(I)" as follows: "(I) special programs for the gifted and talented; and".

Because of their unique learning nature, gifted and talented children require many services and opportunities beyond the confines of the classroom or school. Title III has demonstrated itself to be an effective tool for helping school districts to provide such services and opportunities on a multischool or regional basis. It is the intent of this bill to permit some of the efforts of title III to meet the program needs of gifted and talented children. The use of demonstration programs in Illinois, California, and several other States has had a significant effect on stimulating local communities to develop programs for gifted and talented youth. Title III has provided some assistance in this regard.

Fifth. Direct the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study as to how existing education programs can be best used to meet the needs of the gifted and talented and what new programs might be necessary, making report and recommendations within 6 months.

The resources delineated in the bill represent the most crucial resources needed for program development; however, there are other Federal resources that could provide assistance. For this reason, the Commissioner is asked to show how these resources can be directed toward the needs of highly gifted and talented children.

Once again I stress that these measures are in line with our interest in giving State and local authorities a greater decisionmaking base. The bill does not mandate that they serve the gifted and talented but only increases their ability to do so if they so desire.

#### REPRESENTATIVE TALCOTT URGES HUMANITARIAN RELIEF TO BI-APRANS

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our international problems are not confined to Vietnam, Korea, the Middle East or Eastern Europe. We are making problems in Africa. England's vaunted reputation for diplomatic correctness is unfounded. We ought not to blindly follow its lead—especially in Biafra. We should lend all of our strength and influence—short of military intervention—to achieving a ceasefire.

A united Nigeria may be a worthy goal, but not at the price of the extermination of the Ibos of Biafra. The war appears to me to be a clear case of genocide—against the most outstanding black people of Africa. The Ibos have more Ph.D.'s than the rest of Africa combined. They developed a SAM missile independently of the great powers from practically nothing.

Any war is bad, but this war is without any redeeming aspect, and we are aggra-

vating, rather than ameliorating, the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution intended to dramatize the unnecessary suffering in Nigeria and to urge our Government to respond to alleviate the distress for solely humanitarian reasons.

#### SIXTH APPEARANCE OF CULVER MILITARY ACADEMY'S BLACK HORSE TROOP IN A PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL PARADE

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the members of Congress that this month marks the sixth appearance of Culver Military Academy's Black Horse Troop in a Presidential Inaugural Parade.

This year the world-famous cavalry unit was selected as a national representative in the parade. At the suggestion of Col. Donald W. Griffin, a 1917 graduate of Culver, who is now executive secretary of the National Association of Independent Schools, the troop organized and presented a unique display of American flags in keeping with President Nixon's theme of "Forward Together."

Banners from each one of the 54 States and territories which make up our America were carried by members of the Black Horse Troop as they presented "The United States on Review."

The flags were gifts of my fellow alumni of the Black Horse Troop who live in the various States and territories. Their presentations—and mine today—are evidence of the loyalty and respect for the Black Horse Troop, the largest equestrian unit in the United States today.

#### PRESCHOOL SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, a bill entitled "Preschool Supplementary Education Act," of which I am a cosponsor, was introduced by the gentlelady from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

This legislation will provide Federal assistance to improve educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers. It would make possible preschool education where now little more than custodial care is offered.

In a time when working mothers are no longer a rarity, and the value of preschool education has been shown through the success of the Headstart program, I feel assistance of this type is needed to fill the gap between those not qualifying under the poverty guidelines, and not at that economic level which financially permits meaningful preschool education.

I am proud to be associated with the gentlelady from Hawaii in introducing this legislation and hope it is greeted favorably by my colleagues.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARY  
INCREASE

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

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, in completing its study and releasing its recommendations has stated:

Present salary levels are not commensurate with the importance of the positions held.

The Commission further stated:

We believe the salary rates proposed in this report will improve our capacity to attract and retain men of ability and dedication.

While this conclusion may or may not be justified by the evidence, it is clear that the citizens of my district, the Second District of Utah, do not agree that salaries, particularly congressional salaries should be raised, at least not at this time, or to the extent proposed by President Johnson. A principal objection is the fact that by this pay raise to Members of Congress which is in the neighborhood of 40 percent, we will be setting an example which will encourage further excessive increases which will add fuel to the fires of inflation which are already blazing dangerously, and at a time we should be working to put out these fires. I agree.

A resolution to disapprove the President's action has been introduced. After conversation with some members of the standing committee to which this resolution has been referred, however, I conclude that the standing committee may not act within the necessary 30-day period, due to the fact that it has taken approximately half that period to become organized and the remaining time does not allow time for hearings which are considered necessary.

However, this does not foreclose the opportunity of the Rules Committee to take the resolution from the standing committee and bring it directly to the floor of the House for a rollcall vote. I am, therefore, joining in the action initiated by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) by submitting today a resolution calling upon the Rules Committee to follow that procedure. If enough Members of this House will follow, it will give the Rules Committee the consensus which would encourage it to act.

## LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PROVIDE FOR MANDATORY JAIL SENTENCES WHEN A FEDERAL FELONY IS COMMITTED WITH A FIREARM

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation designed to provide for mandatory jail sentences when a Federal felony is committed with a firearm.

My proposal, which amends and strengthens the Gun Control Act of 1968, calls for mandatory minimum terms of imprisonment when an individual has

been convicted of a Federal felony involving the use of a firearm.

In the case of a first conviction, the sentence is 1 to 5 years and for subsequent convictions it is 5 to 25 years.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that such sentences under my proposal are to run consecutively rather than concurrently with any sentence imposed for the felony itself. The sentences may not be suspended and probation cannot be granted.

This proposal is similar to the one adopted by the House in the 90th Congress as an amendment to the Gun Control Act. The provision was weakened by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, we need look no further than the front pages of our daily newspapers for the reasons for this proposal. The American people are deeply and justly concerned about our crime rate and the increasing amount of violence connected with that rate.

I commend this proposal to the attention of all the Members and urge the House to consider it in prompt fashion.

## HOUSE RESOLUTION 133 INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE GROSS CALLING FOR DISAPPROVAL OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RECOMMENDATION FOR OUTRAGEOUS PAY INCREASES

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 I introduced House Resolution 133 calling for disapproval of President Johnson's recommendation for outrageous pay increases for Members of Congress as well as top bracket officials and employees in the executive and judicial branches of Government.

If the House of Representatives is to be given the opportunity to work its will on these recommendations—and Members were assured they would have that opportunity when the enabling legislation was approved in 1967—then the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee must report a disapproving resolution to the House floor next week. All reports indicate the committee has no intention of acting to this end.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am today calling on the chairman of the Rules Committee to hold a hearing immediately and take House Resolution 133 from the legislative committee for action on the floor.

It will be a travesty on the taxpayers and our legislative procedure, Mr. Speaker, if a legislative, executive and judicial pay bill, costing millions of dollars, is permitted to go into effect in February—at the expiration of 30 days—without any consideration by any committee of the House and without a record vote.

I trust that the leadership of the House will not permit such a travesty.

## CHARLES Y. LAZARUS CHAMPION OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last fall one of my fine constituents received well deserved recognition, both personally and as president of the American Retail Federation.

Charles Y. Lazarus received the first Free Enterprise Award of the National Newspaper Association and American Newspaper Representatives. He was cited as "the best friend the American consumer has" in advertising and selling his wares in the "keen competition of our free enterprise marketplace." Mr. Lazarus was also cited as "a concerned and knowledgeable interpreter of the free enterprise system to the public and to the Government" in contributing to preserving the Nation's free economy.

In responding for retailers of the Nation, Mr. Lazarus delivered an outstanding address entitled "The Future of Retailing in America," which follows:

## THE FUTURE OF RETAILING IN AMERICA—THE INTEREST OF THE PUBLIC AND THE COMING TIME

(By Charles Y. Lazarus)

It is a special honor to represent American retailers everywhere in accepting this first Free Enterprise Award on this anniversary occasion, and to share with you my convictions about the future of retailing.

In leafing through the copy of the *Sentinel*, that first little newspaper of the Northwest Territory, I developed quite an affection for the publisher, Mr. W. Maxwell, and am happy to be a part of a program celebrating the 175th anniversary of his exercise in free enterprise.

Today's editors probably find it quaint and amusing that he buried, on back pages, the newsmost stories in the whole paper, and ran the boiler-plate fiction on page one. The stories that must have generated the most reader interest were the report of the epidemic in Philadelphia that was killing 100 people a day, and the attack by Indians on a military convoy near Cincinnati with a loss of 15 soldiers and 70 horses. This Indian raid story was actually the only local Northwest Territory news in the whole paper. But there were some indications of the newspaper of the future in this first issue too.

The sole letter to the editor complained about the taxes.

At a time when business paper-work must have been minimum, the *Sentinel* had problems with it. The publisher was forced to report that he had lost the subscription list—so please, he said, come and get your copy of the paper at the office.

There were just two ads in the paper, but they forecast the future. One offered a reward for the return of a lost pocketbook—obviously, the beginning of classified advertising. The other was for the Adgate Manufacturing. Mr. Adgate was a retailer who accepted either cash or country produce in exchange for goods, and promised superior quality at reduced prices. His discreet little ad forecast the future close relationship of mass media and retailers.

Mr. Maxwell's credo was "open to all parties but influenced by none." He was truly a great activist—a fine example of the personal commitment and involvement that today's crisis demands, a postmaster, a judge, a lawmaker, a military man, an editor. And he wrote, in his front page statement of purpose, that he hoped the paper could be a vehicle for all who had something to say or to sell and he hoped that men of public spirit would "consult not merely their own personal interest but the interest of the public and the coming time."

"The interest of the public and the coming time" is a much more significant respon-

sibility of free enterprise now than it was as America moved toward the 19th century.

This is a double anniversary occasion, of course—25 years ago, the American Newspaper Representatives founded their organization here, in joint session with the Wartime Conference of the National Newspaper Association. We in retailing are honored by this award and accept it as a gracious symbol of your encouragement.

The areas in which I hope this encouragement will be taken most to heart is a public, not a private one: the total environment of America's cities. We retailers belong to the city. We are nourished by the city. And only to the extent that we contribute to the welfare of the city can we ourselves flourish.

We have known this and acted on it for generations. But in recent years something has been missing. Clearly, we have not had enough foresight, or enough will, or we have not cooperated enough with other groups, such as yours. Whatever the cause, the results have finally shaken us badly. This is a good sign for the future, since dissatisfaction is a great spur to progress.

In saying this, I am borrowing a life-long slogan of the senior member of the Lazarus clan, who addressed your national convention here in Cincinnati 25 years ago. Fred Lazarus, Jr. used this discontent with many things as they are not only to build a family store into a great national organization but to lead retailers everywhere into deeper involvement with the problems of their communities. I am proud to follow in his footsteps.

In accepting this award, I serve as a standard for retailers that range from the proprietors of neighborhood stores to big department stores and national chains. The American Retail Federation numbers all kinds and sizes of stores in its membership that operate in all sizes and types of urban communities from suburbia to the ghetto. The Federation numbers 49 state and 27 national retail organizations within its membership. We work together in the ARF for the same reasons that you work together in the NNA and the ANR, and other federations of communications media. We strive to preserve the freedom of the marketplace of goods and services. You strive to preserve the freedom of the marketplace of information and ideas.

This audience needs no refresher course from me on the current problems of the cities. You have witnessed the growth of crime, smelled the pollution, photographed the hovels of the poor, counted the dead and estimated the destruction after riots, and felt the fear in your neighbor's hearts and know that the guns are piling up in private homes. You have printed and aired the vigorous calls for law and order. And because you are likely to be the most knowledgeable men in your communities, you know that law and order, though necessary, can only be one phase of a solution to the complex urban crisis.

I do not know the solutions to the urban crisis, but I can suggest some things we haven't been doing that we need to be doing. What we may be learning now, rather late, is that free enterprise requires urban responsibility.

We accepted urban responsibility very naturally 50 to 75 years ago. We not only believe that the future of retailing and media and all the other elements of free enterprise were bound up in the well-being of our cities and the environment in which we operate. We supported our belief with personal and vigorous action. Back around the turn of the century, it was a combination of downtown bankers, retailers and newspaper men who promoted the growth and well-being of our cities. We were very close in those days. The relationship of retailer and media, now, tends to be that of advertiser and advertising medium rather than that of citizen businessmen and editors mutually intent on developing a healthy urban climate. Our early working relationships were

good for business because they were good for everybody.

We pushed for paved streets, street lighting and for horse drawn trolleys; for police protection and fire protection; for sewers and water lines; for schools and hospitals. We supported efforts to found the Boy Scouts in our towns, the YMCA, the Community Chest. We were personally involved in local government, and we had a lot to do with the character of yesterday's America. We exemplified free enterprise meshed with true urban responsibility.

As our cities and the demands of our businesses grew, some managements drew away from involvement in the local community's problems. For efficiency's sake, because of growth and mergers, some career managers with no real permanent stake in the local community, replaced the personal owner management of many of our businesses and communication media. Community relations became a professional field of work, delegated out of management, too often handled from the distant home office of big national companies. Because so many businesses and media too became national in scope, we were passive about the transfer of much government from Main Street to Washington. In effect, free enterprise disconnected its hot line to the local community and to true urban responsibility.

The communication media, and particularly television, are often saddled with the blame for some of the frightening things that happen. This is like blaming the stick that beats the dog instead of the wielder of the stick. You report what's happening; you don't generate it.

But there is a great deal of blame that can be attached to you, and to us in business, in terms of our passivity, our personal disengagement. The communications media, and perhaps particularly television, are tyrannized by the majority. Yet it was the rights of the many minorities—religious, ethnic, age, professional, commercial, political—that concerned the founders of our country, and the framers of our Constitution. An almost forgotten idea of Thomas Jefferson's was that provision should be made for re-writing the U.S. Constitution every 19 years. This idea was buried so completely that few have ever heard of it. But it was typical of this man's conviction that a democratic society must be open to change, and to the rights of minorities, such as the minority too young to vote on the Constitution.

When the minority becomes unheard and invisible, when the majority becomes apathetic and delegates even local problems from the street corner to Washington, then national priorities are set, not by participation, but by consent.

What are the results?

With the consent of the majority, highways for private cars and trucks have been subsidized at a cost of billions a year. The minority who need mass transit to get to work are too often left isolated in a maze of freeways.

With the consent of the majority, government has subsidized 10,000,000 housing units for middle income and luxury income families in the last 34 years. For the minority, only 650,000 low-income units have been built. And urban renewal programs have bulldozed away at least that many existing homes of the poor.

With the consent of the majority, we put \$4 billion a year into agricultural subsidies, and much of this goes to big agriculture. This \$4 billion is twice what we devoted to the war on poverty. Much of this subsidy is for not working the land, yet some of the loudest complaints about help for the poor come from organizations dominated by the richest and most powerful farmers.

With the consent of the majority, open housing is too often non-existent, except in theory. The rent that poor people pay for decrepit and rat-ridden living quarters is

often enough for decent shelter outside the ghetto, but we won't let them out despite laws that guarantee otherwise.

With the consent of the majority, we have allowed automobiles and industry to pollute our air and water. Free enterprise is too often construed as freedom to develop without regard for all.

With the consent of the majority, schools in many of our poorer areas are little more than failure factories. In this toughest and most challenging area of education, the most essential for breaking the failure pattern of the disadvantaged, there is the least creative innovation in teaching, the least attempt to bridge the communications and achievement gap that separates the underprivileged from the rest of society.

As the minority rioters stated in Miami during the Republican Convention, they had been trying peacefully to get somebody in government to listen to their housing and jobs story for three years. Only after some violence did the nation listen.

If you are in a minority, and you cannot get anyone to listen, let alone act, you create a crisis. This is the new public relations technique for militant minorities. And it works. It is the best space and attention grabber of all: open warfare.

How did this come to pass? How did this popular democracy get to the point where its minorities felt they could reach the ear of the affluent majority only by sit-downs, fire, looting and death? Each and everyone of us is to blame. Elsewhere I have said my say to the businessmen and to the educators. Today I should like to add a few words about the role of the communications media.

After all, a riot, like a flash of anger in a man's fist, is a form of communication. It is dramatic evidence that more normal media for expressing discontent have been either unavailable or inadequate. Or, as you might say in your defense, the audience was not listening.

Let us listen to your defense first. I know that it is a good one. The poor and the Negro were played down, not because you weren't aware of them, but because the rest of us did not want to look. You write for your subscribers. If they don't want to read about something, you don't write about it. If you did, they would leave you in droves. So would your advertisers—including the retailers. This would be a sure road to bankruptcy. And one more medium of communications would bite the dust. What good would that do anyone, including the minorities?

There is a lot to be said for that point of view. Nevertheless, I don't buy it. I don't buy it because it ignores three ingredients that, to me, are basic to great journalism or any other business or profession in this great country. They are talent, purpose and involvement. Let's take them in order.

You all know that you can get the attention of your readers for any subject—even the most unlikely ones—because each of you has done it. All you have to do is put a talented writer to work on the assignment and give him enough freedom and space. The results are predictable. He will be read, no matter what the subject. This is partly because a good writer can communicate to even a normally inattentive audience. And it is partly because your media carry considerable authority and the priority they give a subject will automatically become the priority given it by a great many readers, listeners and viewers.

Using this technique, you have forced some states to clean up their mental institutions. You have awakened an apathetic electorate and encouraged them to throw a gang of incompetents out of public office. You have built new libraries, put the Community Chest over the top and modernized the accounting methods in city hall. And I suspect that some of you have even persuaded your readers that a political hack was really a statesman.

What about purpose? A clear sense of purpose is a requirement in a successful effort to inform, to enlighten, to fight ignorance, to support courage and to anticipate the future and above all to lead. A clear sense of purpose can also involve you in hot water, but leadership usually involves coping with controversy. A clear sense of purpose means being an important factor in community success and feeling a responsibility to improve community environment. This is a cause worth fighting for. Even thinking about the family life and business problems in the cities of the future is depressing unless we can anticipate changes in present urban trends.

Involvement becomes a necessity if improving the urban climate of the future is a clear objective.

The insight that develops into creative solutions to problems rarely develops from second-hand information. It usually develops from the personal involvement of talented and knowledgeable individuals. You and your writers are among the most all-around talented and knowledgeable individuals in our communities. You are also accepted as the natural spokesman of our communities. You are believable to a degree that some businessmen are not because it is often assumed that business has an axe to grind.

The only axe the enlightened business community has to grind is for the public good first, and our private good second. The urban climate and environment that is good for everybody will be good for business too.

Businessmen have had a recent and revealing demonstration of the benefits of personal involvement in urban problems. Many of the country's large, as well as small, employers have had close and personal involvement with the unemployed of their cities in the JOBS program of the National Alliance of Businessmen. They have learned that personal involvement changes the point of view. Looking at a mass of the so-called hard-core unemployed, you feel hopeless. But look at them one or two or six at a time, study how to help a particular individual become a member of a particular work-force and the results can be very satisfying. Because of this approach—individual involvement—thousands of men and women labeled permanent employment problems a year ago are working and earning decent wages today.

Though there are more, white poor than black poor in this country, the Negro is the more visible because he is always in his uniform—he is black. Like all uniformed personnel, we see him in the mass—regiments of blacks. Personal involvement—yours, ours—strips off the uniform and reveals the individual beneath.

We believe that business—the retailer, the banks, the communications media, and all the other solid local concerns, have heavy responsibility toward the local community. If we don't accept the responsibility as a moral duty, we must accept it as a way of protecting our assets and our future well-being.

There are, of course, parasitic businesses that move in when the take is good and move out when the sales go sour. They couldn't care less about the climate of a community. But most businesses and most communications media are not geared this way. We are here to stay. And part of the price of staying is caring: caring about the schools we operate, the air we breathe, the water we drink, the government we support, the health of our citizens, the peace and tranquility of our neighborhoods.

We have no right to lambaste the Federal government for taking over and fumbling our local problems if we are so short-sighted as to delegate responsibility to Washington for what is, in every city, a local sickness. The mix of problems in each community is unique, and it takes local involvement, in depth, to work out the local solutions to the urban crisis.

There is no omniscient "they" in government. "We, the people" are government, and it is our obligation to change Lincoln's phrase to read "government of all the people, by all the people and for all the people."

Earlier in this talk I mentioned the ancient and honorable relationship between the communications media and the retailers, a relationship that helped build the cities of this country. I said that it had deteriorated from one of cooperation to one at times of mutual exploitation. I am aware of the fact that I seem to have put most of the blame on the editors and publishers and left the retailers relatively unscathed.

I want to repair this one-sided picture. I think we retailers are equally to blame. To our shame, I think we have to confess that we have too often looked upon you solely as vehicles for our advertising. We have warned you not to criticize us and we have come to you for support of our pet causes.

The times are too perilous to continue this selfish relationship. If we are not doing our part toward improving our cities, you should say so—out loud. Would we like this? Not at all. But if you are the kind of newspaper, radio or TV station that is consistently fighting with courage for a better community, your audience will multiply and you will be strong, lively and well-supported that we will not dare do anything more than growl.

On our side, we will have to look at something other than your circulation figures and whether you are giving proper position to our ads and enough play for our promotions. We will have to criticize you when your editorial job is feeble, your perspective narrow and when you fail to report fully on the needs of the whole community—minorities included.

But mutual criticism is not as good as mutual encouragement. And, best of all, would be mutual cooperation. We need each other. And our cities need us both.

Your organization is meeting here in Cincinnati to celebrate the founding in this city of the first newspaper in the Northwest Territory 175 years ago. In the first issue of that paper the editor wrote about the danger to the infant village from slaughter and pillage by the Indians.

Now these villages have grown into great urban complexes. The danger they are in does not come from any outside enemy. It comes from within, from the destructive results of our apathy, our intolerance and our blindness.

All this is beginning to change. Many of our citizens have shaken off their apathy. And some inroads have been made on the Urban problem.

But, let's face it. The progress we have made looks much more impressive to white observers safely cloistered in their suburban sanctuaries than it does to black men who know only the despair of the metropolitan ghetto.

I think I can tell you that, for the first time, business is facing up to this problem—with its dollars, with its time with its brains and with its heart. We want more allies. We need more help. Specifically, more of your help.

We need more of your help as employers. In my business we have had to learn how to train the so-called unemployable, to work on the sales floor, to buy and sell and supervise. Are you satisfied that you have done all you can? In the back shop? On the city desk?

We also want and need more of your help as partners in solving the problems our communities face. Certainly your role is as objective observer and reporter of what's going on. But, we can't afford to let you sit on the sidelines in splendid isolation. We need more of your brains and your compassionate concern. And, you have to figure out how, at one time, you can be both critic and participant.

Last, we need to ask you to do that hardest job of all—see yourself as others see you. Let me make it clear that I am one of your

biggest fans. I think we all have reason to applaud the performance of the American Press and Media. But, that view is not shared by the disadvantaged. They often think of you as part of the problem—not part of the solution.

I urge you, therefore, to look once again at your newspapers—to listen once again to your broadcasts—making sure that you are doing all within your power to bridge that gulf of misunderstanding that is a part of the root of our problem.

Together, let us summon up the will, the strength and the foresight to work together and transform our cities from what is too often a cause for shame into an achievement worthy of our pride and a future in which all citizens and all business will grow and prosper.

#### CONGLOMERATE ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, two decades ago a unique economic cycle quietly began. Today, still largely unstudied, it sweeps across the economic landscape and, in its wake, a new industrial America is emerging.

I am speaking, of course, about conglomerate mergers.

Already the Nation has been warned. The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability recently reported that our Nation's economy is undergoing a "massive restructuring from conglomerate merger activity."

My discussions with economists and leaders in industry convinces me that we have already begun to feel the impact of the great merger wave of the 1960's. What concerns me most is that conglomerates appear to be causing our society to lose vital services which the independent regulatory agencies are bound by law to protect.

Furthermore, although the character of our industrial system is gradually being altered by merger activity and the pace of this activity is accelerating each year, no one has paused to study in detail what its causes and effects might be.

Who knows how often the acquisition of a faltering carrier by a successful conglomerate will result in an emphasis on increased profits at the expense of providing the people with necessary services?

Who can say whether a regulatory agency, under present laws, has sufficient authority to protect the public interest when a company which has been under its direct control suddenly becomes a mere atom in a complex conglomerate molecule?

Who is certain that investors in companies acquired in mergers and people who invest in conglomerates themselves are receiving adequate protection under present securities laws from the possibility of misleading financial disclosures and stock price irregularities?

Who can tell us that, if mergers are motivated primarily by the possible benefits of questionable tax and speculative practices, the commuter, the consumer, or the small investor will not have to pay a price?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time

that we were informed about these matters. It is time that this revolution in American business, in which the economic balance of power may actually be shifting, be spotlighted and examined in depth before it becomes the tail that wags the dog—before conglomerates can possibly influence public policy decisions out of all reasonable proportion to their actual concern for the public good.

And so, Mr. Speaker, today I am filing a joint resolution which will authorize the six independent regulatory agencies to examine the effects of conglomerate activities on the transportation and communications industries, the securities markets, and interstate and foreign commerce. The agencies concerned are: the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission.

My proposed study will look with equal emphasis on both good and bad effects of conglomerates and decide whether the independent regulatory agencies, as they are presently constituted, have adequate authority to supervise conglomerate activities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I reiterate that this matter is urgent. We cannot possibly know whether conglomerate mergers are beneficial or harmful to our economic way of life until a comprehensive study, such as the one I am proposing, is carried out. I urge my colleagues to consider this resolution as soon as possible. Otherwise, we may find that without our knowing very much about them, conglomerates will have already taken the larger share of what should be the prerogative of the people—the right to determine what is in the public interest and how that interest is best served.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution follows:

#### H.J. Res. 315

Joint resolution directing a joint study by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the effect of conglomerate activities on the transportation and communications industries, the securities markets, and interstate and foreign commerce.

Whereas as the result of recent actions leading to the control of air carriers by conglomerate organizations not primarily concerned with transportation cast doubt upon the ability of such air carriers to perform their duties and responsibilities to the public in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; and

Whereas as the result of recent actions leading to the control of rail carriers by conglomerate organizations not primarily concerned with transportation cast doubt upon the ability of such rail carriers to perform their duties and responsibilities to the public in accordance with the Interstate Commerce Act; and

Whereas as the result of recent actions leading to the control of motor carriers by conglomerate organizations not primarily concerned with transportation cast doubt upon the ability of such motor carriers to perform their duties and responsibilities to the public in accordance with the Interstate Commerce Act; and

Whereas as the result of recent actions leading to the control of water carriers by

conglomerate organizations not primarily concerned with transportation cast doubt upon the ability of such water carriers to perform their duties and responsibilities to the public in accordance with the Interstate Commerce Act; and

Whereas as the result of recent actions leading to the control of gas pipeline companies by conglomerate organizations not primarily concerned with the transportation of gas cast doubt upon the ability of such gas pipeline companies to perform their duties and responsibilities to the public in accordance with the Natural Gas Act of 1938; and

Whereas as the result of recent actions leading to the control of communications facilities by conglomerate organizations not primarily concerned with communications cast doubt upon the ability of such facilities to perform their duties and responsibilities to the public in accordance with the Communications Act of 1934; and

Whereas the activities of conglomerates in acquiring or attempting to acquire control of other companies as well as such transportation carriers and communications facilities has a noticeable effect upon the free and orderly operation of the securities markets and also involves the protection to the security holders in the acquired companies afforded them under the various securities acts; and

Whereas many other effects of the activities of conglomerates on interstate and foreign commerce as well as the over-all economy are unknown; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, That the Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission shall, acting jointly, and utilizing the facilities and personnel of their respective agencies, conduct as expeditiously as possible a full and complete study and investigation of conglomerate activities, including acquisitions and mergers, and their effects on transportation (air, ground, water, and gas pipeline) and communications industries, the securities markets, and interstate and foreign commerce. The Chairmen shall as soon as practicable after completion of the study and investigation authorized by this joint resolution prepare and submit a report thereon to the President and to the Congress. Such report shall include such legislative recommendations as the Chairmen deem advisable.*

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2 million to carry out the study and investigation required by the first section of this joint resolution.

#### SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) for today for 1 hour, be transferred to January 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASCELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### CENSUS REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) in his fight for census reform. I feel we should repeal criminal penalties attached to the 67 subjects now

on the 1970 census questionnaire, and I introduced H.R. 3829 on January 16, 1969, in an effort to do this.

There are now more than 67 Congressmen sponsoring bills to eliminate the \$100 fine and 60-day jail sentence which can be imposed on citizens who refuse to reveal personal information about themselves and their households. The proper alternative to the present harassment is to limit mandatory questions to such subjects as name, address, age, sex, head of household, and persons in home at time of census, and leave the remaining ones to be answered on a voluntary basis. The great majority of citizens will cooperate with the Census Bureau to supply essential information needed.

I do not think that there is any justification for the mandatory requirement that forces all citizens to provide information as to—

First, income, dollar by dollar, from all sources including public assistance, alimony, unemployment and disability insurance, pensions, and investments;

Second, the value of property or the amount of rent paid;

Third, educational, marital, employment, and military history;

Fourth, with whom bathroom and kitchen facilities are shared;

Fifth, a long list of household items including dishwasher, television, radios, automobiles, and second home; and

Sixth, where each person and his parents were born.

I must point out that the constitutional purpose of the census is to count people and that the gathering of a hundred other facts about them is a secondary objective. I note that in 1960 the Census Bureau failed to count 5.7 million Americans and has predicted greater undercount in 1970 unless the forms are simplified and most questions put on a voluntary basis.

#### WILBUR COHEN AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I presented to the House the first half of Secretary Wilbur Cohen's annual report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1968. I did so because of the importance I attach to the Secretary's review of his Department's work and to the recommendations he includes for future programs.

I would like at this time to submit the second and final section of Secretary Cohen's report, covering education, welfare, and the financing of the Department's programs. I hope that they will have the careful attention of the Members of the House.

I would like also to reiterate my own appreciation to Secretary Cohen for the remarkable contribution he has made to public service and for the imaginative proposals he has left for our consideration as we seek to improve the quality of health, education and welfare available to the people of our country. His great

professional skill and experience, in combination with his personal warmth, consideration, and kindness, left their mark on these programs and enhanced the quality of the public service to which he contributed so generously throughout his career.

The second half of Secretary Cohen's report follows:

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FISCAL YEAR 1968—II**

(Second half)

#### IV—SCHOOLING: THE GREAT STEPS FORWARD

In education, as in health, we have taken great steps forward in the last years. In education, as in health, we need to move forward faster still, emphasizing the needs of the young. They are, after all, our Nation's future.

About one of every three of us is a student—a teacher—or educational administrator. And six percent of our income goes to formal education.

The fact that we are now truly an "educational society" is reflected at HEW. The more than 75 laws enacted in the past eight years have touched the lives of millions—and changed the face of the Department. The Office of Education which for almost a hundred years was primarily a statistic gathering organization, is now a bustling agency administering funds that are giving millions of our children fuller opportunities: special help for poor boys and girls; books and other educational material; grants, loans, and work study help for young men and women who want to go beyond high school; aid for more than half our colleges and universities; and research grants that have improved the whole process of education. Most importantly, after a century of debate, the fears and bugaboos about Federal control and all the rest have proved groundless; the issues have been clarified and the facts straightened out. The Federal role in education has been established.

We have made a good beginning. Still, we are barely keeping pace with our Nation's rapidly growing and constantly changing education needs. No one can afford to stop learning in a society where, by 1975, some three-fourths of our labor force will be producing goods and services that did not exist ten years before. Future generations need as early a start as possible. And the follow through should be a life time pursuit.

The Nation must make a greater investment in education at all levels. We must close whatever gaps we suffer.

#### Strengthening Federal support

Without an increase in our overall investment in education, we cannot assure each child that the goal of his education depends on ability, not geography, or his family's financial capacity.

We must narrow the range of per student expenditures among the States, and within the States. We must share the cost of educating poor and handicapped children. We must mobilize our research and development resources so that we can improve the whole range of educational activities. And to get the most for our dollars, we must streamline and coordinate our programs through efficient administration, effective performance and evaluation. Therefore, I recommend:

That the property tax—the chief source of revenue for the schools—be modified, supplemented by other sources of revenue, and eventually eliminated.

That within the next four years today's Federal share of 8 percent of elementary and secondary school expenditures be sharply increased year by year, from \$1½ billion to the full authorization of \$3.5 billion annually.

That, to assure that all funds for education are well spent, we encourage and support the national assessment of the state of

learning in the United States, already authorized by Congress, for a five-year period.

That legislation be enacted to place all income to the United States from leases and royalties from shale oil and other minerals in a trust fund, and the proceeds be used for the support of education—in accordance with our Nation's education laws.

#### A real headstart

A growing body of knowledge tells us that very, very young children can be stimulated to learn far more than has been expected in the past, and that learning really does begin at birth. One scientist believes that by beginning at the earliest possible stage in the child's development, we could perhaps stretch the IQ of future generations by as much as 30 points.

All children need attention, time, and money spent on them before they reach the age of six. Yet the children who most need to have their minds stretched and their environments enhanced—including two-thirds of the 2,000,000 poor children between the ages of three and five—lack such opportunity. Therefore, I recommend:

The extension of Head Start for low-income children, for all handicapped children, and ultimately for all children who could benefit, urban and rural—for first for five year olds, then for four year olds, then for three year olds.

Effective follow-up for preschool programs, incentives to attract highly qualified teachers to work with disadvantaged children, and use of advanced educational equipment and of individual tutoring.

New school construction and operating fund programs to improve the quality of education.

Schools which serve as vital centers of community activity; school systems which strengthen community ties with the schools and encourage real parental participation.

#### Day-round, year-round schools

We have a tremendous investment in school plant in the United States; we should put it to better use. One of the greatest wastes we suffer is the school that opens at 8:30 a.m., closes at 3:30 p.m., and shuts for three months in the summer.

Today's slum school especially is often only a building where children are kept for so many hours a day. If it expanded in hours, and community service, it could become something much more: a neighborhood "capital," a source of pride and a symbol of individual and communal achievement.

Schools in both slums and suburbs should be kept open afternoons, evenings and all year long. But twelve months of the same old thing will not do. The school should become a place for young and old to go for useful education covering a wide range of programs—vocational training, work experience, advanced courses, cultural activities, community service, and remedial training of all kinds. Therefore, I recommend:

Federal support to help school systems seeking to convert to full time education, starting with schools for disadvantaged children.

#### The many aspects of education

Our educational institutions—like our citizens—should develop their individualities and keep these individualities. There must be many different kinds of such institutions—each of them as good as possible, in its own way.

The student who wants to learn to work with his hands as a draftsman, for instance, should have that chance just as the Shakespeare scholar has his. The landmark Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 give us the tools to increase opportunities for vocational education. They point the way to new bonds among government, school systems and private industry. In this new partnership, opportunity is joined to educational experience through cooperative, part-time work-study, and both lead to specific jobs.

Once a student finishes high school, he

should continue to have a varied choice of learning styles. Yet, we are far from the goal of giving different sorts of educational opportunities beyond high school to all young people who deserve such opportunities and can benefit from them. We have made progress. The growth of junior colleges over the past decade, has been phenomenal—with schools opening at the rate of about one a week. They have already proven their potential. But we must make sure that no economic or racial barrier stands in the way of talented students who want to go beyond high school—whatever the direction.

What's more, new sorts of jobs and new kinds of careers constantly demand that schools and colleges foster the art of learning in the broadest sense, and provide training outside the formal educational structure. More and more pupils need the kind of broadly based general education that helps them adapt to lifetime changes. Not only must they have a sound basic education, but they need opportunities for continuous learning while they are at school and college, and through their lives. This means their schooling must reach into the community—and into the world of culture, art, and government as well.

We have more than eight million vocational education students in the country today. What is more, businesses and industries show increasing interest in training and re-training programs. Nearly two million people are now involved in vocational, technical and professional training outside the formal educational establishment. Many more are enrolled in correspondence courses. Television's educational courses reach still others. But the potential has barely been tapped. Therefore, I recommend:

That we triple the number and dramatically improve the quality of opportunities in vocational education under the new Vocational Education legislation.

That we develop a whole series of continuing education programs—through vocational and technical schools, junior colleges and universities—educational television, community schools—and any other possible resource.

#### Higher education

The 1960's have seen an unprecedented increase in the Federal commitment to higher education—from \$2.5 billion in 1963 to almost \$6 billion in 1968. Clearly, America's colleges and universities owe their growth and vitality in large measure to such great laws as the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Higher Education Act of 1965. In enacting the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 the Congress took another major step in the strengthening of higher education.

With all this progress, ability to pay, rather than ability to learn, still prevents many talented students from entering and completing college. Students with the same achievement levels, but with different family incomes even attend college in strikingly different ways. Moreover, many question the future financial health of higher education. They especially doubt its ability to take on large numbers of additional students, and to pay for high-quality graduate education. The Nation has a valuable resource in its specialists with graduate degrees and the research they make possible. States and individuals cannot afford to nurture this costly resource alone.

The time has come for a bold new commitment to higher education, a commitment with two major thrusts: to promote equality of opportunity by ensuring that all able students can afford to go on to post-secondary education, and that institutions are able to accommodate them; and to strengthen graduate education and research by supporting graduate students and helping institutions develop a limited number of centers of excellence for graduate teaching and research.

Student aid should be our chief concern. Aid for students who need it most, or who would not otherwise go to college, should have our first priority.

Still, institutional aid enhances the education of each individual student, and equality of opportunity in higher education is an empty goal unless colleges and universities have the resources for high quality education. Part of these resources must come from tuition and fees, part from State and local government, part from private giving. But without increased Federal help, these resources will not be sufficient. The Federal Government must also directly help the institutions meet the financial burden of serving many more students. Therefore, I recommend:

The expansion of Federal student aid programs, such as educational opportunity grants and college work study until the number of federally aided students reaches about three million by 1976—instead of the present 1 1/4 million—with Federal aid available to the majority of students now at college from families with incomes under \$9,000 a year, and to the thousands of potential college students from such families.

Cost-of-education allowances paid to every institution which enrolls a federally aided student (undergraduate and graduate).

A variety of aid for graduate education and research to strengthen graduate research and increase the number of centers of excellence.

Consolidation of Federal aid programs for higher education construction and equipment to give colleges and universities more flexibility to use Federal funds in accordance with their own plans and priorities. New and expanding institutions and those who must replace deteriorating plant and equipment need help for the capital cost of institutional expansion.

Congressional examination of all kinds of institutional grants, to learn more about the impact of formula aid on the quality of higher education, on the balance between public and private colleges, and on the maintenance and growth of support by State and local governments.

#### *Family life and sex education*

Americans depend on their families for warmth, security and sustenance. The family shapes its children, directs their talents and encourages them as they define their values.

Society cannot control the family, or teach people how to raise families successfully and lead successful family lives. It can, however, try to teach what we know of successful family life and sex education.

In August 1968, at my suggestion, the Office of Education issued a policy statement supporting the inclusion of important, long-neglected family life and sex education courses in elementary and secondary school curricula. Many school districts around the country have begun to include such courses as a regular part of children's education from kindergarten through high school. Often such courses become centers of a stormy political issue.

Even highly emotional political controversies prove useful when they excite open and public discussion of a significant—and too often taboo—subject. Expanded programs of family life and sex education will contribute to the stability of families, to the reduction of venereal disease and illegitimacy, and to the fuller appreciation of human life. Therefore, I have broadened the responsibilities of the Department's Committee on Population and Family Planning to include consideration of sex education and improved and strengthened family life.

#### *Student unrest*

The numerous, often violent, disturbances on our college and university campuses have worried and upset the Nation. Reflecting this disenchantment with young dissidents, the

90th Congress enacted certain legislation aimed at denying students who participate in violent and disruptive demonstrations the benefits of federally financed grants, loans, and fellowships.

Surely the student activities at which such legislation is directed are destructive and self-defeating; I cannot condone them. Whatever the need for reform in our academic life, physical harassment, obstruction, and vandalism cannot be used as acceptable means of dramatizing it. Nonetheless, I am deeply concerned about the practical effect of the "student unrest" provisions.

In the first place, they present the colleges and universities which must enforce them with a confusing set of conflicting and overlapping regulations. For example, section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 and section 411 of the 1969 Appropriation Act both turn on the conviction of an individual student of a crime. However, in each section, the nature of the crime, the identity of the convicting court, the procedural incidents, and the consequences of a finding against the student are defined differently.

Moreover, these provisions may have grave consequences for the education programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They involve the Federal Government in the maintenance of campus discipline—usually and properly a college and university function. By imposing rigid Federal standards, they may restrict the ability of college and university administrators to deal with disruptive students on the basis of each individual, particular situation. And, by making the consequences of a student's participation in a demonstration turn ultimately on the size of his pocketbook rather than on the strict nature of his conduct, the untest provisions discriminate on economic grounds.

All in all, then, they may do more to exacerbate campus tensions than to ease them, and do more to hamper official capacity to deal with these tensions than help it. Therefore, I recommend:

That the public interest would be better served if Congress followed the Senate proposal, vesting in the college or university full discretion for determining how a student's misconduct should affect his eligibility for Federal assistance.

That, in any event, Congress correct the present conflicting and overlapping nature of the laws in this area by eliminating the restriction now imposed by section 411 of the 1969 Appropriation Act.

#### *Selective service and national manpower policy*

Descriptions of the American draft system range all the way from pure praise to simple acceptance to "Kafkaesque in its inscrutable arbitrariness."

Whatever the truth, the continued education and training of the graduate and professional manpower required by the national interest warrant the review and modification of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-40). Men of military service deserve more equitable treatment from their country.

A random selection system within the age groups eligible for service may be the long range solution. Any single deferment, regardless of age or educational level, should be based upon the ultimate national interest and security. Pending congressional action on Public Law 90-40, the selective service procedure should be modified so that young men and women eligible for service suffer a minimum of uncertainty.

Therefore, I recommend:

That a prime age group (age 19) be designated as the first to be inducted into the service, and that those who are now past age 19 (but not yet 26) and who are not entitled to deferment, be treated for this pur-

pose as if they were 19 (be placed in the 19-year old pool).

Since all fields of higher education are, or may be, of equally critical importance to the balanced development of the Nation, that no higher education field or discipline be considered more important or critical for selective service deferment purposes than any other.

#### V—ASSURING A DECENT LIVELIHOOD

Our American society firmly believes that an able-bodied man should pull himself up by his own bootstraps. It is only gradually coming to grips with the fact that he can't pull himself up by his bootstraps if he hasn't any boots.

It has been shocking to realize that the man criticized for quitting his job had to do so to take care of motherless children—or that children fall asleep in class because they have been kept up all night in crowded rooms—or that they cannot achieve good marks because they are hungry and undernourished.

As a Nation, we are facing the reality first confronted in the 1930's: No child, no man can thrive on an empty stomach; the key to opportunity is a decent income earned with dignity. But we have not gone as far in assuring this income as have most of our fellow democracies.

It is an ugly paradox that this is true in our wealthy country, with its vigorous capacity for growth and for change. It is a paradox that some suffer hunger in the midst of surplus, rat-haunted slums near comfortable suburbs, a lack of steady, decent jobs in a period of high employment; that when most Americans enjoy an extraordinary high standard of living, we still have some 22 million human beings living in poverty.

#### *Social security*

For the first time since the world began, we, as a Nation, have the capacity to end poverty. The most formidable weapon in our arsenal is one most Americans have not yet thought of as an anti-poverty program—Social Security. The Social Security and Unemployment Insurance Systems moderate the loss in earnings due to retirement, death, disability and temporary unemployment. They offer American workers and their families basic, necessary protection.

For instance, social security is the main source of continuing income for retired people—many would be destitute without it. Social security benefits keep 10 million people above the poverty level. Without these benefits, they would have to depend on relatives who often could not readily afford such support, or they would have to go on relief rolls. Without these benefits, nineteen out of twenty beneficiaries would not achieve even a moderate living standard.

Over 24 million American men and women are receiving old-age, survivors or disability insurance checks totaling \$2 billion each month. Still, the social security recipient keeps body and soul together on an average of \$100 a month. And the minimum benefits are now only \$55 for a single person and \$82.50 for a couple.

Whenever suggestions are made concerning increasing social security benefits, several inevitable but proper questions arise: Can we afford it? Should the cost be borne by payroll contributions?

In considering these important questions, we should remember that the employer's net social insurance contribution rate today is lower than it was expected to be when the social security program was enacted in 1935. I have transmitted to the Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance a report on this matter which in my opinion justifies additional payroll contributions for further improvements in the program.

I recommend:

That social security benefits be raised substantially to a \$100 per month minimum for

an individual and \$150 for a couple over the next several years. This would have a dramatic effect—lifting 4.4 million people out of poverty. The first step toward this goal would be a 10 percent general boost and a jump from \$55 to \$80 minimum for an individual and from \$82.50 to \$120 for a couple. This would move 1.2 million persons out of poverty. This first step alone would take 150,000 aged men and women of the welfare rolls and greatly reduce the number of needy crippled, disabled and blind, at an annual savings in local, State and Federal funds of \$255 million. States would then be free to concentrate their helping efforts on the families most in need of preventive—and where it is too late—rehabilitative services.

That the maximum earnings base on which social security benefits are computed (now \$7,800 a year) be completely eliminated in determining the employer's contribution.

That the maximum earnings base for determining the employee's contributions and benefits be increased by steps to \$15,000 a year so that the social security system will cover about the same proportion of wages as it did in 1939.

Consideration be given to changing the ratio of employer-employee contributions, from a 50-50 basis to two-thirds from the employer and one-third from the employee. This step would recognize the fact that the employer can deduct his contributions as a business expense in computing his tax, while the employee must pay an income tax on his deduction.

That the Congress consider refunding part of all of the payroll tax paid by those below the poverty level out of general Federal revenues.

That the level of unemployment insurance be raised substantially; that Federal standards be set for it, and remaining gaps in coverage be closed; that workmen's compensation benefits be improved for those who cannot work because of disabilities suffered on the job.

That the Congress enact legislation providing for payment of social security benefits to persons at age 60 on an actuarially reduced basis in either of two cases: if at any time unemployment for the United States should exceed 4½% for any four consecutive months, or if the Council of Economic Advisers advises the President that unemployment is likely to exceed five percent for three consecutive months.

That the retirement test on which there is no loss of income be increased from \$1680 a year to \$1800 and that this amount be automatically increased in the future in relation to increased earnings.

#### *The right to welfare*

Nobody likes our present system of public welfare. Those who get it say it demeans them. Those who administer it feel strangled by its paperwork—especially its eligibility forms. Those taxpayers who pay for it worry rightfully about its \$8 billion cost. Here at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Federal agency charged with the administration of the public assistance system—we are committed to its change and improvement. This Secretary, who has worked toward this for 34 years, would also like to end the dole.

But how? Most people turn to public welfare in despair—not greed—and as a last resort. Although 22 million Americans are poor, only 9 million of them receive relief, millions less than might qualify. The great majority—or about 7 million—of our public welfare recipients are either very old (2 million) or very young (4.2 million) or blind (85,000) or permanently and totally disabled (700,000). Unskilled, hampered by a lack of education, families travel to our great cities because they dream of opportunity, not handouts. Once on relief, they usually hunger to get off and into decent self-respecting lives, the kind most Americans take for granted.

It's no wonder. The average monthly welfare check for an aged man or woman is \$70.25, for a family with 3 children, \$162 (or \$39.50 per person). As in any category system of relief, the recipient can starve unaided if he does not qualify under specific labels of dependency. And because states match Federal welfare funds in different amounts, there are gross discrepancies in welfare payments. In Mississippi, a needy mother of 3 gets an average of \$35 a month (\$8.45 per person), in New York, \$282.35 (or \$71.75 per person).

There are also great discrepancies in rules and regulations. The number and style of "investigators" approving or disapproving the welfare client varies. But too many states are still entangled in a quest for the "worthy poor." If six people witness a murder, the alleged murderer can enter a court of law, raise his right hand, swear to his innocence and rate a lawyer. He is innocent until he is proven guilty. But an ill-clothed welfare mother of an undernourished five-year-old is often treated as guilty of some infraction of existing rules until she is proven innocent. Beset by complex problems, bewildered by intricate forms, she presents herself at the public assistance headquarters. The welfare worker almost always has to spend so many hours checking her statements about income, or property, or relationships, or residency, that there is little time left to help set the family on the road to independence by unravelling the personal and family difficulties which beset so many.

All of this has now begun to change. Long ago, the Social Security Act, by demanding a few basic ground rules, set in motion a process which over recent years has effected a quiet revolution in the rights of the poor. The legal framework required of public assistance plans has been strengthened by Congress. The doors of the courts have been opened to demands that these programs meet constitutional standards of equity and rationality, both in substance and in procedure. The emergence of the legal service programs for the poor has made possible challenges to a host of questionable practices.

Today there is a growing recognition of the legal right to the receipt of public assistance, a legal right to insist that it be fairly designed and fairly administered—and a legal right to invoke the Constitution to assure the fairness of the system. What lies ahead is the task of applying these rights, point by point, so that the poor may come to stand truly equal before the law. The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution applies to the poor and the disadvantaged as well as to other citizens of the United States. Constitutional decision is the responsibility of the courts, but the Secretary of HEW also has major responsibilities for the fair and proper administration of public assistance.

#### *An end to the dole*

Most Americans are compassionate, they are pragmatic; they accept the fact that they cannot let over 4 million children starve. They do not so easily accept the fact that there are 1.4 million adults—mostly parents—taking care of these children on the relief rolls—or understand the complex social forces that put them there. All are agreed that we should take a good hard look at our public welfare system, and work toward its reform. My first recommended step in such an effort—raising the minimum social security benefit—would take 150,000 needy aged men and women off the welfare rolls.

We must also turn our attention to the world of work and work opportunities, to the problems of welfare administration, and improved services.

A major study carried out in 1966 by Dr. Lawrence Podell of the City University of New York shows what many of us suspected—that most welfare mothers want to work. Seven in ten mothers interviewed preferred to work for pay rather than stay at home;

two-thirds planned to work in the future (the fact that one in six never went beyond fourth grade and another one in six never graduated high school indicates the level of job they could hope for).

We must concentrate on better training and better jobs for welfare recipients. We must also achieve such training and such jobs for the one-third of the poor who belong to families whose heads hold full-time year round jobs. Wives and children share in any higher earnings achieved by underemployed and unemployed men. If we could lift these families above the poverty level, we could concentrate more effectively on smaller numbers of hard-core poor who are left—on and off the welfare rolls. Therefore, I recommend:

A greatly expanded program of work incentives, and opportunities for productive and self-supporting work (jobs-job training—and the development of New Careers possibilities).

The establishment of a national Federal welfare payment administered according to national standards, to be available to individuals in need in all the states. The Federal courts have pointed the way to this reform in several states by declaring welfare residency laws illegal. If the Federal Government picked up the check, welfare payments and policy among the states would be equalized. And the budget burden of our great cities would be eased, leaving them freer to use their funds for constructive social services—schooling—recreation—and all the rest. Such a system would include financial incentives for men and women to seek employment, adequate day care for the children of working mothers, an effective job training program, legal protection, visiting nurse and family planning services.

Cutting down wasted professional time by using a simplified Eligibility Application Form instead of a detailed investigation, to determine the eligibility of public assistance recipients. This has been tried with some success in New York and California, and would, of course, require scrupulous sample checking. Each of us who pays an income tax is asked to declare our income; and each of us knows that his declaration is reviewed and may be questioned. Each of us knows that if he is found guilty of fraud, he will be punished; the same would be true in public welfare. The public sympathizes with the plight of the aged, the blind, and disabled. We should start our new policy with them. The funds saved could well be used for constructive, rehabilitative social services.

#### *Consumer protection*

A family's standard of living can be raised not only by increasing its resources, but also by assuring that it uses them wisely. The poor and the aged are susceptible targets for consumer fraud. The woman on welfare who knows how to avoid being shortchanged at the supermarket is that much ahead. So is the man who knows how to ask fair treatment from his landlord, whatever his income.

For many years consumer problems were pushed aside, and consumer protection programs relegated to a minor, insignificant place. After all, consumer interests were fragmented, and opposition to them well organized and well financed. Now the leadership of some dedicated members of Congress and the increased attention devoted to consumer problems by the national news media have changed the picture. New laws protect us against a wide variety of dangerous products and unfair practices—from infant blankets to automobiles, from unwholesome food to consumer credit.

Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have taken a number of steps to focus attention on consumer protection, and to provide more and better in-

formation to consumers. I recommend, in addition, that HEW:

Authorize a central or agency publication to give consumers information about consumer choices developed through government-sponsored, taxpayer-paid research.

Offer Federal financial aid to states to improve their consumer service programs.

Provide for the coverage of certain prescription drugs under the Medicare program.

Authorize payments for drugs under Medicare and Medicaid at reasonable prices normally paid by drug dispensing establishments—like pharmacies or hospital clinics.

Publish and disseminate an up-to-date U.S. Drug Compendium of prescription drugs listed by their generic name with pertinent information on each drug.

Require that all prescription drugs in tablet or capsule form bear an identification which would reveal the manufacturer and identify the drug; the manufacturer's name and the generic or established name should also appear on the label of prescription drug containers.

#### Federal credit unions

Federal Credit Unions have come to be an important part of consumer protection, as a method of saving for more than ten million wage-earners. Assets of the 12,600 credit unions now stand at about \$6.8 billion. I have been a member of credit unions since 1936 and I know what they mean to struggling young families.

Though the members of the credit unions are generally working people of modest means, who can ill afford to lose their savings (which average only \$562), the Federal Credit Unions remain the only federally-chartered savings institution without deposit insurance. Therefore, I recommend that:

Federal Deposit Insurance protection be provided to credit union members, similar to the protection of deposits in banks. The fact that liquidations have been infrequent—combined with the Credit Unions' excellent record—would keep such insurance costs to a minimum.

#### Income maintenance

The goal for the years ahead is to weave a net—through employment efforts, our social insurance system, a reformed public assistance program, and intensified consumer protection—through which no American may fall. But even with the best of intentions, the most skilled craftsmen, and the strongest thread, it will take time to make a foolproof web—one without a single hole.

The recommendations of the President's Commission on Income Maintenance, which is examining all practical alternative income maintenance systems, should be very helpful. HEW's goal should be to assure a decent minimum for every American individual and every American family. Such an income maintenance system should have built-in incentive encouraging every able-bodied man and woman to contribute as fully as possible to our economy, as well as to share in its benefits.

#### VI—TO BETTER THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN LIFE: PAYING THE HEW BILL

To reach great goals, we must make great choices. As a Nation, we must decide what kind—what quality of life—we want to accomplish for our people. And we must set priorities, so that we have the means to move toward greater health and education and social opportunities.

This we can do. We need only the will to do it.

Our gross national product increased by more than half between 1960 and 1968. The vitality of the economy, and our capacity to harness the power for stable, steady growth have proven formidable.

If our Nation continues its present course, total production will increase an average of \$40 to \$50 billion each year, and grow larger

as time passes. The same is true of Federal revenues. Given no change in tax rates, they will increase by more than \$15 billion a year.

#### Can we afford improved health, education, and welfare?

Our gross national product for 1969 is estimated to be \$920 billion and will undoubtedly exceed \$1 trillion in 1971. At this rate of growth, the gross national product should reach \$1,800 billion by 1976 and exceed \$1,500 billion by 1980. There is absolutely no question that we have the resources to improve our health, education, and welfare if we commit ourselves to making the proper priorities in our tax system and other programs.

In 1960, our gross national product was slightly less than \$500 billion and we spent in the United States, \$79 billion for all health, education, and welfare activities, public and private. This amounted to 16 percent of the gross national product.

By 1963, our gross national product had increased \$80 billion to \$757 billion, our health, education, and welfare expenditures to \$100 billion, and the proportion of these expenditures to gross national product to 17.4 percent.

By 1968, the GNP had increased nearly another \$50 billion to \$822 billion, health, education, and welfare expenditures to \$163 billion, and the proportion of such expenses rose to 19.8 percent.

These trends unmistakably indicate that during the next eight years, as our gross national product rises, so the proportion of the gross national product invested in health, education, and welfare will and will rise. With a GNP of \$1300 billion in 1976, the proportion invested in health, education, and welfare could rise to 25%, making possible \$325 billion to be invested in health, education, and welfare compared to \$163 billion in 1968—a doubling in the eight year period. This would enable us to be investing by that time about \$50 billion more in health, \$60 billion more in education, and \$55 billion more in social security and welfare. And we could do that simply by more equitable sharing of a bigger pie.

A Nation which spends more than \$8 billion for tobacco and \$11 billion for alcohol, a Nation in which 12 million people own pleasure boats, can surely use its increased revenues for human beings. A Nation in which 79 percent of the households own one car, and one quarter of the households own two or more cars, can afford to improve the quality of life of its least fortunate citizens. But it has to want to pay the price.

#### Paying the HEW bill

The taxes we pay are simply the price of Government services and commodities. Tax collection is the mechanism through which consumers—or the general public—pay the price.

Americans rightfully want to pay reasonable prices. No one wants to pay too much for a car, or a loaf of bread, or drugs. No one wants to find his bought meat so tough he can't eat it, or that a house exactly like his could have been built for less money.

By and large, Americans have received good value for their health, education, and welfare tax dollars. Look at the substantial dramatic gains of the past years.

We have strengthened our chances for the blessing of good health—dramatically lowering infant mortality rates, for instance, and begun a new life-giving community approach to mental health and illness. We have overcome the Federal aid to education barriers, and millions of school children benefited—through books, new imaginative ways of learning, and help toward college education. We have improved the quality of education and enhanced equal opportunity. Fewer high school drop-outs—rehabilitation for handicapped people and those on welfare

rolls—medicare and other improvements in social security—a significant drop in the number of Americans living in poverty. This is the story of the past years.

Many people have asked each recent HEW Secretary, when we have moved forward so rapidly, why must we pay the price for more social services? The answer is two fold.

First, the needs are still great. They are especially great for our least fortunate families. A Nation which still has 22 million poor—living in a world of bad health, housing and food, little clothing, and a hopeless, depressing environment—cannot sit back and rest on its laurels.

Second, the better the quality of life for most of us, the more those who have not achieved such a life, ask. They watch television, they read the popular magazines. They want the best for themselves and their children. HEW programs are designed to help them achieve it.

Increased social services will have to be financed through taxation—as they have been in the past. And, as in the past, increased health, education and welfare expenditures will add to the stability of the economy, its toughness, its strength, and its potential for growth. The more educated Americans, the more Americans in good health, the more trained and able to work, the greater our national muscle. We must invest more in the health, education, and welfare of our children. I have recommended increased education and health services for children. I also recommend:

That the appropriations and authorization for child welfare services (foster care, adoption, care of abused children and all the rest) be increased in order that all children and families in the Nation will have a better chance to lead lives of productivity and fulfillment.

#### Tools for policymaking

So big have become our institutions, public and private, so complicated our enterprise, that meeting our health, education and welfare needs will take even more than determination—and even more than willingness to pay. We must shape more effective tools for policymaking.

As organizations grow, the time needed to implement decisions gets longer. We are increasingly required to make every important and very expensive long-range decisions which, while not irreversible, are very hard to change. If we are not careful, inaction—or doing nothing—will become our chief strategic device, our policy tool.

We dare not let this happen in urgent areas of social planning. Health, education and welfare problems—and related problems in housing or transportation—demand broad active planning.

But we do not have the necessary information to make carefully reasoned policy choices and form sensible plans. We agree, for example, that we want to eliminate poverty. But how—specifically? Many ideas compete in the theoretical market place: guaranteed income, negative income tax, family allowances, wage supplements.

The trouble is that we lack some of the most crucial information about such programs, and their effect on individual lives. If the American people are to decide between alternatives, they must have more facts. What effect would a children's allowance have on family size? How would wage earners react to various kinds of negative income tax proposals?

Again, we agree that we must do something about the quality of life in our major urban centers. Again, how—specifically? Again we don't have enough information—or even refined enough ways of measuring the consequences of urban living upon the very young, the elderly, or upon their health and education. Therefore, I recommend:

That the Federal Government undertake a substantially enlarged statistical program—

gathering and disseminating information necessary for sound social planning from and to States, local governments and other interested organizations. This would include information on the effectiveness of family planning and other health programs, an ongoing national assessment of educational achievement, comparative facts on the effectiveness of delivering health care, job training and preschool education.

That the President or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare each year issue a social report, as the Council of Economic Advisors issues an economic report, measuring the quality of our society for the President, the Congress and the public.

#### *The budget*

As we cut a larger and larger piece of the national pie for social goods and services, we must improve our chief policy making tool—the budget.

Budget timing and process now impose almost impossible burdens on Department and agency staffs, creating difficult problems for program administration, and impairing the quality of decision-making. In recent years Congress has acted on the HEW budget only after the fiscal year has begun on July 1. This means that one year's HEW budget planning must begin before the previous year's budget has been finally acted upon. Senior Department officials spend enormous amounts of time and energy working on two separate budget years at once. This has become the pattern. It is not a sensible one. Therefore, I recommend:

That the budget be put on a calendar year basis so there is enough time for Congress to study and act on important HEW matters. The President would present his budget proposals in January of each year and the new appropriations would be available on January of the following year. Everyone involved would have more time to do a better job; the results would be much improved.

Congress fund programs well in advance of the time they go into effect, especially if they involve school districts, universities, states, or municipalities (which must prepare their own budgets anywhere from six to eighteen months before the budget year of the Federal Government.)

Congress takes a vacation in the month of August, not only to enable its members to have a vacation, but to give key congressional and executive staff an opportunity for much needed rest. No private industry would operate on the present timetable, which is wearing out the senior people in the executive departments and on congressional staffs. A brief pause in the legislative year would improve the Congress' ability to complete its work, and it probably also would do a great deal, in the long run, to improve the quality of legislation.

#### *Civil rights*

Better schools, more hospitals, higher income—all such changes mean little unless they are equally available to all Americans. That is why the Civil Rights legislation of the 1960's stands as one of the most significant measures taken to improve the quality of life in the United States.

HEW now shares major responsibility for the enforcement of such laws, based on the concept that all Americans should enjoy services and benefits made possible by their Federal tax dollars, without regard to race, color or national origin. Though this proposition seems eminently fair, it is nevertheless a fairly recent concept in the administration of Federal grant programs.

Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act specifically and unequivocally prohibits racial discrimination of every kind in federally assisted programs. It also requires Executive agencies to end Federal support of any program in which discrimination is practiced.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act has had a great impact on the desegregation of hospitals, nursing homes, elementary and secondary

schools, colleges and universities. HEW's efforts to enforce such principles in its administration of Medicare—which have been almost 100 percent successful—is one of the great untold stories of the past years. Quietly, steadily, the country's hospitals have been desegregated, more patients are treated equally, and more doctors are admitted to staff privileges. The pattern of discrimination has been broken. Considerations of good health can now take precedence over those of race. In education the record shows steady—albeit slow—progress in desegregation. This thrust has been expanded to all educational agencies in the Nation.

The record shows the significant change that has taken place in compliance of school districts organized on a dual, racially-segregated basis. In 1963, before the enactment of the Civil Rights Act, only 11.7 percent of Negro students in the 11 Deep Southern States were attending school with whites; in September 1967 this percentage had increased to 13.9 percent. Nearly all school districts with white and Negro teachers have begun the process of faculty desegregation.

Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted in 1967 spread the effects of Civil Rights measures by requiring that HEW's compliance program "be uniformly applied and enforced throughout the fifty States." Subsequently the Department began to study the distribution of minority students and faculty—Spanish-surnamed, Oriental, and Indian, as well as Negro—from Northern and Western school districts. More than 30 preliminary reviews and five full reviews of school systems have taken place. Preliminary review shows that civil rights problems are nationwide and concern all minority groups.

In a very real sense, the Nation is at a turning point in its efforts to bring alive the principles of equality and justice. I recommend:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act continue to be not a panacea, but an indispensable ingredient in the total Federal approach to equal educational opportunity.

Legislation to provide Federal financial aid to school districts which have an approved plan of desegregation for school construction, teachers' salaries and other needed services where such school districts demonstrate a fiscal incapacity to carry out such plans.

The civil rights program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be administered by a Deputy Under Secretary with responsibility for compliance, technical assistance, and education.

#### *Improving the quality of the environment*

On Christmas Day, 1968, three Americans circling the moon transmitted photographs to Earth which more forcefully than any other event in history emphasized the fragile and destructive nature of our environment. We know far better now than ever before how thin and precious is the veil of atmosphere, how rare and wondrous are the oceans and rivers, how incredibly complex and delicate is the balance, which permit the existence of life on Earth.

Today this Earth of ours faces a major environmental crisis. Urbanization, the increase of population, fantastic advances in technology, and the mistakes of the past have brought biological, radiological and chemical contamination of land, air, food and water; crowding; noise; destruction of natural resources, and many other threats to human health and well-being. We cannot have it all one way or the other. The human race cannot prosper unless it makes use of the riches of the Earth. But man cannot survive if he turns these resources against himself in the form of pollution and contamination, and hazardous living conditions.

Such problems cannot be solved piecemeal. They require continuous, coordinated study and action. To this end a new organization—the Consumer Protection and Environmental

Health Service was set up last July within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As the one agency in the Federal Government approaching all the complex environmental problems from the viewpoint of human health, safety and welfare, HEW should provide a central focus for the Nation's environmental efforts.

Throughout the environment, the forces of change far outnumber those aimed at understanding the significance of change. Our vast and growing capability in the fields of science and engineering has enabled us to push on, all too often without knowing where we are going, what we are doing to our world, and to ourselves.

As a first major step toward this essential knowledge, I have directed the establishment of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences among the nine National Institutes of Health. This new institute is a further commitment on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the Federal Government, to the principle that human well-being and health must not suffer because of man-made environmental changes.

We must continue and expand our environmental control efforts.

Therefore, I recommend:

Expansion of our efforts to reduce air and water pollution—two of the greatest threats to man's health and economy.

Application of all of our knowledge to reduce accidental deaths and injuries, and expansion of occupational health programs.

Elimination of the food contamination which causes food-borne disease.

Elimination of substandard and unsafe drinking water supplies.

Protection of the American people from exposure to all harmful radiation.

An increase in our efforts to control community noise.

Expansion and improvement of solid wastes management.

Increase in our efforts to reduce home and neighborhood environmental health problems, including a drastic reduction of the number of rats in the United States.

Expansion of research and evaluation of the effects of environmental stresses on the individual.

#### *Cooperation with the private sector*

The private sector in 1968 was responsible for \$52 billion of the \$163 billion invested in the Nation's health, education and welfare. The amount spent by the private sector grew from \$35 billion in 1953 and will continue to grow with the years.

There is ample room in our society for a substantial and creative role for the private sector. Business enterprise can help train young people—including the disadvantaged—for New Careers. They can help perform nutrition research, to solve the terrible problems of hunger and malnutrition. The television and communications industry can forge direct lines between patient and doctor. New learning machines can bring about great changes in curriculum and bring more knowledge for more children. A non-hazardous cigarette might emerge from industry-government cooperation. Such cooperation could also result in the development of technological ways to control air and water pollution.

Business and government are not enemies. They should and could be effective partners in a wide range of constructive activities which would mean better health—education—and welfare for all Americans.

#### *The need to choose*

Eight years ago, when I returned to HEW from university life, there were about 100 programs in the Department. Today we administer more than 250 programs.

Statistics, of course, are significant only as they affect human beings. Statistical changes at HEW have touched—changed—and im-

proved the personal lives of millions. They now spell hope and opportunity in the most profound sense of those over-used words.

But we cannot afford simply to continue what we're doing. We cannot afford to stand still. When our population is increasing so dramatically and the complexity of our problems is intensifying, standing still is going backwards. We have built up the momentum; we must go forward.

To do so we must be willing to pay the bill. We must continue to improve the administration of present programs of course. But in this world you cannot get something for nothing. We must choose what we want to do in health, in education, and in social opportunity, and find sensible, convenient and equitable ways to pay for it.

Here at HEW, we have progressed far toward the achievement of the Republic's oldest, fondest dream: making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before. We have increased the individual American's real freedom. We have done so by giving him greater options. Social Security and Medicare give parents, grandparents and children the freedom to choose different paths. They have more choice as to what to do with their money and their talents. No longer does a family have to give up a youngster's college education to pay a grandparent's medical bills. Education programs give young and old alike the equipment to choose between careers. (After all, the illiterate man has no real freedom to choose what he wants to do.) The development of an effective measles vaccine prevents the crippling of thousands of children and lifts a burden from parental shoulders. Rehabilitation programs make work possible, life bearable, and return the investment made in them many times in earnings and taxes.

It is my hope that the United States will use its vast resources to abolish poverty, improve the health and education of all our people and achieve an adequate system of social security. It is my hope that those who do the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's work will never lose sight of their goals, and will press forward to create better programs for all Americans.

#### 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. HUNT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUILLEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADAIR, for 30 minutes, January 30, 1969.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 15 minutes, January 30.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 60 minutes, on February 4.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. GUBBES in three instances.

Mr. STANTON in three instances.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. HASTINGS in five instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. ASHBRICK in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. MAILLARD in two instances.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. AYRES.

Mrs. DWYER in three instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. McKNELLAY.

Mr. SKUBITZ.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in three instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. PURCELL in two instances.

Mr. KOCH in four instances.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in four instances.

Mr. SLACK in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. DOWNING in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. PERKINS in two instances.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 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:

442. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 56th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on disbursements from the appropriation for "Contingencies defense" contained in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

444. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the claim of Mr. Corbie F. Cochran against the United States, pursuant to the provisions of 45 Stat. 413 (31 U.S.C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

445. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a request for withdrawal and return of case No. A-1758471 previously transmitted, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 4781. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 4782. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4783. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4784. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 4785. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to request the assignment of U.S. Marines to assist in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4786. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4787. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4788. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4789. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. GURR, Mr. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HUNT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MILLS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. STRATTON):

H.R. 4791. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BREWER, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4792. A bill to provide educational assistance to children of civilian employees of the United States killed abroad as a result of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCO, Mr. FARBECKSTEIN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GILBERT, and Mr. GUPE):

H.R. 4793. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 4794. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 4795. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child-welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah (for himself and Mr. LLOYD):

H.R. 4796. A bill to provide that the land reserved for any national monument shall not exceed 2,560 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4797. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4798. A bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to administratively settle tort claims arising in foreign countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4799. A bill to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4800. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 4801. A bill to assure to every American a full opportunity to have adequate employment, housing, and education, free from any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 4802. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Fed-

eral employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 4803. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4804. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4805. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to clarify the right to a member of a uniformed service to a family separation allowance without regard to whether his dependents live in residence or household subject to the management or control of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4806. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself, Mr. ATREES, Mr. QUIK, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. ESCO, and Mr. ESHLEMAN):

H.R. 4807. A bill to provide for educational assistance for gifted and talented children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, and Mr. FRIEDEL):

H.R. 4808. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of every grade crossing along the high-speed rail line between Washington, D.C., and New York City; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 4809. A bill to amend section 101(a) (27) (D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 4810. A bill to authorize the release of 50,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4811. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corp. and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4812. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States, to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4813. A bill to extend the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4814. A bill to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize loans to assist older persons who have been displaced from their homes by urban renewal projects to purchase comparable homes, free of additional debt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4816. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters by the Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title II of the

Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4819. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KLEPPÉ:

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit advance payments to wheat producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4821. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. KEE, Mr. MATSUMAGA, Mr. MICKVA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4822. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4823. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide that the Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy and Air Force shall be a brigadier general or rear admiral, as the case may be, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4824. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4829. 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 exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4830. A bill to authorize realistic, economic, and modern building heights and bulk in the District of Columbia, to provide

new business and employment opportunities for all, to expand the tax base, to stimulate and assist efforts to break the poverty cycle and strengthen the economy, to provide parking, to rebuild and renew blighted, slum, burned-out, and underdeveloped areas, to conserve and make the best, and maximum, use of land, to achieve the best design, to save tax funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4831. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the concurrent payment of foreign post pay differentials and nonforeign post cost-of-living allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend title 42, United States Code, to limit the information which may be required by local school authorities from recipients of free or reduced-price school lunches under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4833. A bill to establish a commission to make a comprehensive study and evaluation of the methods of selecting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4835. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Constellation National Historic Site, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4836. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit the baiting of waterfowl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4838. A bill to establish the National Oceanographic Agency; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 4839. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and maternity care in service facilities for certain members of the uniformed services and their dependents after such members are separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4841. A bill to provide for Federal control over foreign banking corporations operating within the United States, the District of Columbia, the several territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4843. A bill to improve educational quality through the effective utilization of educational technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4844. A bill to amend title 39, United

States Code, to provide for the mailing of newsletters of nonprofit organizations addressed to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, without cost to such organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PREYER of North Carolina:

H.R. 4845. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands at Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 4846. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the brave men who served on the U.S.S. *Liberty* and the U.S.S. *Pueblo*; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4847. A bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4848. A bill to expand and improve the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. Saylor:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 4850. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 4853. A bill to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the Okefenokee Wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 408 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to aid law-enforcement officers taking courses through correspondence schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4855. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4856. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the inclusion of certain cost estimates of certain measures reported by the standing committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 4858. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to include within the parental beneficiary class under the servicemen's group life insurance program persons who stood in loco parentis to a deceased insured; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax

credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4860. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenses of child adoption shall be treated as medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a deduction from gross income for certain contributions to the support of an aged parent or divorced mother who is not gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a deduction from gross income for certain expenses of employing full-time household help; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4863. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of advanced education (including certain limited travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4865. A bill to authorize the distribution of a portion of the Federal tax revenue to the States for elementary and secondary education purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 4866. A bill, Utility Consumers Council Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. MIZE, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. LURENS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. DOWNING):

H.R. 4867. A bill to establish a commission to make a comprehensive study and evaluation of the methods of selecting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4868. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for the accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concession investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 4869. A bill to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4870. A bill to authorize the construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., operation and maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no garnishment of compensation and no seizure of property may be made by the Internal Revenue Service without a court order; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 4872. A bill to provide for the apportionment of funds in payment of a judgment in favor of the Shoshone Tribe in consolidated docket Nos. 326-D, 326-E, 326-F,

326-G, 326-H, 365, and 367 before the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 4873. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 4874. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4875. A bill to establish a Commission on Hunger; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4876. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to improve the existing program for assistance for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities and to provide for the making of loans for such modernization; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4877. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, relating to the dumping of certain materials into the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers and single persons who have attained age 30 and maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 4879. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4881. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the effects of the display of violence in television programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 306. 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.

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 310. 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. DE LA GARZA:

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution directing a joint study by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the effect of conglomerate activities on the transportation and communications industries, the securities markets, and interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICKINSON, Mr. DONORO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLARD D. FORD, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MIRKVA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. NEZDI):

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POEDL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, as signatory bodies, for certain amendments to the compact creating the Potomac Valley Conservancy District and establishing the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the intervention in Czechoslovakia

by the military forces of the Soviet Union and its satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to terminate foreign direct investment controls; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to implement the foreign economic policy of the United States by terminating controls on foreign direct investment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to investigate the capture of the U.S.S. Pueblo; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the furnishing of relief assistance to victims of the Nigerian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H. Res. 162. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H. Res. 164. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Res. 165. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H. Res. 166. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 167. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H. Res. 168. Resolution relating to the clerk hire allowance of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RARICK:

H. Res. 169. Resolution relative to commitment of U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 170. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 171. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. Res. 172. Resolution relative to consideration of House Resolution 133; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. Res. 173. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4882. A bill for the relief of Allison Jean Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4883. A bill for the relief of Shee Ming Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4884. A bill for the relief of Luis U. Ursua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4885. A bill for the relief of Stanley Wing Soon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 4886. A bill for the relief of German D. Anulacion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4887. A bill for the relief of Onofre Olivar Napenias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4888. A bill for the relief of (Juan) O. Francisco Orbino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Acierino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Alois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4891. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe and Stella Ambroselli and minor child Michael Ambroselli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4892. A bill for the relief of Francesca and Antonio Ardizzone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4893. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Ardizzone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4894. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Badalamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4895. A bill for the relief of Gino Badalati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Battaglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4897. A bill for the relief of Riccardo Bazzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4898. A bill for the relief of Antonino Bellone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4899. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Canale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4900. A bill for the relief of Gilda and Arturo Canestraro and minor children, Sandro and Mirena Canestraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4901. A bill for the relief of Francesco Casello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4902. A bill for the relief of Rosario Corrao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4903. A bill for the relief of Matilde Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4904. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo D'Aquisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4905. A bill for the relief of Pantaleo DeSanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4906. A bill for the relief of Amelio DeSimone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4907. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo DiNatale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4908. A bill for the relief of Mordechal Elbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4909. A bill for the relief of Giusto Farinella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4910. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe and Nunzia Gatusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4911. A bill for the relief of Paul Hypolite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4912. A bill for the relief of Jakob Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4913. A bill for the relief of Gaspare LaMarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4914. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe LoBuono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4915. A bill for the relief of Ruel Longmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4916. A bill for the relief of Faro Lucce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4917. A bill for the relief of Natalina Miceli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4918. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Pacchiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Ernestina Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4920. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Polizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano and Ross Maria Riccobene and minor child Ross Maria Riccobene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Francesco Romanotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Kalman Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Maria Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4925. A bill for the relief of Martino Salluzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4926. A bill for the relief of Cologero Sanzone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4927. A bill for the relief of Marino and Antonia Stanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4928. A bill for the relief of Rocco Stanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4929. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Tarantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4930. A bill for the relief of Maria Terracciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4931. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Tola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4932. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4933. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vivona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4934. A bill for the relief of Marco Visconti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4935. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4936. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Vlachakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4937. A bill for the relief of Ng Chio Kwan, also known as Daniel Yong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4938. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Saladino and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4939. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francois E. Alouf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4940. A bill for the relief of Rosa Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4941. A bill for the relief of Jacek Swiergula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4942. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Uribe-Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4943. A bill for the relief of Dr. William W. Lee and his wife, Rowena C. Yee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4944. A bill for the relief of Tomazos G. Leonidas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 4945. A bill for the relief of Presentacion Solana Aguado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4946. A bill for the relief of Renato Costanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Guia Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4948. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Rega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4949. A bill for the relief of Fu Sheng Cheng (also known as Fred Cheng); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4950. A bill for the relief of Luigi Bottari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4951. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ciprietti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4952. A bill for the relief of Adrian Thales Halmar Corfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4953. A bill for the relief of Jane Nathalie Corfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4954. A bill for the relief of John Fraser Rohn Corfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4955. A bill for the relief of Gabriele DiGiacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4956. A bill for the relief of Flavia Merlino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4957. A bill for the relief of Luis Maria Quinteros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4958. A bill for the relief of Antonio F. Savini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4959. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Serafino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4960. A bill for the relief of Adua Taraschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4961. A bill for the relief of John Venizelate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4962. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Sanfilippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 4963. A bill for the relief of Antonio Esposito, Giuseppa Esposito, and Maria Rosa Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4964. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Esposito; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 4965. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4966. A bill for the relief of Milba and Rodolfo Latorre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4967. A bill for the relief of Enrique M. and Margarita Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4968. A bill for the relief of John S. Avagelou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4969. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Georgiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4970. A bill for the relief of John Fotopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Geroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Petroula Kapranos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4973. A bill for the relief of Christopher John Kyriazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Liskopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Spyridonios Limberatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4976. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Lyberopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Florentina S. Mallari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4978. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Papastathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4979. A bill for the relief of Stavros Vasiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 4980. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Saied Ahmed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4981. A bill for the relief of Guido Aquilini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of James M. Buster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Wilfried K. Byl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Santiago Peith Castellanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4986. A bill for the relief of Ali Riza Korkut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4987. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rizeline Lanuzo and her minor daughter, Leolina Lanuzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4988. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luigard R. Oswald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4989. A bill for the relief of Yuksel Sagirlioglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4990. A bill for the relief of Cecilia A. S. Peixoto da Silveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4991. A bill for the relief of Heydar Rezaghy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4992. A bill for the relief of Miss Melody P. de Guzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Jurgen Schmidt, his wife Hanna Schmidt (nee Kock), and their son Michael Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4994. A bill for the relief of Donald Tooms, his wife Astrid Tooms, and their children Louise Tooms and Donald Craig Tooms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4995. A bill for the relief of Teresa Metrisiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marvin Riesel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaime E. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lydia L. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4999. A bill for the relief of Flora Zervas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDOVA:

H.R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Luis Barca Ruiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 5002. A bill for the relief of Alberto C. Fowler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Vashdev Ramchand Khanli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Nilmet Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esteban G. Friera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Naim Nissim Ben-Zur, Eliana Ben-Zur, Liora Ben-Zur, Orna Ben-Zur, and Mayer Ben-Zur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5007. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Cappello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Ciro Guestella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5009. A bill for the relief of Stefano Inzalaco, Calogera Inzalaco, Angelo Inzalaco, and Giovanni Inzalaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5010. A bill for the relief of Domenico Vilasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 5011. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bastianini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5012. A bill for the relief of Sergio Farina, Maria Farina, Sergio Giovanni Farina, Gino A. Farina, Maria L. Farina, and Blanca Farina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5013. A bill for the relief of Domenica Gagliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5014. A bill for the relief of Irene Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5015. A bill for the relief of Rosa Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5016. A bill for the relief of Angel Saghabazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 5017. A bill for the relief of A. Hughlett Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 5018. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Marvin R. Foltz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 5019. A bill for the relief of Desanka (nee Rogic) Haen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5020. A bill for the relief of Sabatino Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 5021. A bill for the relief of Arrighi Renato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5022. A bill for the relief of Doriane Santalmassas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5023. A bill for the relief of Dr. Venkatachala Iyengar Sreenivas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFITHS:

H.R. 5024. A bill for the relief of Pablo Gregorich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leo Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5026. A bill for the relief of Young II Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5027. A bill for the relief of James L. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5028. A bill for the relief of Renee Aljean (Hogarth) Ballesteros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5029. A bill for the relief of Yip Shing Butt, his wife, Kim Wah Chan Butt, and their minor daughter, Siu Wah Butt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Dominador Villena Calip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kyung Nam Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5032. A bill for the relief of Du-Nam Lee Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5033. A bill for the relief of Victor Amaro Cuoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5034. A bill for the relief of Nasser Honavar and his wife, Sabreh Honavar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5035. A bill for the relief of Myung Ja Jun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5036. A bill for the relief of Honestio Magdirlila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Ok Sun Maher and her children, Chris Maher and Donna Maher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Sheng Tong and Sheng Mee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5039. A bill for the relief of James F. Nugent and Catherine F. Nugent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5040. A bill for the relief of Vincent Rohaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5041. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Milagros Acuna Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5042. A bill for the relief of Manuel Salazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5043. A bill for the relief of Joe A. Seljan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5044. A bill for the relief of Rachane Tangtrongchit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5045. A bill for the relief of Maria Nelly Toscano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5046. A bill for the relief of Kyung Hie Won and his wife, Jung Hie Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 5047. A bill for the relief of Justin S. T. Hsu (also known as Su-Tieng Hsu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5048. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 5049. A bill for the relief of Eusebio Briones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5050. A bill for the relief of Georgios Dracos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5051. A bill for the relief of Mario Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5052. A bill for the relief of Guido Ghiselli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5053. A bill for the relief of Secundo Neri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KART:

H.R. 5054. A bill for the relief of Anna Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 5055. A bill for the relief of Israel Wald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 5056. A bill for the relief of Antonio Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5057. A bill for the relief of Maria Palestini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Angelo Panari and Pierina Panari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVENSTEIN:

H.R. 5059. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hossein Firooznia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 5060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Engracia Davila-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Erdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Mr. Paulino Narvios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5063. A bill for the relief of Andreino Simonetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 5064. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nazar I Abu-Merta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5065. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mahmoud Wael Lotfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5066. A bill for the relief of Generosa Sisno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5067. A bill for the relief of Yuka Awamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5068. A bill for the relief of Mieko Imoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 5069. A bill for the relief of Ilaea Kalember; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Florentina Layugan Tungpalan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Cho Fae Man; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Georgiades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5073. A bill for the relief of Antonia Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Benedetto and Valeria Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Vito Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5076. A bill for the relief of Nadia Canducci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe, Giuseppa, Rose, Pietro, Rosario, and Santa Inzerillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Victoria Tellas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kee Po Fu Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Bizzarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5081. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Croce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Rocco Croce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Salvatore DeSimone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Antonio DiCampli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Lombardo and his wife, Gaetana Castrogiovanni Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5086. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Martinetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5087. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Menegazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5088. A bill for the relief of Walter Pedro Narbalz and his wife, Nelda DiCamelo Narbalz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5089. A bill for the relief of Angelo Noto and his wife, Maria Pluchino Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Francesco Andreottola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Enrico Carrieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gaspero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5093. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Marzulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Francesco Schilfone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Chul Ok Yoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Philemon M. Hou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5097. A bill for the relief of Miss Hiroko Kurokawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5098. A bill for the relief of Mr. Pyoung Tai Kwun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5099. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agueda C. Monserrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5100. A bill for the relief of Mrs. prima C. Rulivivar and her minor son, Francisco C. Rulivivar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5101. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Kates C. Semenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5102. A bill for the relief of Patricia M. Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5103. A bill for the relief of James Yu-Wan Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5104. A bill for the relief of Carol Philippa Wettlaufa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5105. A bill for the relief of Kai-Loo Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5106. A bill for the relief of Rogelio Tabban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 5107. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Mosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5108. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Blotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5109. A bill for the relief of Ferminia R. Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5110. A bill for the relief of Jose Laranjeira Cerqueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Maria Fernanda Pascoal da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5112. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Perdigon de Peralta-Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5113. A bill for the relief of Maria De Jesus Da Silva Ferreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5114. A bill for the relief of Ana Adelina Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5115. A bill for the relief of Maria Inez Pacheco de Andrade Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5116. A bill for the relief of Caterina Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5117. A bill for the relief of Lubelia Maria Mendes Moniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5118. A bill for the relief of Othon Da Rocha Rebello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5119. A bill for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Silva Lourenco Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5120. A bill for the relief of Nicola Santangelo, his wife, Merina (Tarciani) Santangelo, and their minor child, Antonio Santangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Geraldine Teixeira Claudette Skeete; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5122. A bill for the relief of Rui Carlos Vasconcelos and his daughter, Nair de

Marques Teixeira da Souza Vasconcelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5123. A bill for the relief of Teresa Wind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBEL:

H.R. 5124. A bill for the relief of Naoko Straub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5125. A bill for the relief of Giorgios Miron Kalimakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5126. A bill for the relief of Guillermo O. Ruminian and his wife, Febe A. Ruminian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 5127. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vivien C. Baltan and his wife, Rosalina Estrera Baltan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5128. A bill for the relief of Dr. Caesar Octavio Jimenez-Pazos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5129. A bill for the relief of Bernard Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5130. A bill for the relief of Chong Wan Lee, his wife, Hong Sam Lee, and their children; Paul Lee and John Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5131. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandrasekaraparam Narayanan, his wife, Yamuna Narayanan, and their children, Manoj Narayanan, Vinodh Narayanan, and Pramilla Narayanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5132. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacques Sauvage, his wife, Jacqueline C. Sauvage, and their children, Dominique Jose J. Sauvage, Anne Michele Sauvage, and Jean-Jacques M. Sauvage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 5133. A bill for the relief of Pagona Anomeranaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5134. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Schofield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5135. A bill for the relief of Dr. Subhash Shah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5136. A bill for the relief of George Tilson Weed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5137. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tran Kim Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5138. A bill for the relief of Pham Thi Ly (also known as Mrs. Hal-Linh Tran); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5139. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giuliano and his wife, Giuseppina Testa Giuliano, and their children, Michelina Giuliano and Magdalena Giuliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 5140. A bill for the relief of Erman Donald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5141. A bill for the relief of Parvin Gohari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5142. A bill for the relief of Julita Sidiarin Hepolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alejandrina Medina de Ibanez and her minor children, Norah Silva Ibanez and Juan Lewis Ibanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Maria Lidia Hernandes Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5145. A bill for the relief of Muriel Bertha Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5146. A bill for the relief of J. Jesus Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 5147. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Maria Calone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Stefania Chaber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5149. A bill for the relief of Italia Ponzone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Ilona Galambos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Christine (Krystyna) Gorayska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5152. A bill for the relief of James Vincent, Eugenia, Serafina, Rocco Fernando, and Nicolo Mella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Gloria Molina Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5154. A bill for the relief of Vito, Giovanna, and Maria Tarantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Wolfgang Scheufgen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5156. A bill for the relief of Werner Max Wehnemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## BAIL REFORM NEEDED

**HON. TIM LEE CARTER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Thomas W. Lippman of the Washington Post shows a classic example of the need to tighten the Bail Reform Act. The man accused of rape was sentenced to a prison term of 10 to 30 years. Prior to his conviction for rape, he had been arrested for various other crimes, including auto theft, housebreaking, carnal knowledge, housebreaking a second time, and petty larceny—and he was released on these several charges on his personal bond. Finally, he committed such a revolting crime that he was at last sentenced to prison for a term of 10 to 30 years.

The folly of releasing a habitual criminal on his own bond or on probation is exemplified in the article which I include at this point in the RECORD:

JUDGE GIVES RAPIST 10-30 YEARS

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

In a case he called a "classic example" of the need to tighten the Bail Reform Act, a judge yesterday sentenced a convicted rapist to a prison term of 10 to 30 years.

Judge John J. Sirica of U.S. District Court said the crime committed by Philip E. Duckett, 23, was "particularly vicious." But he reserved his strongest words for the legal system that allowed Duckett to be free to commit the crime in the first place.

His remarks, which he prepared in advance, were made part of the record in Duckett's case.

On May 27, 1966, Judge Sirica said, "this defendant was placed on probation" after pleading guilty to a charge of auto theft, a felony.

While he was still on probation, he was arrested on Aug. 24, 1966, on two other felony charges—housebreaking and carnal knowledge. He was released on personal bond to await his trial. His probation was not revoked.

The following April, still on probation and still awaiting trial on the later charges, he was picked up again, this time for housebreaking and petty larceny.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Sister Elisa (Antonietta Frongia) and Sister Maria Claudia (Luciana Cancedda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Irini Chalmoukis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5159. A bill for the relief of Precioso Abayan Gabrillo, Jr., and his wife, Erlinda Ignacio Gabrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5160. A bill for the relief of Epa A. Onate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5161. A bill for the relief of Bernward Karl Paulke and Winfried Paulke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5162. A bill for the relief of Kamisetty Ramamohan Rao, his wife, K. Karuma Rao, and their children, K. Ramesh Rao and K. Sasirekha Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5163. A bill for the relief of Morad Rashti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5164. A bill for the relief of Samir Tarsha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. XATES:

H.R. 5165. A bill for the relief of Jakob Karl Blumer and his wife, Brigitte Blumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5166. A bill for the relief of Amnon Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5167. A bill for the relief of Vito Portucci and his sister, Maria Miceli and her husband, Giacomo Miceli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edmund A. Langr, Laurel, Md., et al., relative to taxation of citizens for public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

41. Also, petition of Louis Kushner, Monticello, N.Y., relative to election to the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

return to court in 90 days for a review of his conviction.

The 17-year-old was driving the car the police chased from the bank. A 16-year-old companion was found in the trunk. He has not yet appeared in Juvenile Court.

Police said they also found three loaded guns and \$818 in cash in the car. Det. Sgt. Harry Noone of the Robbery Squad said he believes that three youths were involved. He said the officers chasing the car saw it stop once and let out a teen-ager who got into another car and drove off in a different direction.

The disposition of the 17-year-old's case was not known until yesterday. Judge Fauntleroy could not be reached for comment.

It seems to me that an attempt should be made to rehabilitate this young man.

### ANTI-SEMITISM IN POLAND

**HON. JACOB K. JAVITS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 28, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the winds of dissent coursing through Communist Eastern Europe, where the youth are raising questions about justice and individual freedom, have brought a chill counterblast of anti-Semitism in Poland. This reaction to popular demands for freedom is sadly reminiscent of the tactics of czarist times when the Imperial Russian Government blamed the Jews for its woes. Fortunately, to its great credit the Catholic Church, which still has considerable influence with many Poles, has opposed this campaign.

Of the once thriving Jewish community of 3.5 million who lived in Poland before World War II, only a pitiful remnant of between 20,000 and 25,000 souls—less than 1 percent of Poland's population—remain to be buffeted by this government-encouraged anti-Semitism.

The New York Times of December 30, 1968, contained an excellent analysis of the status of Poland's Jewish population. I ask unanimous consent that it be